

THE SENATE DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1981 – 86

THE SENATE

Wednesday, January 23, 1985.

The Senate met in the Senate Chamber, Public Buildings on Wednesday, January 23, 1985, at 11.20 a.m.

PRESENT

His Honour Senator the Honourable Sir Arnott Cator, K.C.M.G., (President)

His Honour Senator J. C. W. Wickham, M.B.E., (Deputy President)

Senator the Hon. N. A. Barrow, (Minister of Information and Culture) (Leader of the Senate)

Senator the Hon. O'Brien Trotman, (Minister of Health)

Senator the Hon. C. A. Griffith, (Minister of State, Prime Minister's Office)

Senator J. E. D. Williams, (Parliamentary Secretary of the Prime Minister)

Senator H. R. Linton

Senator Mrs. E. M. Lynch, G.C.M.

Senator D. A. C. Simmons

Senator Mrs. M. O. Reece

Senator E. E. Greaves

Senator A. W. A. McClean

Senator Mrs. G. G. Reader, M.B.E.

Senator C. D. Seale

Senator the Rev. Canon I. McK. Jones

Senator L. A. Ward, G.C.M.

Senator C. E. Jemmott, B.S.S., J.P.

Prayers were led by Senator the Rev. Canon I. McK. JONES.

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Mr. PRESIDENT: I have a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General to the Honourable the Senate:

"His Excellency the Governor-General has the honour to inform the Honourable the Senate that on the advice of the Prime Minister the seat in the Senate held by Mr. St. Clair Ethelbert Howell has been declared vacant under the provisions of section 39(1) of the Constitution with effect from the 7th January, 1985.

His Excellency further has the honour to inform the Honourable the Senate that on the advice of the Prime Minister the following persons have been appointed under the provisions of section 36(2) of the Constitution to be Senators with effect from the 7th January, 1985:

Mr. Herbert Elwyn Yearwood
Mr. John Emmanuel Jordan."

Will the Clerk please ask these gentlemen to come in?

Senators HERBERT ELWYN YEARWOOD and JOHN EMMANUEL JORDAN entered the Chamber, escorted by the Clerk, and took their places.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Yearwood and Senator Jordan, it is my very pleasant duty, on behalf of myself and the Senate, to welcome you most cordially to this Chamber.

I understand that both you gentlemen have had some experience in public life. Mr. Yearwood has served on Statutory Boards and is at present Chairman, I believe, of Caribbean Airways and Aero Services. He has also had an association with the Transport Board in the past. I believe Mr. Jordan has also had association with the Transport Board, and is at present on the tutorial staff of the Community College.

Although you have not been exposed directly to the Legislature, I think that your experience in public life will have geared you for the work which you are prepared to do up here. The atmosphere in this Chamber is

a little bit different from what you might have associated with another place. We very seldom get into turbulent situations in this Chamber, but it is nevertheless a most important and integral part of the Constitution of this country, and it has the capacity for doing a great deal of important work. Apart from a delaying and revising Chamber, which looks over legislation that has passed the Other Place, and sometimes discovers reasons why legislation should be amended, this Chamber has the power to initiate legislation, provided it has no financial implications.

11.30 a.m.

I am sure you will be able, in due course, to make a useful contribution to the work of this House. I welcome you, as I say, very cordially. I understand that you have taken the necessary oaths and I now invite you to take your seats in this Chamber.

SENATORS H. YEARWOOD and J. JORDAN took their seats in the Chamber.

Applause.

Mr. PRESIDENT: If you would like to say anything, you can do so now.

SENATOR H. E. YEARWOOD: Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, fellow Senators, I am indeed happy. I wish to thank you, Mr. President, very much for your kind remarks in welcoming me this morning to this Honourable Chamber. I am honoured to have been given this opportunity to serve in this distinguished House among such distinguished citizens of this country.

I am conscious of the responsibility which has been placed upon me, and I will certainly do my best at all times to uphold the dignity and the rich traditions for which this House is so well known.

It is my desire, Mr. President, to contribute as much as possible to the debates in this Honourable House, I hope that, in my contributions in this House, I will do as much as possible in the interest of all my fellow countrymen.

Mr. President, I wish to thank you once more for your kind remarks, and I hope that I will have a very satisfying period in this Chamber.

Applause.

Mr. J. E. JORDAN: Mr. President, I wish to thank you for the warm words of welcome and facilitations that you have offered. I pledge to uphold the dignity and character of this Upper Chamber and to give of my best.

I hope that these qualities will be reflected in my tenure in this Chamber.

I thank you, Sir.

Applause.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR

Mr. PRESIDENT: I understand that our Chaplain has taken ill and is in hospital. I am sure honourable Members would wish me, on their behalf, to send him remembrances and our wishes for a speedy recovery.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I have the honour to present the following:-

The Health Services (Embalmers and Funeral Directors) Regulations.

Financial statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for 7 months ended 31st October 1984.

The Annual Report and Financial Statements of the Barbados Export Promotion Corporation for the year ended 31st March 1984.

The Judges Remuneration Order, 1984.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1984.

The Fourth Annual Report and Financial Statements of the National Sports Council for the year ended 31st March 1982.

The Fifth Annual Report and Financial Statements of the National Sports Council for the year ended 31st March 1983.

The Sixth Annual Report and Financial Statements of the National Sports Council for the year ended 31st March 1984.

The Consumption Tax Order, 1985.

Report on the Audit of the Accounts of the Child Care Board for the financial year 1982 to 1983.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, there are no Bills, but there are three Resolutions, which, in accordance with the Standing Orders of the Senate, would have been given adequate notice of in that they have been given a clear day's notice. These Resolutions are:-

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 approve the revision of salaries of certain posts on the staff of Parliament; and

Resolution to approve the revision of salaries of the posts of the Prime Minister's personal staff.

The Resolution which we would find more challenging, the Resolution dealing with the borrowing of 5 billion yen, is one which I have to inflict on the Honourable Chamber today, because it is a very urgent matter. I am sure Senators would have no difficulty in dealing with the other two today as well.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Sir, I propose to take the order of business as it appears on the Order Paper today, and to take the three items which I have just mentioned in the same order that I have given them.

PRIVATE INVESTIGATORS AND SECURITY GUARDS ACT, 1984

Order No. 1 was called - To move the Second Reading of a Bill to provide for the licensing and control of private investigators and security guards and for related matters.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, this Bill, according to the file, had its origins before April 13, 1978, in that on that date we find a member of staff in the Attorney General's Chambers seeking policy instructions in order to draft a Bill about which the then Attorney General had spoken to him. In the time that has elapsed between April 1978 and now, there has been a great deal of consideration given to this matter. All sorts of reasons advanced in the course of conversations have been given careful consideration, and so the Bill has reached us in the present form. Yet, when we come to deal with the Schedule, I shall have to offer an amendment, because one little thing did get away. This relates to the fact that the Solicitor-General, who is for many purposes the legal adviser, has been named in the Schedule as the Chairman of the Board. I think the files will show "Solicitor-General Browne", which means many years ago, because Browne has not been in the Government Service now for some time. I pointed out many years ago that this should not be so, but that was the one that got away.

11.40 a.m.

The amendment which I shall move, when we come to deal with the Schedule would be to delete (a), then go to what is set out as (b) and delete the word, "deputy", and then do a consequential renumbering, so that (a) to (e) will become (a) to (d). That, of course, will require the Bill going back to the Other Place, because once it is amended, it must go back.

This Bill seeks to provide for the licensing of private investigators for means of affording greater protection to the individual's rights against possible invasion by private investigators; for the licensing of security guards as a means of ensuring, as far as possible, that those who provide services as security guards or engage in the business of providing security guards are fit and proper persons, and also seeks to regulate the conduct of private investigators and security guards. The Bill has some 31 clauses, and I shall briefly go through the important provisions which I think members need to bear in mind.

I trust it has become evident that the whole context of this is that the use of security guards has become rather more prevalent in Barbados than was formerly the case. This has brought Government's attention to the fact that there is need for bringing the operation of the security guards and of private investigators within some clearly-defined context, so that they will understand what the limits are within which they operate, and that the society will understand that its rights are protected within this context.

In essence, what this Bill is introducing is the provision that a licence is necessary for a person or agency to function under the provisions of the Bill. Accordingly, Clause 3 (1) makes provision for the establishment of a Board, to be known as the Private Investigators and Security Guards Licensing and Advisory Board. (When titles are that long, I know that there is a great temptation to abbreviate. I trust that if they seek to abbreviate this, they will be a little careful in not seeking to pronounce the abbreviation). The Board will have the power to issue, revoke, suspend or vary a licence.

Under Clause 17 (3), notice of the issue of a licence must be published in the *Official Gazette*. Clause 18 (1) provides that:

"Any person may, within 1 month after the issue of a licence is notified in the *Official Gazette*, file with the Board an objection in respect of the issue of the licence."

The Board may suspend the licence until the objection is determined. Appeals to a decision of the Board may be made to a judge in Chambers, whose decision is final. That last provision is, of course, extremely important, because it provides against the arbitrary or whimsical refusal of a licence by the Board.

Under Clause 9(1), power is given to a security guard to arrest without a warrant any person who is in breach of the peace, or whom he reasonably believes to be in breach of the peace, who commits or attempts to commit treason or a felony. However, where such an arrest is made, the security guard shall, within reasonable time thereafter, take the person arrested to a police station or before a magistrate. That power of arrest is one which, at first, might excite interest. The fact of the matter is that every citizen, under the common law, does have a power of arrest. Police have wider powers of arrest. Here, the power is quite clearly prescribed, and, in my view, is hardly different from the power of arrest which any citizen enjoys, the right to arrest someone who is committing an arrestable offence or attempting to commit an arrestable offence.

I should mention the important guarantee there is that, having arrested someone, there is no discretion. The legal obligation is to take that person to a police station or before a magistrate. When we talk about "within a reasonable time", this is not something which is a subjective matter. This is, given the circumstances, what is a reasonable time. In some cases, a reasonable time may be half an hour; in some cases, it may be a little longer; but that is a matter which is capable of judicial assessment.

In an attempt to protect the rights of the individual, Clause 11 (1) prohibits the use of listening and photographic devices by a private investigator or security guard without the prior consent of that other person. This is very necessary in a country where we are not well provided with legislation protecting privacy. There is a penalty provided, of course, for violating that section. That is extremely important, because that is the provision which will prevent people from tapping your telephone and doing any such thing unless you consent to it.

Under Clause 24, a magistrate is given the power to authorize a search of premises by any member of the Police Force, if he has reason to believe that a place is being used for the purpose of carrying on the business of a private investigator or security guard, or any agency, by any person who is not a licensee under this Act. That is straightforward.

"On application to the Board security guards who have received special training may be granted permission to use firearms in the performance of certain prescribed functions, if they are licensed to use firearms under the Firearms Act, Cap. 179."

The provision is important if they are licensed to use firearms. In other words, the Commissioner of Police has under that legislation, the power to grant or refuse a license for a firearm. That power continues. If you are a security guard you will not automatically be given a

license for a firearm. Whatever are the standards which obtain by which a license is granted or refused, those standards continue. So unless you are a person who, in the opinion of the Commissioner of Police, ought to be entrusted with a firearm, you will not be entrusted with one. So whatever the provisions are right now, they are in no way violated.

11.50 a.m.

When this legislation passes, it will facilitate a number of persons who have expressed an interest in setting up security services, but whose applications the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Defence and Security is reluctant to promote before this legislation is put in place.

I move, Sir, that this Bill be read a second time.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, I do not believe that one would want to question the desirability of setting up a licensing system for private investigators and security guards, and for the regulation of the conduct of private investigators and security guards in matters relating thereto. One would find, as Senator Barrow has said in introducing this Bill, that, within recent years, we have seen quite a number of agencies which operate in this area, with the result that there are now a number of security guards in Barbados. So we are as one in that particular area.

Senator Barrow indicated that, under common law, every citizen in this country has the power of arrest — I think this is generally known — and he went on to make the point that what is being stated here as the right of the security guards to arrest without warrant is no different than the right every citizen enjoys under common law. The fact of the matter is, however, that a citizen would be extremely reluctant to move into this very dangerous area of arresting someone who may be committing a felony or any act for which he can be arrested. I believe that it is out of an abundance of caution that people would hesitate to get into this particular area. It is an established fact that even people who have been trained in police matters, and whose knowledge of conditions under which people can be arrested for any misdemeanour, or indeed for any of the crimes for which people can be arrested, are prone to make errors. One would expect that they would be extremely careful, but it is a fact there have been a number of cases which have gone before the courts where it has been established that even police officers have exceeded their authority in the whole question of arrest.

We now have a situation where a security guard, as Senator Barrow said, has the same right as any private citizen, but who is in a slightly different position because he is in uniform — most of them are in uniform — and,

therefore, in a way, would be clothed with much greater authority, or, indeed, may perceive that he has more authority than the ordinary citizen. And without the specialized training and exposure that policemen would normally have, one would find that this would create a number of difficulties and a number of problems. I suspect that in their zeal to carry out what they may very well consider to be duties conferred upon them under this bit of legislation, one could have all sorts of problems and difficulties, and I want to offer a word of caution in this particular area, because there could be some very serious problems developing in that area.

If one looks at the wording of Section 9, which talks about the powers of the security guards and which confers on him powers of arrest, it must raise a number of questions in the minds of reasonable people. Without attempting to go into a matter which, I suppose, you might say could possibly be dealt with when the Senate is in Committee, just let me refer to page 7, Section 9, which says:

"(1) Subject to subsection (2), a security guard may in the performance of his functions arrest without a warrant, any person:

- (a) who is in breach of the peace or whom he reasonably believes to be in breach of the peace; or
- (b) who commits or attempts to commit treason or felony."

I think these are very wide provisions to be, in my view, placed directly within the hands of security guards.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. President. I will ultimately have to respond and I would like to know to what I am responding. Is the Senator saying that as soon as you become a security guard, the powers of arrest which an ordinary citizen might have enjoyed at common law are to be taken away from you?

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I am not saying that. If Senator Barrow was in here, he would recognize that I took the point that an ordinary citizen does enjoy the power of arrest. I went on to make the point that it is a fact — it is part of human behaviour — that if you take two people and you put one in a uniform and not the other one, the person in uniform assumes, or perceives, that he has more authority to arrest. Human beings will respond in that particular way. There are things which a person would not do without a uniform; put a uniform on him and you will see a completely different kind of behaviour. This kind of provision will raise some very serious problems in this country. History will show very

clearly what will be the outcome of this. You are going to have trouble in this particular area.

12.00 noon

When it comes to the interpretation of this particular area, a person who is in breach of the peace, what really is in breach of the peace? Could it be a situation where there may be a crowd, and, let us for argument's sake say, the Leader of the House passes and somebody says something that makes the crowd laugh, and the security guard could very well interpret that as a breach of the peace. This is something which one would have to be very careful about, and I hope that some provision in the whole act of licensing these various agencies and security guards would be made for ensuring that the security guards go through some period of training, and indeed that it becomes an obligation on the part of the agencies before they are licensed to have a proper training system for the persons who they are going to employ. It is my humble submission that a lot of responsibilities are placed on security guards, and certainly will be placed on security guards later on.

The other aspect I want to refer to has to do with the last point made by Senator Barrow. He said that when this legislation is passed, it will facilitate a number of persons who want to set up security guard services in this country and that the Permanent Secretary has been holding them back because he was awaiting the passage of this bit of legislation. When one peruses this Bill, one finds that there is no provision to suggest who would be the kinds of persons that would be entitled to establish agencies, and who are the kinds of persons who would be entitled to become security guards in this country. In short, it seems as if this will be an open house. Non-nationals under this legislation, because there is nothing here which says that they would be excluded, could come and set up a security guard service or a private investigation agency. Non-nationals can also, provided of course, they get their work permits — and that does not seem to be too much of a problem these days — come and work in the service. This is a matter which is of profound importance to us in this country, and I believe that this is one area which one ought to be very careful about, the fact that non-Barbadians could come and work in the service and could set up these types of agencies. We ought to be more careful about this kind of trend and this possible development, not only from the point of view of employment, but also from the point of view of security, and this Government is supposed to be a very security conscious Government.

I think that, overall, one can say that the Bill has serious implications, in my view, both for the public and for the Police Force in this country. You are going to find that we will now immediately be, as it were,

setting up a kind of para-Police Force. Will it work with the Police Force? Or will there be competition to show which one is more efficient?

One also finds that, as I said before, the whole question of the extension of powers which one would normally associate with the police would now be extended to security guards and private investigators.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. President: The honourable Senator is misleading the Senate.

(SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: In what way?)

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: In that he is talking about this extension of powers which exist nowhere within the Bill. It is a direct misleading of the Senate, and I believe it is deliberate.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: The Bill, as far as I can see, will place powers in the hands of security guards that one would normally associate with the police.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order: The honourable Senator is misleading the Senate. If he needs evidence, he needs only to look at Section 20 of the Police Act, Cap. 167, and understand in doing that what the arrest powers of the police are. I insist that we really deserve a little better than this.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: If I may continue, I am satisfied that what one is finding in this country is an attempt by the Government through its present policies on the Police Force to downplay the work and the role of the Police Force in this country. Will you find something in the Constitution to dispute that? In the first place, I believe that, for the first time in many, many years, the year 1984 passed without any recruits being selected and trained at the Police Training Centre.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. President: Do we still have an obligation to observe the Standing Orders and be relevant in the debate? This is a Bill about the security guard service.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: It is about the police, too.
12.10 p.m.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Just a minute. You will have to persuade me, Senator Greaves, that the reference to the police has some relevance to this debate. I am not yet persuaded.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Sir, I believe that this Bill has to do with the prevention of crime in this

country, whether it is crime at a private dwellinghouse, or in a business place, or, indeed, in a supermarket. It is a fact that private individuals from time to time employ security guards, it is a fact that supermarkets employ security guards, it is a fact that business places employ security guards, so it has to do with crime in this country. Therefore, let me talk then in the context of crime and crime prevention in Barbados because I see the security guard service as an attempt to deal with this particular problem, and crime in this country is so serious that it needs to be dealt with, not only by the security guards, but also by the Police Force in this country.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order: It is quite clear that if we mention anything, we can by some tangential act — I do not think you can call it reasoning — bring anything within the ambit of a discussion. But we are concerned not in seeing whether someone can provide a link between Bridgetown and Oistins Town, we are concerned with whether the matter directly relating to the Bill under discussion is what the honourable Senator is talking about. I wish to submit that a Bill which has to do with regulating the conditions under which security guard services and private investigators operate has absolutely nothing to do with policing in the country.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, I want to refer to a debate of the House of Assembly, Tuesday, October 23, 1984.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Explain to me what you are referring to.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I would like to quote from the debates of the House of Assembly for October 23, 1984. The exact pages are 1448 and 1449.

I must insist that one could not debate this Bill in this Honourable Chamber or anywhere at all without reference to crime and criminal activity in Barbados, without reference to dope peddling, without reference to the pushing of cocaine openly on the streets of Barbados. One cannot deal with this unless one relates to the explosion in criminal activity that has taken place in this country within the last four or five years, because I see this Bill as one of the ways of attempting to assist in dealing with this particular problem. There has to be a connection. And, certainly, one cannot discuss this Bill without looking at the question of the Police Force and whether this security force would not be providing assistance to the Police Force in this country.

If one examines the debate in the Lower House on this, at page 1448, one would find that the Prime Minister made reference to the whole question of the

Police Force and the way in which he sees the security guards are providing assistance in that particular area. He said:

"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."

In the same speech, at page 1449, the Prime Minister said:

"I know there are those who say that current proposals to create a Police Reserve and to employ the reservists in the different security forces of Government, indeed to create a Fire Service Reserve and employ the reservists as security guards or in other such positions, should not be done unless those bodies are under the control of the Police Force. I do not agree with that. I think the idea of having a Police Force of 1100 people, as we are now aiming at, and having another 200 or 300 trained persons who can enter the Police Force and who are employed as security guards, beach wardens, traffic wardens, or whatever, is an idea which will give some flexibility in police manpower in this country without the question of the control over these bodies being given to the Police Force."

What is interesting about this speech by the Prime Minister is that he is promising to increase the Police Force in this country, and we have a situation where the Commissioner of Police indicated.....

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order: The fact of the matter is that whether the Prime Minister was responding to a point in the Other Place and said what he said or not — I do not know, because Senator Greaves has the debate and I do not have it — does not make it relevant to this debate. We are not here talking about the numbers in the Police Force. We are talking here about legislation, the need for which was seen much earlier than today. We are talking about something going back, as far as the files are concerned, to 1978. We are talking, as a matter of fact, of one of the things which would have given rise to this legislation. I am glad Senator Simmons is in his seat, because he is the person indeed who would know a great deal more about it.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Sir, on a point of order: I hate to cross on a point of order but that is not a point of order to me. It would seem to me that the leader.....
12.20 p.m.

Mr. PRESIDENT: When this argument started, my impression, from what Senator Greaves had said, was that he saw this section of the Bill dealing with security guards as downplaying the police. That may be his point of view, I do not agree with it, but I do not see the

relevance of discussing the police, their numbers and that sort of thing except in a very tangential way. I am not certainly going to allow a debate in that context. If the Senator wishes to debate that as a separate matter, he can put a substantive motion on it. That is my ruling.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Sir, I cannot question your ruling. I understand very well.

I contend that there is an attempt in this country by the Government, the Barbados Labour Party Administration, to downplay the role and the function of the Royal Barbados Police Force for reasons best known to itself. In this same context, one is finding that crimes are taking place in Barbados — crimes against the person, breakings; all sorts of crimes — as a result of the fact that the police does not have the equipment nor the manpower to deal with these very serious problems. I hope that the establishment of these security guard agencies will assist the police in that particular area, because people in Barbados have become terrified within recent months. For the first time, one is hearing about the establishment of vigilante groups in various communities to protect themselves or the various communities against the criminals and their activities. That is because of the fact that the police do not have, or do not seem to enjoy, the confidence of the Government.

What did you hear yesterday, for example? Because the Commissioner of Police indicated that since 1977 they have been calling for more help by having the Force increased, you find the Deputy Prime Minister, in a debate in Parliament yesterday, indicating that he was challenging the Government! You see, nobody can say anything to the Government. Nobody can give any advice to the Government, regardless to their position, their competence or anything like that. They are the know-alls. Nobody must tell them anything.

In here, under this Bill, which has to do with the question of providing some measure of security, making people feel at least comfortable or a little more comfortable than they feel at present, one refers to the Police Force and indeed one refers to an explosion that is taking place in serious crimes in this country, one finds that Senator Barrow gets up and objects. What are you hiding? Do you have anything to hide? Do you not want me to talk about crime in here? What do you have to hide that you do not want me to talk about the Police Force in here? What do you have to hide that one cannot talk about the Police Force and crime in the context of a Bill which has to do with providing some measure of security in Barbados?

Mr. PRESIDENT: Please address the Chair when you are speaking, Senator Greaves.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I am sure that people in Barbados would feel quite comfortable if they could leave home and come back and not find it burglarized; if their daughter can walk the streets of Barbados without disappearing or without being raped; if a man can sleep in his house, whether it is a lonely house or indeed a plantation house, and feel that he is protected, that the Police Force is on top of the job and has the men and the equipment to offer that kind of protection which ought to be offered to the citizens of this country. People are not comfortable knowing that out of three hundred walkie-talkies the Police had in their possession about a month ago, only about thirty of them were working because they could not get the money to put batteries in them.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Senator Greaves.....

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: I am saying, Sir,.....

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir,.....

Mr. PRESIDENT: All right. Let me deal with it.

I have already made a ruling, Senator Greaves, that although I will allow references in a general way, because this is a matter of security guards, I will not allow a full-dress debate on the details of police numbers and walkie-talkies or any other matter. If you want to raise that as a substantive question, do so. You will obey my ruling.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Sir, I really would not want to get into a full-dress debate on the police. There is so much to be said that I would not be able to cover it in the time allocated. But I just wanted to make a point in the context of what we are looking at here. I think it is a very serious matter. That is why I say that I am not at all opposed to the idea of a registration of the security guards.

There is another point which I want to make relating to the Commissioner of Police as relates to this Bill. Under the Schedule it says:

"The Board shall be constituted as follows:

(a) the Solicitor-General,"
et cetera, et cetera. I understand there are going to be some changes in that one. But:

"(d) The Commissioner of Police, ex officio, or his nominee."

So you are going to find that the Commissioner of Police or his nominee will be a Member of the Board. Yet, somewhere in the Bill, one would also find that the Commissioner of Police would be responsible for issuing

a Certificate of Character to the person who may be interested in becoming a security guard. I wonder if this really stands on all fours, and whether the Minister would want to address this particular point.

12.30 p.m.

The composition of the Board is an extremely serious matter. One would hope that in selecting the three persons who will be selected by the Minister responsible, the Minister would look for and indeed select persons of impeccable character and integrity.

Asides.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Senator Barrow would do well on this Board.

SENATOR H. E. YEARWOOD: Mr. President, I came here today as a new Senator, and I really did not expect to get into any debate on this matter, but, clearly, Senator Greaves seems to be misunderstanding this Bill to some extent.

Clause 1 of the Bill says that the Act may be cited as a Private Investigators and Security Guards Act, 1984, and the Bill obviously comes under the Private Investigators and Security Guards Licensing Advisory Board. I would really like Senator Greaves to understand that, in fact, it does not seem from what is here that this is coming under the Commissioner of Police at all. This is something completely different, and I believe Senator Greaves is either misunderstanding the Bill or deliberately trying to mislead us, as Senator Barrow has said. I agree with Senator Barrow that, obviously, this Bill cannot be debated as something to do with the Police Force, because it clearly states here that it will be a completely different body.

Senator Greaves also referred to the composition of the Board and to the Commissioner of Police. Certain people on these Boards have some sort of special experience in the various areas, and the Commissioner of Police would be, in my view, an excellent choice for such a Board because of his position and experience. He could give a lot of advice and input on matters which would obviously come before such a Board.

This debate should really be carried out just under what it is supposed to be, that is the licensing of private investigators and security guards. I think that to bring a debate at this stage about the Police Force and the numbers of the Police Force and all such things would be quite irrelevant.

Applause.

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: Mr. President, I am not going to pretend that a discussion on this Bill

must of necessity exclude a reference to the functions of a Police Force. I am not challenging any ruling at all, Sir, but I would concede that perhaps it would not be appropriate to have a full scale debate on the Police Force arising out of this Bill. But throughout every part of the Bill there are references to the Police Force and, therefore, not only by implication, but expressly, there can be some comment about the relationship between the Police Force and the private investigators and security guards.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I do not know whether you were here when I said what I said on that point. I will allow general reference, because it is something dealing with law and order, but I will not allow a full debate on the sort of details that Senator Greaves is talking about unless there is a substantive motion on that subject before the House.

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes Sir, I accept that, Sir. I was reinforcing your ruling for the benefit of Senator Greaves. You may not have heard the word tangential, Sir.

For many years, there have been in operation in Barbados a security guard service set up by Briggs and possibly other persons; there was another one called Wells Fargo. In addition to that, in the days when adultery was a ground for divorce, many attorneys made resort to persons in the nature of private investigators to assist in the collection of evidence. Happily the days of that kind of behaviour have now passed us since 1980 and there is only one ground for divorce, that is, that the marriage is broken down. It has nothing to do with adultery, cruelty, or any of those things, what used to be called offenses, a hangover, of course, of the days when adultery was a crime, prior to 1857. So the extent to which lawyers would have now to rely on private investigators perhaps is limited, having regard to the disappearance of that aspect of function. Nevertheless, the security guard system in Barbados has developed, particularly since this Government came to power in 1976. We have seen a gradual expansion, certainly in the number of guards seen at Government offices, and no doubt the increase of crime in certain areas has also prompted calls for an extension of security guard services.

I did not hear the full presentation by the Minister, but I note that Senator Greaves studiously avoided any reference to demands made by the private sector, in particular the hotel proprietors, for help in dealing with the invasion of their property and the nuisances who patrol beaches and harass both local women and foreign women. I have forgotten how long ago it was, but certainly within the last two years there were meetings with the Hotel Association, Barbados Board of Tourism and the Commissioner of Police about trying to find a mechanism for enhancing the security of hotel proper-

ties and guests. The Commissioner pointed out that, obviously, with whatever numbers he had, it was impossible for the police to adequately secure the properties of all the hotels in Barbados. I believe Mr. Jack Dear, as Chairman of the Board of Tourism, accepted that, and it was, as I understand it, agreed by all that the question of the security of private property, hotel property in particular, was really a matter that required the spending of money and the development of a system by the hotel proprietors themselves, and they were asked not to lean heavily on the police for the specific requirements of protection of their property and guests.

12.40 p.m.

The police have general policing functions which would embrace passing by hotel properties, but they cannot give 24 hours constant surveillance of hotel properties. That is something that the hotel proprietors themselves must address and provide for out of their operating budgets. I believe that the wider community accepted that if you have a hotel, or a private property, which you think is likely to be threatened and required specific protection, then you have to pull your own pocket to create an atmosphere of security, be it by the employment of security guards or otherwise, for that particular property. If that is so, this Bill, which does not say it in as many words, I suppose has at the background of its principles a desire to satisfy the needs of the private property owners, like the hoteliers.

Put another way, it is a Bill that will allow for the hoteliers and private owners of property to provide security guards, but you do not want any and every person to be a security guard. I know of a supermarket where a security guard was himself the biggest thief. Every night at Carlton — it went to court so we can talk about it — he was carrying away whatever he could find, and however he could load it up, impoverishing Mr. Seale. They caught him in about two months, but he had done considerable damage to the whiskey by then. It is not every policeman who is an honest policeman. They have to be vetted, and even when they are vetted, some of them, as we have seen in the past, have committed criminal offences and paid the penalty.

I think that while this Act allows for the licensing of security guards, it provides some rigorous pre-conditions for licensing. It has a Board that consists of the Solicitor General or his nominee, the Permanent Secretary, Defence and Security; the Permanent Secretary, Legal Affairs; the Commissioner of Police or his nominee, and three members appointed from the private sector. When I saw that, I felt convinced that the aim of this Bill was to assist private owners and private developers, hoteliers and such, in providing security guards for their properties.

Whenever a piece of legislation seeks to give somebody other than a policeman a power of arrest, the

community immediately reacts that you are going to set up a police state in another way. I think the public must always be careful and be wary of legislation which perhaps gives rights of arrest to persons other than the police, but we have to balance that surveillance with the facts. If you look at Section 20 of the Police Act, Cap. 167, set out in that section are a number of instances in which a policeman can arrest without a warrant, instances running from (a) to (j). For a security guard, there are only two circumstances in which he can arrest without a warrant: in Clause 9 (a) of the Bill he can arrest anyone who is in breach of the peace, or whom he reasonably believes to be in breach of the peace, hustling on the beach, loitering and so on, and (b) someone who commits or attempts to commit treason or felony. In no other circumstance has he got a right of arrest unless he has a warrant.

I think the public must be aware that, as compared with a policeman, there are limitations on the powers of arrest which are given to a security guard. I do not believe that there is anybody in Barbados, including members of the Opposition, who would say that if a security guard is patrolling a hotel at night and sees a man come over a wall and hide in a bush that that security guard ought not to have a power to go and arrest him. It is in a circumstance like that that he is given power. If he sees him trying to break in, like he is attempting to commit a felony, a burglary, he is entitled to arrest him. I think that is quite fair and reasonable.

I want to draw attention to Clause 10. Even though a private investigator or a security guard must produce an instrument of authority, and is to be licensed, I was a little concerned that perhaps we are not as far-sighted as I would like. I believe we should make it obligatory for a security guard or private investigator, when requested by a member of the public, to give proof of his identity.

There is a lot of unhappiness with the way the police operate sometimes. A policeman will stop you for not having your disc, your road tax licence, on the left side of your car, if it is a right hand driven vehicle, and will make a case out of that. If you ask for a name or number, there are some who will refuse. I know of several instances where some policemen are positively, down-right rude once they have nabbed you. It is not a general practice in the Police Force, but it is a practice, and they feel that they do not have an obligation to give members of the general public their names and numbers.

I was hoping that a security guard would have to have some identification and would have to show it once requested to do so. I do not put anything past people who are bent on crime in Barbados today, and I do not think it is far-fetched to suggest that a criminal may dress up himself in a uniform to look like a security guard, take advantage of the fact that he is in the grey

and black, or whatever they wear or will wear, try to commit crime, and when confronted refuse to give any information.

12.50 p.m.

A security guard does not have any obligation, if confronted by a member of the public, to give any information. The neater thing, really, would be to have him produce his actual licence, signed by the Board or whoever it is who would issue them. I feel the public should have been given a little protection by making it mandatory for the security guard to provide proof of who he is. He only provides proof to a member of the Police Force or his employer, and chances are that he will be in greater contact with members of the general public than members of the Police Force.

I know that Senator Barrow will perhaps draw my attention to another clause which deals with impersonation, but that is not the point. Clause 14 (3), on page 11, says:—

“Any person who, with intent to deceive, impersonates a private investigator or a security guard, or does any act to suggest that he is a private investigator is guilty of an offence.”

You have to catch the fellow first. You have to catch him after he has pretended that he is a security guard, sent by such and such a person to watch my house, and he breaks in. I have to try and find him later on, or the police have to try and find him, and we know how difficult it is for them to find anybody these days.

The police has powers under this Act, which we can all see, but specifically I wish to respond to some of the points that Senator Greaves was allowed to make, on the assumption that when he made the points, Your Honour was in your most liberal mood and treated them as being tangential to the Bill. Senator Greaves said he sees the Bill as having to do with crime and crime prevention, and that it is an attempt by the Government to downplay the role of the Royal Barbados Police Force. On the contrary, I see the Bill as an attempt to broaden and enhance the security of Barbados in all aspects, as an attempt by Government to relieve the police of some of the burdens which they are called upon to deal with today, having regard to the vast expansion in crime, the nature of our development, particularly housing development, and hotel development. I think that if you had 2 000 police, they still would not be able, efficiently and effectively, to do the job of security that is required in Barbados today.

I believe it is accepted by all criminologists, certainly by John May, in his book “Crime and the Socialist Structure”, written in 1962, that criminal activity tends to have a relationship with the development of a society. The evidence in England has been quite clear. Where there has been new town and other property development, the crime leaves one area and moves into those areas. We have seen in Jamaica, in the attacks made against the property classes in areas like Drax Hill and Graeme Heights. I am

not going to give any explanation for this. It may have to do with a number of factors, one of which may be the stark contrast between poverty in one class and people who are perceived as being more well-to-do in another class, and envy and jealousy. All those may be tied up in an explanation as to why crime tends to move from among the worst off classes. We have that in Barbados. We have developments in St. George where there has been some criminal activity recently. We have seen it in the Sunset Crest area four years ago. We have developments elsewhere and we will see it in other areas.

The hotel type crime is a different type of crime. That, I believe, is more than a nuisance type of crime than anything else. I do not think it is so much breaking into hotels. I believe there is more harassment of guests for whatever purposes. I am sure some of the purposes are sexual, but, generally, as against Barbadians, crime is more against those who are seen to have property and are believed to have money. So I do not believe that it would be within the power of the Police Force to adequately do general policing in the community, and at the same time, concentrate on finding criminals who are in, day and night, the middle-class developments, and at the same time, do surveillance of hotels.

We need to have an extension of powers. We have always had island constables in this country. We have not made the greatest use of them, but since 1900, I believe we had island constables. There is still legislation in the Book, Cap. 166, which deals with parish constables, and some of the terms of this legislation is very similar to the language used in relation to the parish constables. If we are not going to bother too much about increasing the number of the island constables, and we are going to set up a different set of security people, I think this is the way to go. I am satisfied that the provisions in the Bill are sufficiently rigorous as to ensure that it will not be at whim, or it will not be for capricious reasons, that a person will be licensed as a security guard or a private investigator. I think that the Board will be very careful, having regard, as I said earlier, to the pre-conditions that are required for licences, as to whom they are prepared to license in the future. And this does not derogate from the right of any citizen to object to a person. Any person, within a month after the issue of a licence is notified in the *Official Gazette*, may file with the Board any objection with respect to the issue of the licence, so the general public have rights. If I am licensed as a security guard under a name, but you know that my real name is something else and I have defrauded the Board, for whatever reason, you can object.

I think that members ought not to be worried as to how this will operate. We have to hope, though, that those who are licensed as security guards will show a sense of responsibility and discretion in the exercise of

their powers. We have had policemen and writ servers who, I can say, abused the powers vested in them, especially in the area of the exercise of discretion where you are not obliged to arrest the man, drag him down a street and embarrass him, but you could do something else, for whatever reason. Senator Greaves said that some people get a different sense of power when they are put in uniform. Whether it is for that reason or not, I do not know. I only hope that at some stage when these people are licensed and we have a body of them licensed, the authorities, be they the police authorities or counsel in the Attorney-General's department, or some of us from private practise, be invited to talk to these people. I would give a lecture to them about how they should carry out their responsibilities under the law. I think that if some provision is made for proper counselling and training before they are let loose on the public, the system can work satisfactorily. I do not think that many people know, for example, that the car park attendants have powers of arrest and you do not hear any talk about their abusing authority. I have seen them once or twice bringing across people to the Central Police Station. 1.00 p.m.

It is unfortunate that a number of comments should have been made in relation to the Police Force and crime. If I may be allowed just briefly to put my case, I would say that, to the best of my knowledge, the police, particularly since 1976 — and I say 1976 because the Government changed in 1976 — have had a better deal from the present Government than the last Government. There should be no cause for complaint on the score of training, on the score of improved conditions and even on the score of improved motor vehicles and equipment. Every policeman, I believe, must have a walkie-talkie by now. Certainly they have plenty; there is at least one to every two or three men. They never had them in the old days.

In 1975, when crime was at its highest, they did not have the kind of facilities they have now. They certainly have better accommodation now, and when the Estimates are debated, I will draw attention to the nonsense that is being talked about tension between the Barbados Police Force and the Defence Force. There is none. I talk to senior policemen. They have got a lovely station at Oistins. How many sleep in? They do not want to sleep in. But the Defence Force men have to sleep in.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Let us not.....

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: Yes, Sir. I am not getting off the point. That was just to remind Senator Greaves. But he is not even in here, he has gone!

One cannot seriously say that Government has attempted to downplay the role of the police, having regard to what I have said just now about the improvements that

have attended the Police Force since 1976. I trust that Government will continue to maintain its position of allowing the Commissioner to have full reign of the day-to-day activities of the Force. But matters of policy and employment must be within the breast of Cabinet and the Ministry responsible for employment. So even though this Bill does not have to do with crime, I think it is a worthwhile attempt by the Government to enhance the security of Barbados and its citizens even further.

There seems to me to be some problem with 25(d) on page 19. It says:

"Any person who:

"refuses, neglects or falsifies any information which he may reasonably be required of him and which is within his power to give;"

Something is wrong with this. It must mean, "which may reasonably be required of him". The "he" must come out.

Mr. PRESIDENT: They could treat that as a typographical error.

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: I would not treat it as a typographical error, because if it is allowed in and it comes to court, lawyers would have a field day as to what it means. What it means is what it says. I think the "he" must come out.

I entirely endorse this legislation and give it my fullest support, subject to the reservations that I have made about the need for having people in the law, people in the Police Force particularly, set up some scheme for training in respect of these people who are going to be licensed.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: I believe Senator Simmons has covered much of the ground that I intended covering, and I do not particularly want to duplicate anything he said.

I support the general principles of this particular Bill. I do believe that it can now be improved in one particular regard, the one identified by Senator Simmons, where perhaps security guards ought to be required to provide identification not only for members of the Police Force and to employers, but also to people who they want to arrest or in any way discommode. I also believe that this legislation presents a framework in which Government, and others, would be in a position to exercise some degree of quality control in the area of security guards and private investigators. Such persons have become a necessary adjunct to the Police Force in modern Barbados. In many ways, the level of performance in those areas will go a long way towards contributing towards a better performance on the part of the police.

I accept the view, well put by Senator Simmons, that security guards and private investigators must be seen as intertwined with the Police Force. This is envisaged by the Act where certain responsibilities have been placed on the Commissioner of Police in this area. He is a member of the Board, he has to be involved in the provision of certificates of character, and he has to be consulted on the use of firearms and granting permission for the use of firearms by security guards. As such, I would think that the way in which the security guards and private investigators perform their functions must have direct implications for the way in which the police would have to perform theirs. Likewise, I think that the security guards will probably take example in many areas from the police as to how they should behave. They will pattern themselves in some degree on the way in which we conduct policing duties in Barbados.

There is one specific area that I should like to direct some attention to. It is an experience which, in some degree, is even new to the police — the carrying of firearms. We have recently heard that policemen in Barbados, at least in the immediate future will be carrying firearms in more situations than they would have done hitherto. I think this is a new development in Barbados. I am certain that the majority of Barbadians appreciate and support it; appreciate in the sense that they recognize the necessity for it.

Since this is new, I should like to suggest that the Police Force in Barbados, in general, must address the question of the way in which our policemen would operate in this new situation. I especially want to caution that policemen should be oriented towards accepting the view that they should not see the gun in any way as an offensive weapon, a weapon that they can use to assist them actively in apprehending prisoners who might be running from them and that kind of thing. It must be seen solely as a defensive and last-resort weapon. Because if for one moment it should shift from the level of being a defensive and last-resort weapon towards an active weapon so you can shoot down fleeing people, or use it in ways which would probably lead to the death of criminals, the criminals will respond, and Barbados will gradually shift from the type of society you have now towards one like Jamaica, where policemen have killed a lot of criminals and criminals have killed a lot of policemen. The life of a policeman will be rather less safe than it is now. So the very instrument that you give to them to protect their lives, if it is not used carefully and cautiously, could set off reactions which would put the policeman in greater danger than he is in Barbados today.

1.10 p.m.

In that sense, I hope that the policemen in Barbados will develop a responsible tradition, a tradition which is most different from most places in the world where policemen use guns commonly. I also hope that this

would extend to our security guards, and that on the question of power of arrest, it will be inculcated in security guards that they must exercise that special responsibility. I do not think that policemen, generally, in Barbados can be accused of irresponsibility in the use of this power, although, I am certain some of them have exercised this power irresponsibly.

Apart from the actual exercise of the power of arresting someone and taking them to the station, I believe that the power of arrest should not be used in other ways, for instance, to threaten people. I suspect, from things that have reached my ears from time to time, that policemen may be slightly more guilty than they ought to be in threatening people with the power of arrest for whatever reason, to get compliance or to get the person to show due respect to them. I think that is unnecessary, and sometimes can be counter-productive, and I hope that a tradition could develop where the police, the Commissioner in particular, will see himself as having a particular responsibility to the country to monitor the quality of the performance of security guards, and, wherever necessary, intervene to make sure that these people perform at the highest level of excellence. This would mean that he should be involved in the question of training.

In addition to the areas identified by Senator Simmons, I believe this Bill can be enhanced slightly if there were more explicit provisions for regulations which could relate to qualification and disqualification criteria, and to other ways in which you may want to direct or reorient the activities of security guards. At the moment that is very much up in the air. The Board is there to advise the Minister, and I do not know what general powers the Minister may have, but it may be after due consideration that it might anticipate an amendment which might enhance this Bill in the areas mentioned.

All in all, I think it is a necessary piece of legislation at this time, and I will support it.

SENATOR MRS. E. M. LYNCH: Mr. President, in supporting this very timely measure, there are some comments which I would like to make, which I think you might describe as tangential.

The Act seems to me to try to ensure that persons employed as security guards are, in fact, qualified to do the job they have undertaken to do. There are many persons who now have firms for providing security guards, and it is quite possible to find yourself with security guards who seem to have been dressed up for the occasion and sent along, but who have no idea whatever of what a security guard should do. So this is a form of ensuring quality, in the same way as it is not so much the number of police that we need as their skills. Crime prevention takes place largely because it is controlled. It is not so

much punishment but the certainty of detection which is important in controlling crime; so what we need is not merely more police, but highly skilled police, as befitting changes taking place in the type of criminal offenses.

I am worried about the fact that whenever we hear of crime and law and order, we begin to talk about the number of policemen and security guards and things of this sort. In fact, we think of crime as being the business of law enforcement agencies only. We do not seem to realize that crime comes out of the nature of the society itself. We do not ask ourselves to what extent ordinary citizens may be, by their attitudes or by their lack of understanding, by contributing to criminal attitudes.

We have a lot of influence from outside, and there is no doubt that in the world as a whole, we are living in an era of violence. Democratic communities such as ours can never have enough policemen to hold the society down, so-to-speak, to make it behave by the mere show of police force. That is only done in a police state, and we do not have a police state — and we must be careful not to appear to be creating a police state.

We have to ask ourselves some questions: What is the nature of our society? What is the nature of the things taking place in it? How can we in constructive ways seek to eliminate our criminal attitudes? We will not be able to eliminate such attitudes completely, but certainly there are constructive ways in which we can deal with the obvious results of unemployment, a purely materialistic view of life, resentment against persons who seem to have more than oneself, the tendency to tell people that because they are poor they are powerless, emphasis on "haves and have-nots", the failure to recognize the dangers of the enclaves that we have created, and are creating, where we have groups of people easily identified by the area in which they live.

I grew up in an area where all kinds of people lived. Some were very poor and some were fairly well off, and we were able to help each other. We are moving away from this, largely, I believe, because of the availability of land for building houses, but we are having blocks of people in sort of hardened areas, where they do not communicate with each other very much, even though they are very near. The churches can do a great deal about this, because some of them go to the same churches, but we must all make greater effort to deal constructively with the problems that we see.

1.20 p.m.

I have to deal with boys and girls who come out of institutions where they had gone through a process of training and correction and seemed to have benefited by it. They seem to come into the community with a willingness to make good, but such persons are not em-

ployed if it is even known that they have been in a place of correction. In short, you deny the person the right to re-enter the community and to have a chance to function in it properly.

I would like to hear these debates on law and order move away from policemen, spies, investigators and security guards and measures which are purely punitive to constructive measures, and asking ourselves what can we do to prevent our community from becoming "them" and "us".

SENATOR L. A. WARD: Mr. President, I support this Bill, because I support anything that would improve the security in this country. I feel that licensing security guards and investigators would mean that perhaps we would get a better quality person as a security guard and better trained. But as a person who has had some dealing with security guards myself, especially in the hotel area, I feel a certain amount of sympathy for the security guards.

I believe most law-abiding people would not fear a security guard, but I do believe that there is an element in the hotel area which used to be known in the early stages as beach boys. Since they have become professional, they are known, I believe, as beach bums. These people are a big threat to security guards. Hotels which ten years or so ago employed perhaps one security guard now employ many more than that. I know of one which is now employing nine security guards at considerable cost, some \$70,000.

I must say that the support a lot of these hotels are getting from the police is quite good. They are doing their best to assist the security guards, but this element on the beaches that harass Barbadians and foreigners alike are a danger to 250 000 people in this country who are dependent on a tourist industry, and I do not see Barbados doing without it. If we registered these professional so-called beach bums, I am sure that we would know whether there were 250 or 2 500 of them.

I will give you an example of the risk that a security guard, who is supposed to protect the guests in a hotel, who have paid to come down here on a holiday, runs. This is a case which has gone before the court and the person has been dealt with, so perhaps I can mention it. One of these beach bums only last Friday night tried to eliminate a security guard with a good-sized stone. He was not very accurate and he missed the security guard — but he struck one of the female guests in the hotel in her head. She had to be taken to the hospital to have her head stitched up.

The security guards are doing their best. They arrest these beach bums and they go before the courts and are charged, but within an hour they are back on the beach

laughing at the same security guards — and even the police, if they are there. So in supporting this Bill, I hope that it will improve the security that we have, and that it will be the beginning of some real effort to eliminate these people from the beaches. All Barbadians have the right to use the beaches, but I do not feel that any small section of the community has the right to destroy a tourist industry that has cost Barbados so much to put there. I really hope that this Bill before us today will be the beginning of cleaning up this problem that we have on our beaches. Otherwise, I feel the tourists will stop coming and we will not have anybody for them to harass.

Some of these security guards operate at great risk. Some of them have been beaten up and hospitalised for over a month, that I know of, and I believe that, in general, they do their best to protect the property which they are employed to protect.

SENATOR J. E. D. WILLIAMS: I think we are all much obliged to Senator Simmons for the succinct way in which he expressed Government's intentions as far as the Bill is concerned. Nevertheless, there are one or two points I would like to mention, and one has to do with training. The Bill is particularly silent on this.

Senator McClean spoke about the Act making provisions in regulations, and indeed Section 29 does make provision for regulations by the Minister, so I am hoping that under this particular section we could have a more enunciated policy as far as training is concerned. I think that before anyone is given a uniform and allowed to go and guard somebody else's premises or their lives, they ought to undergo a period of training, and it should be clearly set out.

1.30 p.m.

There is another area that I am also particularly concerned about, and Senator Greaves being a union man, I thought that he, too, would have mentioned it. From time to time, security guards are involved in industrial disputes, because you find that certain premises suffer from having security guards on duty who take certain courses of action which are sometimes inimical to the interest of that particular company. The way in which the police operate, they just cannot go on wild cat strikes, but this has become a problem with security guards, and I am hoping that the regulations would actually deal with this.

As far as the question — and this was something raised by Senator Greaves — of allowing work permits to people who operate security guard services, I consider that business to be a business like any other business. I think it would be stupid for any Government, for that matter, to prevent anybody from setting up a business if it is going to employ Barbadians. If the market forces suggest to somebody that he could have a viable business

in Barbados providing security in one form or another, and thereby employ 50 or 100 Barbadians, I think it would be rather stupid of me, or for that matter any Minister, to suggest to that person that he cannot operate a business and, therefore, would be denied a work permit. I cannot see us agreeing that some people will be allowed to operate security services and not others. Of course, it is our hope at all times that when businesses spring up, Barbadians are the persons at the top, the persons creating the business, but, nevertheless, there will be occasions where it will be necessary for people to apply for work permits.

Generally speaking, I believe that the Bill addresses itself to a number of the problems relating to the operation of the security guard services. I am particularly happy with the composition of the Board. I think it comprises persons who have been particularly familiar with, and experienced in, such matters, and who are obviously in a much better position to advise the Minister from time to time as to the regulations which should accompany the Act. I am indeed very impressed. The Bill is timely and, as I said, I am very much obliged to Senator Simmons for his cogent remarks.

SENATOR C. E. JEMMOTT: Mr. President, I think that, rather than the members of the Opposition criticizing the Government along certain lines, they should be complimenting the Government.

I see this as a means of helping to maintain law and order in certain areas which the average person would not be able to see, such as the hotels and the supermarkets, and even at grounds where certain entertainment is going on. Senator Simmons and I have had the experience of having security guards at the National Stadium without any powers of arrest whatsoever. You just had them there as glorified watchmen.

There is a lot of talk about law and order and crime in this country, but the people who have started this rundown of law and order, who have permitted it and encouraged it in one way or the other, are the members of the Democratic Labour Party. About six years ago, a criminal was beaten in Sunset Crest by an overseas person. They called in the police to take him to the hospital because they had beaten him badly, and on his way he died. Instead of Mr. Branford Taitt finding out from the police what really happened to the man, I remember that he got in Parliament and he railed at the police about brutality, about how the police beat the man and killed him. On investigation, they found out that the police only touched the man by putting him into the van. So there is a lot of talk by the Opposition about crime and that the Barbados Labour Party is encouraging it and doing nothing to support the police when they are the ones who started on the police, and by so doing, set up the police to the public as villains.

There is another case where I have seen an attorney from the other side in court openly saying that the police were walking about and shooting people. I was in the court on that particular day. So they are the ones who have set the image, and, quite naturally, the criminals feel that they will be backed by their politicians, regardless if they are BLP or DLP – whichever ones they will be wrong – and backed by people in Parliament because they want to be popular. I think this is how we started.

I am glad to see this Bill. I believe it will help to strengthen the police, rather than downplay them, as Senator Greaves has said, whereby the police will be free to do other duties and these people would be able to help in the private sector, where they are more needed.

Apparently, we are living in a society where the criminal is a hero. We have had it with Biggs; he was on television. The criminals are the ones who are having all the sympathy shown to them. We have had even a priest keeping a requiem mass for the vagabonds who killed someone. He did not remember the families of the people who were killed. This is the sort of society that we are living in.

We are accusing Government, and we are accusing everybody, but we have to accuse ourselves overall. I agree with Senator Lynch that those of us who call ourselves leaders, whether it is in politics, religion or whatever, have to set the standards. By so doing, we would be able to bring back the country. We have to do that rather than pointing our fingers at a certain group.

The police have to do a little in-searching. They are not all exempted. I have seen some cases which were lost at the Assizes because of the police preparing bad cases and not giving the right evidence. I know of a case where a policeman was shot at in the execution of his duty and the offender was charged at the Assizes. At the preliminary hearing, the cartridge of the gun was brought as an exhibit, and when the case reached the Assizes, the cartridge could not be found to exhibit. It was lost somewhere inside the police station. If you are going to have this sort of thing coming from within, you do not leave any room for law and order.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Try and keep a little closer to the Bill.

SENATOR C. E. JEMMOTT: I think that we have to compliment the Government, instead of saying that the Government is not doing anything to support the police. I would like to see, as Senator Simmons has said, some system set up so that these people can be properly trained. I would like to compliment Senator Simmons, and I do hope the Press would be able to bring, if not all at once, parts of his speech over a period of time,

because I think the public would have a true understanding of what the whole Bill is all about.

1.40 p.m.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I do not mean to reflect on your ruling, but my contention really has been once or twice borne out in the course of this debate, my contention that we had to regard only such matters that are directly raised by the Bill and those that were relevant. I sympathize with Senator Jemmott for that reason. I think he could have gone ahead and had a good lick, too, talking about the police in a way much the same as Senator Greaves insisted on doing, regardless of what the ruling of the Chair might have been, since he would have enjoyed doing that, and we would have been hearing a not necessarily relevant debate for the rest of the day.

The points which were advanced by Senator Greaves, to which I wish to pay some attention, are those which appear to me to be relevant to the debate. I do not intend to follow him into certain areas, for the simple reason that it is very clear that while finding nothing in the Bill to disagree with, Senator Greaves came in here prepared to try to use the Bill as an umbrella under which to attack the Government in the way in which he perceives Government behaves in relation to the Police Force. Being interrupted somewhat, he still found the way to make certain comments which are easily answered. The only trouble is, if we keep falling for that, where are we going to end up?

The result of my trying to make him relevant was to be asked the question, "What are you afraid of?" I was also told that whenever the question of crime and the question of the police is raised, Government is afraid of something. Had Senator Greaves been in his place, I would have told him what I was afraid of. I am afraid of being dragged into the kind of debate that would force me to repeat the things that Senator Greaves' comrade-in-arms, Mr. Vernon Smith, has always said about the Democratic Labour Party in relation to the police, crime and drugs and, more specifically, in relation to the Mark Stokes episode. I am afraid of having to repeat the kind of things which the Democratic Labour Party membership often repeats behind the back of their Leader.

I need not spend any more time answering Senator Greaves' question, because, in fact, we on this side have nothing to be afraid of. The whole point is that if we do not regard a debate as a matter where relevancy is to be respected, then the whole point of having a debate on any issue is going to be defeated.

Senator Williams has responded to the point about non-nationals and security guards. More was mentioned and Senator Simmons dealt with that.

Specifically, Senator Greaves said that the police were given walkie-talkies but no money to buy batteries, which statement is a direct unembellished untruth. I believe the author of that statement was Mr. Longe. I believe that Mr. Longe should be ashamed of himself, because the money was put in the vote.

Apparently, what the police were quarrelling about was that the controller of supplies, the Head of the Central Purchasing, was not buying the batteries for them. I do not want to get into any argument between two civil servants as to who would not buy, or who ordered, or anything of the sort. Let us just leave it where it is. It is an argument between two public officers as to whether or not one did not buy the batteries that the other one wanted, or whether the other one could have found a way of getting them. It has nothing whatever to do with the provision of funds, which is a political act. The funds were provided and were there. If people cannot buy batteries, I do not think there is something wrong with the politicians. I think there is something wrong with the people who cannot buy the batteries. I would have thought that is a very simple thing to do. But you get these misrepresentations.

He is concerned that the Commissioner of Police is a member of the Board and will also be issuing the certificates of character. He is not apparently concerned that the Commissioner of Police is a member of the Board and is also issuing gun licences. It all amounts to the same thing. There are certain priorities which belong to the Commissioner of Police, and, in my view, the exercise of those powers does not in anyway adversely affect his membership of the Board.

When Senator Greaves was forced to admit that there was nothing in the powers of arrest, he then shifted to something about people in uniform. How can you be criticizing security guards and talking about the Police, and by implication praising the police, if you are going to make the point that the mere putting on of a uniform makes some people behave in a particular way. That is really a direct criticism of the police, whether Senator Greaves wants to admit it or not. If because his brother is a policeman he does not want to come out and say what he feels about them, it is a matter for him. But, really, he ought to come straight out if he wants to say something about the police, because they wear uniforms. I do not know that the point has any merit in it whatever.

If you want to say that when some people put on uniforms they undergo a change of character, you can make the point. But to what avail? I cannot think how it can be relevant within the context of this Bill. It may certainly be true of the Police Force that members of it do undergo a change of personality, but we have the Boy Scouts, the Girl Guides, the Landship, security guards, the Defence Force. What really is the point of

saying that because people put on a particular form of dress they have a change of personality. Senator Greaves' point really never was, and at the end of his speech he could still not appear to be making any point.

A point was made by Senator McClean which gave me great amusement. He is suggesting that now that the police are armed, they must understand that the gun must be used as "a defensive or last-resort weapon." I think those are the exact words. I believe that it is true to say that if you do not understand that the gun is an offensive weapon — I think it is offensive in every sense, mark you, but it is a weapon of offence — and that there is nothing defensive about the gun, I think we may as well take the guns away from the people we give them to. It is an unfortunate fact. I believe that people who are trained to use firearms, and who use them as a matter of course, will never tell you that they regard it as any defensive or last resort weapon, for the simple reason that if you wait, somebody else may find out whether the fellow was up to any mischief but you will not. That is another unfortunate fact.

It is indeed for those reasons that I will reluctantly accept arming the police; but very very reluctantly. I do not like it, and I would always hope, as I do now, that it was never necessary but I will not say that I can expect them to regard the gun as a defensive weapon, because I know they cannot regard it as a defensive weapon. I can only hope that our experience proves different from that of other countries in which people have been armed for this kind of work. I hope that we are soon able to revert to a situation where they can do their work without being armed. It would be a novel experience; it tends to get worse rather than better, and, therefore, the arms proliferate. If it were relevant, I could talk of my own experience in Jamaica, but it is not, so I do not want to go down that road.

1.50 p.m.

Some points were made by Senator Simmons and Senator McClean, one in relation to education and the other in relation to training. Having been fully aware of the fact that there was a power to make regulations in the Act, I searched when each of the Senators were talking and could not find it until Senator Williams spoke and identified the section — Section 29. The point raised by Senator Simmons can be met under 29(c), and the point made by Senator McClean can be met under 29(f), I believe. Senator Simmons also raised a point under 25(d) which I think can be dealt with in Committee.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, the Senate resolved itself into Committee on the Bill, Senator J. C. W. WICKHAM in the Chair.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Bill be taken in Parts.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Parts I and II were called and passed.

Part III was called.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: I beg to move that Part III stand part of the Bill.

SENATOR D. A. C. SIMMONS: In relation to Clauses 9 and 10, I accept the Minister's point that perhaps under 29(c), we can include as a question of conduct the necessity for a security guard to produce proof of his identity to a member of the public or an arrested person.

I want the Minister to include two specific provisions when he is preparing the regulations. At the moment, if a security guard does not produce proof of identity to a member of the Police Force or to his employer, he is liable to a fine of \$500 or 3 months.

I am not going to say that he should be liable to the same kind of penalty in relation to a member of the general public, but I certainly feel that two things should be specified in the regulation. Firstly, that he must provide proof of identity upon arrest of a person. He must arrest the man, state his name and say that he is licensed to arrest. Secondly, if he is seen by the general public and a member asks for proof of identity, he must give it, or be subjected to a penalty.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: I will make a note of that on the file, so that when they come to deal with it, it will be on record.

The question that Part III stand part of the Bill was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Part IV was called and passed.

Part V was called.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Deputy President, Section 25(d) falls in Part V on page 19 of the printed copy. I beg to move, that the word "he" in line 2 be deleted.

The question that the word "he" in line 2 of Section 25(d), Part V, be deleted was put to the Senate and agreed to.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: I beg to move, Sir, that Part V, as amended, stand part of the Bill.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Part VI was called.

SENATOR H. R. LINTON: Mr. Chairman, I want to make one point, which perhaps may be regarded as

being in elaboration to Senator Simmons' point; perhaps all that it will require is the Minister to make a note on file and make the appropriate recommendations to the Board.

I should like to suggest that, under 29(e), where provisions are being made for uniforms to be worn, such uniforms should include the provision of a number for each security guard by which he can be easily identified, and that such numbers be issued by the Board. That will in fact make it easier for persons who may be apprehended to identify the apprehending officer, even if he forgets, or does not understand, the name of the officer. I would like to see them carry numbers in similar fashion to the members of the Royal Barbados Police Force.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: I shall make the appropriate note.

The question that Part VI stand part of the Bill was put to the Senate and agreed to.
2.00 p.m.

The Schedule was called.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, in the Schedule I beg to move the following amendment:

That "(a) the Solicitor General *ex officio* or his nominee who shall be Chairman" be deleted; and that in (b) the word "Deputy" be deleted, and that it should now read "The Permanent Secretary, Defence and Security Division *ex officio*, who shall be the Chairman; and that there be a consequential renumbering of (a) to (d) instead of (b) to (e) as it would now stand.

The question that the Schedule as amended stand part of the Bill was put to the Senate and agreed to.

On the motion of Senator the Hon. N. A. BARROW, the Senate was resumed, Mr. PRESIDENT in the Chair.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I beg to report the Bill has passed the Committee with an amendment to Section 25(c) by the deletion of the word "he" in line 2, and also by amendment to the Schedule by the deletion of (a) in paragraph 1; by deletion of the word "Deputy" in line 2 of paragraph 1; in (b) of line 2 of paragraph 1, and by a consequential renumbering so that it would now become (a) to (d).

I move, Sir, that the Bill, as amended, be read a third time forthwith.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

Mr. PRESIDENT: This Bill as amended has now been passed. The Clerk will take the necessary steps to send a message to the Other Place.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. PRESIDENT: I think this is a convenient time to suspend the sitting. The sitting will be suspended until 2.45 p.m.
2.05 p.m.

ON RESUMPTION

Mr. PRESIDENT: The sitting is resumed.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, it has been drawn to my attention that of the three Resolutions of which I gave notice, one of them, the Resolution to approve the revision of salaries for certain posts on the staff of Parliament, has been dealt with in a form in which it is really a money Resolution and applicable only to the House of Assembly. It is not properly a matter before us, and therefore I wish to withdraw that from the list which we gave. It surprises me, but the fact is, that is how it is.

At the same time I would like, therefore, to move up the Resolution to approve the revision of salaries for the posts of the Prime Minister's personal staff as the next Order of the day.

Mr. PRESIDENT: If there is no objection, this will be taken as the next Order of the day.

ORDER NO. 5 – A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE REVISION OF SALARIES FOR THE POSTS OF THE PRIME MINISTER'S PERSONAL STAFF

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, the salaries involved, which are the salaries of the Prime Minister's personal staff, were revised with effect from the 1st April, 1984 on the same basis as the salaries for public servants. These posts enjoy ratings of parity with certain posts in the Public Service, and I shall refer to them. The Private Secretary to the Prime Minister is rated with a Senior Executive Officer. The Prime Minister may have either a Press Secretary, graded with the Senior Information Officer, or a Press Officer, graded a little lower, with an Information Officer. The Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister is graded in the same level as a Senior Administrative Officer.

In short, all that is being sought in this Resolution is that the same increases applicable to the posts of Senior Administrative Officer, Senior Information Officer, Information Officer and Executive Personal Secretary are now to be applied to the equivalent posts in the Prime Minister's Office. It is the same measure of increase, which is 12½% to April 1984, and then 5% from April 1985 to the end of March 1986 would then apply.

I beg to move that the Senate concur in this Resolution.

Mr. PRESIDENT: That mark which appears against Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister which looks like \$144 000 is a dash.

The question that the Senate concur in the Resolution was put to the Senate and agreed to.
2.55 p.m.

RESOLUTION RE ANNUAL SALARY PAYABLE TO
THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL, WITH EFFECT
FROM 1ST APRIL, 1985

Order No. 2 was called — To move the passing of the Resolution to vary the Schedule to the Governor-General (Conditions of Service) Act, Cap. 6, by increasing the annual salary payable to the Governor-General with effect from 1st April 1985.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I did not realize that it was so easy just to knock off \$100 000. The Resolution before us concerns the salary of the Governor-General in respect of the 5% increase which should apply with effect from the 1st April, 1985.

I beg to move that the Senate concur in this Resolution.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to.

SALE OF THE PROPERTY SITUATE AT PINE HILL
IN THE PARISH OF ST. MICHAEL

Order No. 3 was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the sale of the property called "Marlborough House" situate at Pine Hill, St. Michael to Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Gaskin.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Sir, as you come down from the road that comes past St. Winifred's School and the property that used to be known as 'Medlum' when Mr. Eric Manning lived there, but is now known as 'Newlands', after Courtney Newlands McClaren Blackman, you are facing 'Marlborough House', where a British writer wrote the book "The Biggest Pig in Barbados" when he used to live here.

It was a property purchased by the Government from the Barbados National Bank consisting of coral stone, lath and plaster, together with 4 892.643 square metres, something over an acre of land, including road facilities. The house has two floors with a cellar. The floor is generally of pitch pine, with vinyl tiles in the kitchen and bathroom. The main floor consists of a living room, dining room, kitchen and powder room. The upper floor has four bedrooms, toilet and bathroom.

The property fell into a rather sorry state of disrepair, and Government thought of restoring it. Quotations for repairs came in at \$98 000, \$150 000 and \$82 824, from a private contractor, from the Ministry of Transport and Works and the National Housing Corporation. It was considered imprudent to effect repairs and start at such a price when dealing with old houses, because you do not know what you will find, and it was therefore agreed to sell by invitation to tender. This was done, and the bid put in by Mr. and Mrs. Gaskin is the one which Government accepted. As you know, Government cannot dispose of property without parliamentary approval. Accordingly, the Resolution was brought here to enable Government to receive from the purchaser \$180 000 and let them have the house.

I move that the Senate concur in this Resolution.

SENATOR C. E. JEMMOTT: Mr. President, I am supporting this Resolution, but there is one comment I want to make in relation to Government owning these houses. There is a great need in this country for houses for people of certain income levels, and I feel that with feasibility reports, some of these properties could have been refurbished and turned into flats to help to ease the problems of people at certain levels for houses.

Young people who have just got married live at relatives because they cannot get the type of homes they would like to get. I feel that it would be a service plus a means of income if Government could do a feasibility study on the houses which they own, as they are very many, to see if they cannot be turned into flats whereby people would be able to have houses to live in, rather than one person owning a big house, as in this case.

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: Sir, I wish to support this Resolution. I am very pleased to see that the Government has decided to sell this property. I believe that Government should take a good look at all of the properties they own and sell those for which they have no immediate use. It is one way of getting some revenue into the Treasury without burdening the taxpayers.

I am also pleased to note that the Government, through the sale of this property, has realized that the market for old houses has fallen, and that the prices available are not what the Land Valuation Department thinks. I

think this has clearly brought this out, and I believe the Government owes it to those owners of old houses to take a look at the valuations and to refund those owners. I am an owner of an old property, on which the Government has seen fit to put on a 20 per cent higher valuation, but now the Government has come and dropped their valuation of this property to another 20 per cent on market value. I feel that this is some indication to the Government that old houses are not now so valuable, and therefore their Valuation Department should take a different look at them.

I wish to offer Mr. and Mrs. Gaskin my sympathy, because buying an old property is an expensive undertaking. I notice that Government was very wise that, after they heard that the renovations would cost anything between \$82 000 and \$98 000, to sell it. But it is not only the immediate renovations that are costly, it is also the constant repair that you have to keep these properties in. When a man gets to a certain age, he constantly has to use medicine to keep him alive, and with an old home, you have to constantly repair just for it to stay up. So I want to offer my sympathy to Mr. Gaskin; he may believe that he has got a bargain, but he has got a lot of problems.

SENATOR MRS. G. G. READER: Mr. President I rise to support this Resolution and to thank the Government very much for selling this building instead of giving it to the Child Care Board as a children's home, because we spend more money repairing old buildings we have as children's homes than we can spend on the children's food. That is the truth. As Senator Seale has said, it is a constant matter of repair, and it is a constant drain on the resources of any organization when you have a multiplicity of old buildings that have constantly to be kept in repair.
3.05 p.m.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, I can well appreciate that the market for old houses is not particularly strong at this time, and that people might not be able to command the type of price that would accord with the valuation that Government has put on some of these houses. But without specifically debating the merits or demerits of this particular Resolution, I would say that Government should not move from one extreme to the other, that we should get rid of all of our old houses at whatever price people would offer, because I am certain that the type of offers that people would make to Government will be influenced by the fact that they are making it to Government as opposed to a private individual. In the same way that people may want to charge Government perhaps more for rendering certain services, they would want to offer less for the things that they want to acquire from the Government. This must be carefully considered.

One of the tests which I think should be applied is the value of the land *vis-a-vis* what you sell the entire property for. I think that if you relate the cost of land in that general vicinity to the overall sale price of this property here, you will probably find that they are giving the house the same, or maybe taking off a little bit from, the land price. I am not too sure that that is necessarily desirable. Again I do not specifically want to reflect on the merit of this, but I just want to use it as indicating a general principle that one should have in mind.

This also probably says something about this policy that we seem to have adopted quite strenuously in recent time about preserving old houses in Barbados. It is true that we need to maintain some contact with our past in terms of retaining some of the architecture from earlier times, but we do not have to have a multiplicity of similar buildings. If we have fifteen of these things, which are essentially the same, which come from the 18th century or the 19th century, we must temper our enthusiasm for retaining old buildings with the reality of the cost of maintaining them in proper repair. Like everything else, the time might come to put that land to better use, even if that means just putting a new house on the same spot. Government should consider that as an alternative to just selling off properties because they have old houses on them.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: I have listened with interest to the points which were made in the course of the debate, and the first point I wish to refer to is about the price, because that seemed to have attracted a lot of attention. The fact of the matter is that right now it is a buyer's market. Property values are down. They are beginning to come back up a little; there is a little more activity in real estate and, therefore, things would probably find their level just now again. Senator Seale, for example, need have no fear since he does not have to sell in a hurry. He will be able to get full value for the property if he ever decides to dispose of it.

I think that you would probably find that the smaller lots of land in that vicinity would run for about five dollars per square foot. If you are dealing with the very large lots, you have to remember that the unit price decreases as the size of the property grows, so nobody is going to go and pay \$180 000 for an acre of land at Pine Hill. I am speaking as somebody who has had a little bit of experience in the field. Nobody is going to pay that unless he is buying it — and not even then — with full development permission, because with the cost of development running well over two dollars per square foot, what then will he make of it if he has to put in services and develop it. If you are talking about a relatively small, already serviced lot, you are talking about a different price than if you are talking about a large area in excess of one acre.

The point really to be taken in this Resolution is that we have had examples already, of which Ilaro Court is a very fitting example, of Government owning property. Ilaro Court has been Government property for some time before this party came to power — I believe it is in excess of twelve years. What happened was that it was allowed to sit there and deteriorate. All of us in here I think know that if you do not live in a house, if you just shut it up and leave it, it goes — and goes very fast. But the time you start to do restoration to such a house, then you begin to understand that simple maintenance on a continuing basis is the only way you could deal with it.

Restoration is an extremely expensive matter. This is one of the things that happened to Ilaro Court. Having done that to Ilaro Court, because it is a property well worth national recognition, and it makes a far superior residence to what Culloden Farm did, are you going to go around now and do it to every single other Government property? I agree that would be totally unrealistic. So when you come to a property like Marlborough House, it is either going to be reasonably inexpensive to restore it or it has to go. If it does not go one way, it is going to go the other. If you do not repair a property, it will go, so you would not own anything anyhow. So unless we are interested in just holding the piece of land there, what would be the point of hanging on to it?

As far as I know, the Minister of Housing is carefully going through Government's holdings, because he is the Government landlord and he has to rationalize Government's holdings. Properties will either have to be of use or be got rid of, or we will see whether there can be internal structural changes in the case of property which we want to preserve outside of architectural reasons.

I do not think that we have gone overboard with the conservation business either, because if we had Rosemont, Rosemont would never have come down. Rosemont came down after there had been a howl by the National Trust and others. The fact of the matter, though, is that there had always been in Barbados many better examples of that period of architecture than Rosemont. You just cannot keep everything for the sake of holding on to it. We must have a sufficient stock of examples of our own architecture across periods of time.

The question that the Senate concur in the Resolution was put to the Senate and agreed to.

RESOLUTION RE BORROWING OF 5 BILLION JAPANESE YEN.

Order No. 4 was called — To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the sum of the borrowing of 5 billion Japanese Yen to be raised by the issue and sale

of bonds 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.

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, this Resolution seeks approval of Government's proposal to raise a loan of the equivalent of \$40 million to assist in financing its capital works programme. The loan will be made under the External Loan Act, which provides for the issue of sale of securities.
3.15 p.m.

A private placement of bonds on the Japanese market, is proposed. Nikko Securities Limited of Japan will be the head arrangers of the issue, and the International Bank of Japan will act as paying and record agents on behalf of the Government of Barbados. It is expected that purchase agreements will be ready for signature about February 22, 1985, and the bonds are scheduled to be issued a week later, on February 28, 1985. The bonds will have a maturity of 5 years.

Due to extraordinary circumstances, the firm figures are not yet available for price and interest. The price, however, is not expected to exceed 99 per cent, and present indications are that the rate of interest will not exceed 8 per cent. The extraordinary circumstances relate to the unusually protracted negotiations taking place between the Japanese Ministry of Finance and the syndicate of investors with regard to the annual setting of the price for Japanese Government paper. As a result of the protracted nature of the negotiations, the rate could not be fixed by the usual date of December 25. Consequently, a new prime lending rate in the market is not yet determined. The new prime rate will influence the rate of the proposed loan, but figures given earlier are unlikely to be exceeded.

It is generally known that Barbados faces graduation from many international lending institutions. We have had something of a temporary reprieve from the World Bank, but we must seek to establish our credibility in the commercial market as widely as possible, and this is why we propose to go outside of the traditional borrowing areas and to raise this loan on the Japanese market.

Proceeds of the loan will be used to assist in financing Government's Capital Works Programme, and therefore, to put some 1400 people to work. The twelve projects involved have a total cost of \$154.5 million, and partial funding of \$78.95 million have been identified for ten of these. The twelve projects are: the Airport — West Coast Road, the Bridgetown Fishing Harbour, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital expansion, the Glebe Polyclinic, Municipal Solid Waste Plant, (Senator Griffith

knows about that.) the Rural Development Project, Scotland District Soil Conservation Project, the Sub-loan Programme of the Barbados Development Bank, the Speightstown Fisheries Project, the Northern Access Road and road rehabilitation, the Tent Bay Fisheries Project, and the runway rehabilitation at the Grantley Adams International Airport.

As of November 30, 1984, the external debt position amounted to \$361 535 000. The spread is as follows:

Euro dollar market — \$93 557 000
 Foreign Governments, U.K. and Canada
 — \$28 748 000
 International Financial Institutions — \$162 076 000
 Bonds from the Trinidad Market — \$40 million
 All other sources — \$37 154 000

I move that the Senate concur in this Resolution.

SENATOR E. E. GREAVES: Mr. President, it looks as if I am expected to speak first after each measure is introduced. I do not get any reprieve to hear somebody else make a contribution.

I want to express my usual concern about the extent of borrowing, which seems to be the hallmark of this Administration. However, it was useful for Senator Barrow to delineate the twelve projects which this money will be assisting. What has struck me is that it would seem that a lot of this money will be going into road construction, and one has to raise some very serious questions about the economic value and about the tremendous amount of money which is being put into developing all of these new roads arounds the country. I am prepared to stand by that because, after the construction of these massive roads, the question which will remain will be, what will be the employment which will be derived from it?

We have to recognise a number of jobs will be created, when constructing a road, but these jobs will be of a temporary nature. When one is looking at an investment, he has to, I believe, look beyond the temporary nature of any benefits which will accrue to the country and see what will be the lasting benefits of it. Construction provides direct employment for a certain type of worker, mainly men using heavy equipment and doing the kinds of jobs which are associated with this particular area — I do not think that it can be generally said that women have gotten into the construction field in any big way at the present moment — so you will find that there will be a disparity which will be created as far as whatever job opportunities which will arise as a result of the construction of these highways.

I really want to be convinced about the real economic value which will accrue to this country as a result of this highway construction. I know that there is going to be a lot of displacement. People will have to be removed from their settled positions into new environments, and that kind of thing. That is one point. The other point has to do with the fact that we are borrowing money in hard currency, and, as indicated, a number of the projects which have been identified are projects which will not in themselves generate hard currency. So we are having a situation where we are borrowing money which then will not be generating the kind of earnings to service the particular debt which we will find ourselves in as a result of that.

Senator Barrow indicated that as of November 1984, the external debt was \$361 million, and he indicated the way in which it was spread. I think that in looking at our external public debt, there is another aspect to our external debt portfolio, and that is that we have also guaranteed certain debts to companies like the Barbados Light and Power Company, I think the Telephone Company and one or two other semi-private, public companies in Barbados. If one is looking at our total external debt, we have to recognise the guarantees which we have given to debts which will be raised on the overseas markets for the particular purposes for which they have been used, because in the final analysis, if something, God forbid, was to go wrong with the functioning of the particular companies and they became insolvent, I believe the Government would ultimately be responsible for these debts which they have guaranteed. If one takes the total figure, one would find that our undertaking both public external debt and public guaranteed debt from external sources will be as of today in excess of \$600 million. I believe that we in developing countries, small countries with open economies, have to exercise some care in these matters, and the Government ought to be a little cautious in this particular area.

3.25 p.m.

History is a very interesting thing, because it teaches us a lot of lessons. When I observe what is beginning to go on in this country, since late 1984 and as we move into 1985, I am seeing a pattern emerging which is very similar to the pattern which emerged in 1980, when the Government reflatd the economy with borrowed money, when it embarked on a number of capital projects which provided jobs of a temporary nature. And we know what happened in 1981. In 1980, and coming into 1981, the Barbados Labour Party adopted a slogan from the

British Conservative Party, "We Never Had It So Good", which was the theme which went through with all this borrowing of money. As soon as the election had passed, one found that we had to have a mini-Budget, everything was tightened up, credit was cut off, and we then really begun to get some idea of the tremendous economic problems which confronted this country.

I see a similar pattern emerging in this particular situation. It is very clear to me that the wicket is being prepared for some things, and I would not be surprised if this is not the beginning of the election campaign of the Barbados Labour Party. The pattern is very clear, and I would like to warn the citizens of this country not to be fooled a second time by the strategies which were used in 1980, because in the final analysis, if they were fooled, all I would say is that the Lord would have to help them.

The other thing is that we have to recognise that it is going to be more and more burdensome on the taxpayers of this country when the day of reckoning comes. I believe 1985 is going to be the year of reckoning for the taxpayers of Barbados, because in this year, we have to repay the massive loans which were taken up from the International Monetary Fund. Whereas projects have been identified for which this money will be used, I have a feeling that the real purpose of borrowing this money is for balance of payments support and to make our foreign reserves look good. I sincerely believe that. As I said, I want to issue a cautionary note to the Government, and I hope that my words will not fall on deaf ears.

What is a little worrying, too, is the haste with which the Government seems to be coming down with this particular matter. The negotiations have not been completed, and not having completed the negotiations, not knowing the price or the interest rate, I wonder what was the haste in bringing this Resolution at this particular time. I wonder whether it could not have waited to get all of that matter straightened out and then to be able to come to this Honourable Chamber and present a clear and total picture about the transactions, rather than coming with a half-baked measure like this and asking us to approve it. I think too much trust is expected to be placed in the Government when measures are brought in this way, and the Government has demonstrated very clearly that it cannot be trusted.

SENATOR A. W. A. McCLEAN: Mr. President, in rising to support this Resolution, I would just like to make a plea for an approach to presenting such Resolutions in the future. I think it would help a lot if the person introducing such Resolutions would give us some background information relating to the current state of the Government debt and some debt service projection into the next two, three or four years, so that we could be

better informed in agreeing or disagreeing, or making comment on the matter. It is not merely a question of what you are borrowing the money for or what the rate of interest is, but the terms and conditions of repayment in relation to the existing debt, and whether or not you are moving into a situation of bunching of debts. These are things we should be in a position to observe and comment on in some way, and we can only do that if we have the information. I do believe that type of information should be brought clearly into the public domain. I hope that the information is available to the Minister of Finance and others who have to make these decisions to bring these Resolutions to Parliament.

3.35 p.m.

Getting to the specifics of this Resolution, I agree that it would have been preferable if the terms and conditions were firmed up so that we would know precisely what we are lending our support to. I trust that the Government would be sufficiently responsible that if, suddenly, they discover that the price and the interest rate turn out to be different from what they had anticipated, they would know that they have to evaluate the situation and determine what is in the best interest of the country.

I welcome the idea of our diversifying the areas from which we borrow going into other markets, but at the same time, this is going to require increased sophistication on the part of the Government and the Central Bank in respect of knowing when to borrow where, when to move the funds out, when to move the funds back in and things of that order in a world where exchange rates fluctuate. I notice at this time that the U.S. dollar is very strong *vis-a-vis* all the rest of the currencies in the world, but there is some high expectation that this might reverse in the not too distant future as a matter of policy. We know that the Japanese, traditionally, have tried to stop their currency from appreciating too much *vis-a-vis* other people's for strategic economic reasons, but I am not too sure that they will be able to continue to hold that line forever, and these are things that the Government and the Central Bank should take into consideration when they are timing the movement of these funds out and in to Japan.

I think that, overall, the Resolution is worthy of our support. Senator Greaves did say that he suspected that the fundamental reason is related to balance of payments support. All foreign borrowing is related to balance of payments support. It is the only reason why you borrow overseas. You make a judgment in advance as to the capacity of your economy to finance what you want to do internally, and if you see that you can do it, you do not worry to borrow from anyone else. So although there might not be any balance of payments crisis, every informed decision to borrow overseas, as opposed to raising the funds locally, is ultimately related to managing your payments position, and in that sense

could be regarded as a matter of supporting your balance of payments. That is nothing to be alarmed about.

Some people do borrow money for balance of payments support in crises situations, in which they have to run and get something quick before they get embarrassed. I do not think that that is the case with Barbados at the moment. We have been able so far to stave off the consequences of that big CMCF error, and we seem to be able to manage our affairs in a way as to keep away imminent crises. This measure may just be one step in ensuring that such a crisis does not descend upon us.

SENATOR H. E. YEARWOOD: Mr. President, I also rise to support this Bill. The projects which will be facilitated by the borrowing of this money will be very beneficial to the community at large. Obviously, if you spend a considerable amount of the funds on a road network system, it helps in many areas. With proper roads, you cannot do many things; you can expand your hotel plant, you can build further factory space and you can save a lot on your vehicles. If you have the roads, of course, people do not complain that their vehicles are being destroyed, so it is extremely important that we have a good road network.

The other project, of course will help in the employment situation, and I am sure Senator Greaves would be the first to admit that that would be one of the areas that would benefit considerably. Senator Greaves complains that they employ almost all men in these projects. I should like to point out that in any area where employment is generated, if mostly men are employed in these areas, it means that they can at least support their wives and their children, and this again will benefit the economy generally.

He must understand that every country in this world borrows money, and borrows heavily. We know of the different deficits in the various countries in this world. We know that Brazil owes the international banks something like \$83 billion and Argentina owes some US\$43 billion. I think that Barbados is doing very well; we might owe some money, but borrowing is something which every country in this world has to do in order to survive. Barbados has a very good credit rating in the international money market, and I think that most of us know this. It has to be recognized, and it is known, that this Government has been managing its affairs very well, and I believe that that is what might be frightening Senator Greaves.

Senator Greaves is saying that he believes that this money is being borrowed to support our balance of payments. Earlier he said that it was something to do with electioneering. I do not know which one he is really serious about. It is not for the Government to try to fool

anybody. It is quite clear that projects have got to be carried on. Barbados is in a good position to borrow money and we must go and get that money where we can. Nobody is being fooled. We have to get the money to create some employment, and if people are prepared to lend, I think it would be worthwhile borrowing in order to keep employment in the country up and see that things go right in Barbados.

Senator Greaves says that we adopted the conservative slogan, 'We Never Had It So Good.' I still tell him that we still never had it so good, and I hope that is understood.

I think one of the things which we must say and make clear is that people should understand that these debts have not got to be repaid overnight. I think that must be made clear to the average man in the street. Some of these things are usually hidden. Our children, our children's children and their children will still be reaping these benefits when we are all gone. At times people tend to think that the money must be repaid within a few months. If it was so, it could be a very serious matter which could cause a crisis in the country. This is not the case.

3.45 p.m.

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: I support the Resolution and I congratulate the Government on its ability to be able to borrow money from Japanese sources. Those countries do not lend money to countries that are not credit worthy. We do not hear about Brazil or Argentina owing Japan any bad debt, so it is a real honour in the cap of Barbados to be able to float a bond issue in Japan.

I was very pleased to note, of course, that some funds are coming to the Barbados Development Bank. The Barbados Development Bank, as you are aware, is the godfather of the tourist industry and the manufacturing industry in Barbados. To the small business, we are the only father they ever knew, because there was no small business loans in the Barbados Development Bank before the present Honourable Minister of Finance became the Minister in charge of the bank. Loans were never given to small business before. In fact, I saw a directive there which said to open a window for \$250 000 and dish it out \$1 000 at a time to all the small shopkeepers. Not one application came in, because who would want to borrow \$1 000? That was the type of help that small business got in this country prior to 1976. So I can easily say that the Barbados Development Bank is the father of small business loans since 1976.

Applause.

SENATOR C. D. SEALE: In our role of assisting industry we have been doing some indepth studies and we

realize — we realized it before but we realize it more on hindsight — that loans made to industrial and tourism projects at interest rates above 11 per cent are really too high, and we are very shortly going to reduce the rates of interest on these projects. However, for the bank to remain viable, it will need some injection of equity capital from the Ministry of Finance. We are going to be giving up revenue and we need to earn more revenue, and that is why we will have to have an injection. I am quite satisfied that the Ministry of Finance will see the light and give us this capital in the Estimates, because I think it is very much needed.

I think the Government should take a good look at giving guarantees to commercial banks when the companies have problems. We have seen two commercial banks in Barbados in the last couple of months make decisions to place companies into receivership. What has happened really? The Foundry, for instance, has been reduced to old iron, and the assets which the bank thought they had have now become nothing. Club St. James has been closed down by another commercial bank.

I believe that if those commercial banks were to approach the Government for some sort of assistance by way of a guarantee, those projects could still be open. Those companies could still be there, and people would be employed. In the case of the Foundry, that business is over one hundred years old. That was only a temporary setback. There were some wild fellows in there in the last couple of years, and some of the assets have been eroded. But that is a company that can be returned to profitability. It does not need to be closed down. It does not need to send home the two hundred odd people and have a lot of money being lost.

Look at Club St. James! What have they really done? Burnt lights since August or September when they went into receivership. The bank has earned nothing. That hotel was at least making some interest payments. But all of a sudden, maybe a head office says by telex, "Close down the place and put it in receivership." And they earn nothing!

I believe that the Government cannot allow these fellows in the commercial banks with the hard hearts to come down upon the poor companies that are in trouble. I think the Government will have to step in on a few occasions with guarantees. We have the precedents in the United States. Chrysler Corporation now making billions, but that was assisted by the United States Government. In Britain, there are also a number of businesses that have been helped out. I think that we can do that here at no cost really to us — maybe in the future, but certainly not in the present — because we will guarantee the debt for a while and probably put in good management.

Once again, I congratulate the Government for having the ability to float this loan. I am satisfied in my mind that it is going to be used wisely, because in 1985 we have to take back off. Early in 1984, I said in here that I was afraid for 1984. I am not afraid of 1985. I see that we are on the road to prosperity again, with the Government taking us along. I am confident that if they see the light and get out of the sort of problems caused by international economists, we will be all right. There is one such gentleman on my right, but I think he agrees with me that the high interest rates that we have been flouting on the people of the world must go and we must return viability to businesses. We are going to do this in 1985. The Barbados Development Bank is going to be in there leading, because with the hotel report, as you know, we have started to return prosperity to the country by a little more addition in promotion and what have you. We are going to continue in industry and we are going to do it because we are doing it for Barbadians.

Applause.

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: Mr. President, the Government is about to start on a programme that will cost us Bds\$300 million and we are borrowing US\$20 million on the Japanese market, and we hear from the Opposition Benches that they cannot see the economic sense in this! If one looks at the programmes which we are about to start, it would take either a genius or a Dem to say that we are not going to have any economic benefit. Because it is not only a matter of building a northern access road or the Airport-West Coast Access Road, we are going to get into a programme of resurfacing the Grantley Adams Airport.

The runway at the airport, as most of us would know, is in bad condition. Tourism is our major foreign exchange earner, and we cannot continue to have a runway which makes you think that you are landing on a dirt track every time a plane touches down. The plane jumps about and the pilots must have nightmares when they land at Grantley Adams nowadays. We want to bring our runway back to the quality it enjoyed in the last five or six years. It has deteriorated and we want to resurface it. It is going to cost us \$20 million to do that, and that is only part of the funds we are talking about.

I do not know how Senator Ward could ever hope to bring people to Barbados as a hotelier if they think their lives are threatened when they land at Grantley Adams Airport. I do not think we have to justify that to anybody, except Senator Greaves, that we have to fix the airport. Yet, Senator Greaves is a man who uses the airport a lot. The union fellows do a lot of flying about.

The Northern Access Road, which is estimated to cost us BDS\$30 million, is essentially designed to bring

materials from the pits on the East Coast to the cement plant at Checker Hall. We used to spend large sums of money importing cement until we got the Arawak Cement Company going. We are now in the business of exporting some cement. The Company is negotiating and has made sales to Guyana and Puerto Rico, and if it is to continue in business, if it is to continue to get raw materials from St. Andrew down to Checker Hall in St. Lucy, then they must have a road — unless Senator Greaves want to send it by helicopter. We are going to spend \$30 million on the road, because we know that, in the long run, it will not only give Barbadians perpetual employment at the cement plant producing cement to send to the rest of our CARICOM neighbours, but it will also improve the general transportation in the northern parishes.

3.55 p.m.

Senator Greaves' leader in the Other Place has gone on record as saying that one does not get fish by having a harbour, so you can understand why they are opposed to spending \$24 million on the Bridgetown Fishing Harbour. But we understand that if you do not have a fishing harbour, you cannot market the fish and that marketing is an essential part of business. So we are going to fix up Bridgetown. The old Bridgetown will fade away, the old careenage with the boats, will pass away, and we shall have a new fishing harbour where people can make fishing in this country a real economic venture, where fishermen will no longer be worried about whether or not they have to sell flying fish at some strange price as in Oistins nowadays, where they almost give them away.

It cannot make sense for fishermen to buy a boat, service the boat and then sell the flying fish at four cents each. That happens not because he has too many fish, but because there is no proper arrangement for marketing. If you have a proper harbour, with proper fishing facilities, you can have more fish, a continuous supply of fish, and the fishermen can make a decent living. But they do not understand that.

There are two matters in the programme which involve my Ministry. We intend this year to refurbish the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, to build a new wing at the hospital, and to build a polyclinic in the Glebe, St. George. The Glebe will have an important part to play in the delivery of the National Health Service when it comes on stream later this year. Is Senator Greaves saying that he will deny the people of Barbados the privilege of having a proper National Health Service by not supporting the Resolution for the loan? Is Senator Greaves saying that he will not support the improvements at the QEH and the expansion of the hospital so that it can teach doctors in the Caribbean? Because the QEH, you must remember, is a teaching hospital as part of the UWI, and most of the expansion will go into the teaching element of the

hospital, along with the Burns Unit, which we propose to start.

The other project that matters to me is the Solid Waste Plant. My friend, Senator Griffith, insists on calling it the "Municipal Solid Waste Plant." I say that there is no municipality.

The truth is that everyday we complain about the environment. We see how untidy Barbados is. We condemn the Sanitation workers.....

Aside

SENATOR THE HON. O'B. TROTMAN: We are not going to have any cemetery at this plant. It does not have anything to do with the dead. It has to do with garbage disposal.

Senator Griffith has stated that the energy used in burning this garbage can generate some measure of electricity and contribute towards the general power situation in Barbados. But the important thing about this is not the little electricity that we will get. The truth of it is that at present the Sanitation Service Authority gets rid of its garbage at various old quarries — Kingsland, Black Bess, Oldbury Road — and at present we have no more quarries to put garbage in; Kingsland and Black Bess are the last. So unless we get some new method of disposing of our garbage, we all will have to keep our garbage in our backyards.

How are we going to get people to come to Barbados as a tourist destination unless we have some mechanism for cleaning up the place? That plant alone is going to cost, I believe, \$21 million. I believe that at present we are looking at putting it somewhere near the Spring Garden Road, near the rum refinery or somewhere in that area. But we will not only have the garbage collected, but we will have a clean operation, so there will be no more smelly, rotten and unhealthy dumps at Black Bess and Kingsland. Yet Senator Greaves says that he cannot see any economic value in these things.

There are a few other programmes which will benefit from the loan. Senator Seale has mentioned the Development Bank, and there is the regular road rehabilitation programme. Only on Sunday I heard people complaining about the deteriorating state of the roads. That will happen because, as we have said over and over, the roads were not geared for heavy traffic. So when the container trucks pass, they destroy the roads, and you have to be constantly spending money on resurfacing roads. I believe that we are going to spend US\$19.4 million in fixing the roads in Barbados, so that the tourists can drive on good roads, and so that the Senators here can drive on good roads on the way to the Senate,

and so that we can get rid of all the pot-holes we have in this country. That is one good reason we are asking the Senate to concur in the Resolution, and we are only seeking to borrow a small sum of US\$20 million on the Japanese market to finance \$300 million in projects over the next few years.

Senator Greaves has another problem. He believes that they are not yet ready. They are saying they are ready, but apparently he is not now ready, and so he is frightened. He is not frightened because of the loan or the projects. He is frightened because he is not ready.

SENATOR THE HON. C. A. GRIFFITH: This matter could not pass without making a comment, and I am inspired in my commentary by the nonsense that keeps passing from the Opposition on the question of economic matters. As I was sitting listening to the non-points made by Senator Greaves it came home very forcefully to me that people who come into public life in this country and claim to want to represent the public must try and get an understanding of economic issues. There is no point coming here and talking about matters that are beyond their comprehension and then expect to go out and represent people at a political level.

I have detected this manner not only in Senator Greaves, but in other prospective candidates of the Democratic Labour Party. Recently on a programme I heard one Democratic Labour Party prospect saying that he does not understand economics and, therefore, he has to refer to somebody else. But we cannot survive in this country if people in the political directorate do not appreciate the intricacies of economic matters. It does not take much. A little homework would have helped Senator Greaves to understand, for instance, as a member of the Senate, that a copy of the Five year Development Plan was made available to him, and in that Plan the programmes call for an investment of over \$750 million. If he had only taken his time and studied the Plan, he would not have showered us with the arrant nonsense about temporary jobs.

When you start to talk about temporary jobs, you have to look at them in relative terms. A road programme project, which is going to take three years, can be considered a temporary job if you compare it with a crash programme which was done in 1961, when people were just digging up holes and filling them with grass. That was happening in 1961 — and people hailed the inventor of that crash programme as an economic genius!
4.05 p.m.

There has been a whole outcry about the unemployment situation in the country. The Minister of Finance in a mini-Budget presentation outlined a programme to

get the country back to work. We have come with a loan programme that is designed to support an entire capital works programme of the Government to do just that, and we get criticised for it! We hear it is a lead up to the election! If the honourable Senator had done his homework, he would have recognised that most of these projects were in the idea, development and planning stages for over two years. You cannot get a project before the Inter-American Development Bank and off and running just before elections, and the IADB would not look at any country in this region and say it is going to support a project which does not have some kind of economic benefit to it.

The airport/west coast road project has been designed with the economy in mind, and it has shown that the project has tremendous economic benefit. I am surprised to hear that a spokesman for the Opposition can criticise the project as a vote-catching measure, when you are going to have three years of work for people, when you are going to have industrial estates, when you are going to cut down on the time of travel, and when you are going to save tremendously on the cost to the people who use the road, not only Barbadians but the people who travel to Barbados to do business. But all of that is criticised!

One would have been concerned about that if the measure proposed here by the Leader of the Senate concentrated on roads only. This matter dealt with several aspects of the Government's programme, not just roads. We are to have a plant which will solve some of the problems of the health of future generations of Barbadians, and indeed solve some of the problems related to the tourist industry, simply because if we continue to destroy the environment by using land fill, we are going to be hurting not only Barbadians but we are going to hurt our tourist industry. This plant, which was designed with energy use in mind, has now assumed a priority of being more suitable for the environmental considerations than when it was first started. There are a number of things besides roads which must be looked at. The Chairman of the Barbados Development Bank, Senator David Seale, was high in praise for the loan because the Inter-American Development Bank funding is provided to help an industry which generates foreign exchange, so no decision is taken about borrowing money for the sake of borrowing money.

Obviously Senator Greaves does not understand what is going on when he talked so much foolishness about the real purpose of borrowing this money is for balance of payments support, and I am glad that Senator McClean was able to teach him a lesson or two. These are waters which, if you do not know your way around them, you should not get involved in them. I think that the people of this country will judge these so-called

spokesmen on public matters very harshly if they do not do their homework and understand that we have a country to run, particularly a small country where the economy is open, where we have to be susceptible to the influences of international activity, and where we are not the only country that borrows money — as Senator Yearwood said, countries must borrow money for their developmental programmes. Even the gigantic United States has borrowed money from the International Monetary Fund about six times in the space of ten years — and we have to borrow money.

We are just a small country, and we have gone to the Japanese market, a market that is virtually uncharted. There are complaints time and time again about the Japanese infiltration in almost every country in the world and their not returning any kind of benefit. This loan could possibly have been raised on the markets in London, or New York, and I am aware of the fact that there is a lot of interest in the investment markets in New York for financing projects in Barbados. I am aware of the fact that Barbados can easily float bonds in the New York financial market and get support for them because of its credit worthiness, and I have had approaches about doing this for Barbados, so there is no

difficulty in getting the loans. The key thing is that we have been able with this loan to break into the Japanese market, an economy and indeed a country which is usually hostile to incursions of foreigners which may seem to threaten what happens in its own economy.

The Government has done a good job on this, and it is about time that these so-called spokesmen for the people understand what they are talking about before they come into this Chamber, or go any other place, and pretend that they are speaking for the people, because they are only misleading the public.

The question that the Senate concur in the Resolution was put to the Senate and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW: Mr. President, I beg to move that the Senate do now adjourn *sine die*.

The question was put to the Senate and agreed to and Mr. PRESIDENT adjourned the Senate accordingly.
4.15 p.m.

CONTENTS

MESSAGES

Message re the appointment of Mr. H. E. Yearwood
and Mr. J. E. Jordan to the Senate 613

Mr. President, 613; Mr. Yearwood, 614;
Mr. Jordan, 614.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Announcement re illness of Chaplain
of Senate..... 614

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW..... 614

The Health Services (Embalmers and Funeral
Directors) Regulations.

Financial statement showing Net Customs and
Excise Receipts for 7 months ended 31st
October 1984.

The Annual Report and Financial Statements
of the Barbados Export Promotion Corpora-
tion for the year ended 31st March 1984.

The Judges Remuneration Order, 1984.

The Customs Tariff (Amendment) (No.6)
Order, 1984.

The Fourth Annual Report and Financial
Statements of the National Sports Council for
the year ended 31st March 1982.

The Fifth Annual Report and Financial
Statements of the National Sports Council
for the year ended 31st March 1983.

The Sixth Annual Report and Financial
Statements of the National Sports Council
for the year ended 31st March 1984.

The Consumption Tax Order, 1985.

Report on the Audit of the Accounts of the
Child Care Board for the financial year 1982
to 1983.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

SENATOR THE HON. N. A. BARROW..... 614,615

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 Plant 1983/88 and
other capital expenditure approved by resolu-
tion of Parliament.

Resolution to approve the revision of salaries
of certain posts on the staff of Parliament.

Resolution to approve the revision of salaries
of the posts of the Prime Minister's personal
staff.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

Private Investigators and Security
Guards Act, 1984 615

Senator Barrow, 615, 628; Senator Greaves,
616; Senator Yearwood, 620; Senator
Simmons, 620, 629; Senator McClean, 624;
Senator Mrs. Lynch, 625; Senator Ward, 626;
Senator Williams, 626; Senator Jemmott, 627;
Senator Linton, 629.

RESOLUTION RE REVISION OF SALARIES
FOR PRIME MINISTER'S PERSONAL
STAFF 630

Senator Barrow, 630.

RESOLUTION RE INCREASE IN SALARY
PAYABLE TO THE GOVERNOR-
GENERAL..... 631

Senator Barrow, 631.

SALE OF PROPERTY AT PINE HILL
ST. MICHAEL 631

Senator Barrow, 631, 632; Senator Jemmott,
631; Senator Seale, 631; Senator Reader,
632; Senator McClean, 632.

BORROWING OF 5 BILLION JAPANESE
YEN TO BE RAISED BY BONDS. 633

Senator Barrow, 633; Senator Greaves, 634;
Senator McClean, 635; Senator Yearwood,
636; Senator Seale, 636; Senator Trotman,
637; Senator Griffith, 639.

SUSPENSION..... 630

ADJOURNMENT 640

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

BARROW, Hon. N. A.
CATO, His Honour Sir Arnott
GRIFFITH, Hon. C.A.
GREAVES, E. E.
JEMMOTT, C. E.
JORDAN, J. E.
LINTON, H. R.
LYNCH, Mrs. E. M.
McCLEAN, A. W. A.
READER, Mrs. G. G.
SEALE, C. D.
SIMMONS, D. A. C.
TROTMAN, Hon. O'b.
WARD, L. A.
WILLIAMS, J. E. D.
YEARWOOD, H. E.