

Leave of Absence

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

SENATE

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

The Senate met at 1.30 p.m.

PRAYERS

[MR. PRESIDENT *in the Chair*]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. President: Hon. Senators, I have granted leave of absence to Sen. the hon. Embau Moheni, Sen. Nicole Dyer-Griffith and Sen. Terrence Deyalsingh, who are all out of the country. I have also granted leave of absence to Sen. Basharat Ali.

SENATORS' APPOINTMENT

Mr. President: Hon. Senators, I have received the following correspondence from His Excellency the President, Prof. George Maxwell Richard T. C., C. M. T., Ph. D..

“THE CONSTITUTION OF THE REPUBLIC OF TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

By His Excellency Professor GEORGE MAXWELL RICHARDS, T. C., C. M. T., Ph. D., President and Commander-in-Chief of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago.

/s/ G. Richards
President.

TO: ARCHBISHOP BARBARA BURKE

WHEREAS Senator EMBAU MOHENI is incapable of performing his duties as a Senator by reason of his absence from Trinidad and Tobago:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, GEORGE MAXWELL RICHARDS, President as aforesaid, in exercise of the power vested in me by section 40(2)(a) and section 44 of the Constitution of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, do hereby appoint you, ARCHBISHOP BARBARA BURKE, to be temporarily a member of the Senate, with effect from 31st January, 2012 and continuing during the absence from Trinidad and Tobago of the said Senator Embau Moheni.

Given under my Hand and the Seal of the President of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago at the Office of the President, St. Ann's, this 30th day of January, 2012”.

Senators' Appointment

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

“THE CONSTITUTION OF THE REPUBLIC OF TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

By His Excellency Professor GEORGE MAXWELL RICHARDS, T. C., C. M. T., Ph. D., President and Commander-in-Chief of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago.

/s/ G. Richards
President.

TO: MR. ARNOLD RAM

WHEREAS Senator Nicole Dyer-Griffith is incapable of performing her duties as a Senator by reason of her absence from Trinidad and Tobago:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, GEORGE MAXWELL RICHARDS, President as aforesaid, in exercise of the power vested in me by section 40(2)(a) and section 44 of the Constitution of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, do hereby appoint you, ARNOLD RAM, to be temporarily a member of the Senate, with effect from 31st January, 2012 and continuing during the absence from Trinidad and Tobago of the said Senator Nicole Dyer-Griffith.

Given under my Hand and the Seal of the President of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago at the Office of the President, St. Ann's, this 30th day of January, 2012”.

“THE CONSTITUTION OF THE REPUBLIC OF TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

By His Excellency Professor GEORGE MAXWELL RICHARDS, T. C., C. M. T., Ph. D., President and Commander-in-Chief of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago.

/s/ G. Richards
President.

TO: MRS. SHERRIE HAMIDAN LORNA ALI

WHEREAS Senator TERRENCE DEYALSINGH is incapable of performing his duties as a Senator by reason of his absence from Trinidad and Tobago:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, GEORGE MAXWELL RICHARDS, President as aforesaid, in exercise of the power vested in me by sections 44(1)(a) and 44(4)(b) of the Constitution of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, do hereby appoint you,

Senators' Appointment

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

SHERRIE HAMIDAN LORNA ALI, to be temporarily a member of the Senate, with effect from 29th January, 2012 to 1st February, 2012 and continuing during the period of absence from Trinidad and Tobago of the said Senator Terrence Deyalsingh.

Given under my Hand and the Seal of the President of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago at the Office of the President, St. Ann's, this 27th day of January, 2012. ”

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE

The following Senators took and subscribed the Oath of Allegiance as required by law: Archbishop Barbara Burke, Arnold Ram and Sherrie Hamidan Lorna Ali.

TECHNICAL DIFFICULTIES

Mr. President: Hon. Senators, you may have noticed that we are having some technical difficulties. My microphone is working fine, so you are hearing from me, but you may have difficulty being heard. I propose that we suspend the Senate for 10 minutes, and we will resume therefore at 1.52 p.m. This Senate now stands suspended until 1.52 p.m.

1.42 p.m.: *Sitting suspended*

2.00 p.m.: *Sitting resumed.*

Mr. President: My apologies for that interruption, but I think we are off to a good start now. I call on the Leader of Government Business.

PAPERS LAID

1. Consolidated financial statements of Evolving TecKnologies and Enterprise Development Company Limited for the financial year ended September 30, 2006. [*The Minister of Public Utilities (Sen. The Hon. Emmanuel George)*]
2. Consolidated financial statements of Evolving TecKnologies and Enterprise Development Company Limited for the financial year ended September 30, 2007. [*Sen. The Hon. E. George*]
3. Consolidated financial statements of Evolving TecKnologies and Enterprise Development Company Limited for the financial year ended September 30, 2008. [*Sen. The Hon. E. George*]

4. Consolidated financial statements of Evolving TecKnologies and Enterprise Development Company Limited for the financial year ended September 30, 2009. [*Sen. The Hon. E. George*]
5. Consolidated financial statements of the Trinidad and Tobago Bureau of Standards for the year ended September 30, 2009. [*Sen. The Hon. E. George*]
6. Loan Contract No. 2617/OC-TT between the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago and the Inter-American Development Bank for the Sustainable Energy Program (First Programmatic Operation) [*Sen. The Hon. E. George*]
7. Loan Contract No. 2600/OC-TT between the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago and the Inter-American Development Bank for the WASA Modernization and Wastewater Infrastructure Rehabilitation Programme. [*Sen. The Hon. E. George*]
8. Annual administrative report of the Mayaro/Rio Claro Regional Corporation for the period 2008/2009. [*Sen. The Hon. E. George*]
9. Annual administrative report of the Couva/Tabaquite/Talparo Regional Corporation for the period October 2008 to September 2009. [*Sen. The Hon. E. George*]
10. Annual Administrative Report of the Sangre Grande Regional Corporation for the period October 2009 to September 2010. [*Sen. The Hon. E. George*]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Mr. President: Hon. Senators, as we lost 20 minutes in time, I propose that rather than end at 2.15 p. m., this period dealing with questions will end at 2.35 p.m.

Trinidad Generation Unlimited (TGU) (Details of)

21. Sen. Fitzgerald Hinds asked the hon. Minister of Public Utilities:

- (A) Could the Minister indicate how the electricity generated by the Trinidad Generation Unlimited (TGU) is being utilized?
- (B) Could the Minister also state whether the Government has attracted any investor(s) to set up plans/factories to utilize any excess or unused electricity produced by the TGU?

The Minister of Public Utilities (Sen. The Hon. Emmanuel George): Thank you, Mr. President. Question 21, the reply is as follows:

Section A of the question: commercial operations of phase 1 of the TGU power station began on August 01, 2011, which resulted in 225 megawatts of generation being added to the grid. Phase 2 of the operation of the power station began on

December 01, 2011, which added another 225 megawatts of generation to the electric grid. This power is transported to the National Transmission Station via T&TEC's new 220 KV substation at Union Estate in La Brea. The TGU power station is being fully utilized at as present.

The information necessary for answering part B of this question does not fall within the purview of the Ministry of Public Utilities, as such it is advised that the question be redirected to the appropriate Minister.

Sen. Hinds: Mr. President, when in the past a question may have been improperly directed, another Minister, naturally, the question having been proffered, responds. The Minister is saying in relation to part B, since the information sought from him, does not apply to his Ministry, a fresh question should be directed. Mr. President, I think that this is inefficient and I really do feel that the Minister should have procured the services of another of his colleagues to answer the question today for the benefit of the people of Trinidad and Tobago.

Mr. President: Thank you, Senator. You may proceed to the next question.

**Trinidad & Tobago Football Federation
(School football support)**

23. Sen. Fitzgerald Hinds asked the hon. Minister of Education:

Could the Minister indicate whether cash and non-cash support from his Ministry has been given to the Trinidad & Tobago Football Federation or any predecessor organization or affiliate, in support of school football for the past five (5) years?

The Minister of Education (Hon. Dr. Tim Gopeesingh): Mr. President, it is indeed a distinct honour for me to be here [*Desk thumping*] once more, having been here during the Sixth, Eighth, Ninth Parliament in this distinguished Senate, and amongst distinguished Members of this Senate. Permit me first of all, in the New Year, to wish you and your family a very happy and healthy New Year, and also all Members of this distinguished august Chamber.

The answer to question No. 23 is as follows:

The Ministry of Education through the Physical Education Unit, Curriculum, Planning and Development Division, has oversight responsibility for sports in schools. The Primary and Secondary Schools' National Football Associations are made up of principals and teachers. The National Primary Schools' Football League and the Trinidad and Tobago Secondary Schools' Football League, run primary and secondary schools' football respectively.

These organizations take responsibility for the organization and administration of schools' football, from the school to the district level to the national level, and sometimes to the international level. Both these organizations have received corporate assistance for their respective competitions, particularly over the last five years. May I take this opportunity to sincerely thank all those corporate bodies, corporate entities—NGOs, CBOs—for giving the Ministry of Education the assistance in the holistic development of our children's education.

Indeed, the relationship between the leagues and the Trinidad and Tobago Football Federation is that they were former affiliates of the Trinidad and Tobago Football Federation. In this regard, an affiliation fee of \$6,000 per year is paid by the Trinidad and Tobago Secondary Schools' Football League to the TTF, and a fee of \$1,200 per year by the National Primary School's Football League. Apart from such affiliation fees, from time to time, the Trinidad and Tobago Football Federation may invite the leagues to participate in coaching courses. Where there is a cost involved, the leagues would be required to pay for their participation, and for their participants. Both leagues are principals' leagues, that is, the leagues are under the control of the principals or their representatives.

The National Primary Schools' Football League: football at the primary level is run at the level of the education district. Each district must have three representatives from which an executive, which has overall responsibility, is elected. We have the current members of the executive consisting of a chairman, vice-chairman, secretary/treasurer, assistant secretary/treasurer and a public relations officer.

The Trinidad and Tobago Secondary School's Football league—there are five zones for secondary schools' football: north, south, east, central and Tobago. There is a council which has overall responsibility for football, and is made up of representatives of each zone. The current members of the council will include the secretary, president, first vice-president, second vice-president, assistant secretary operations and an assistant secretary administration.

The Ministry of Education takes a supportive and facilitative approach to the organization of sports, other extra-curricular activities and co-curricular activities in our school community, especially at the national level. There are presently registered and recognized by the Ministry of Education national schools sporting organizations in football, cricket, netball and track and field at both primary and secondary levels, and in addition, volleyball, badminton and basketball at the secondary level.

The main role of the Ministry has been technical advice at meetings, provision of space to hold meetings at the Rudranath Capildeo Learning Resource Centre, when possible, and the provision of funds for transportation of students, teachers and parents to enable students to attend games and events at zonal and national levels, for example, at the Hasely Crawford Stadium for athletics, et cetera. The cost of transport is paid directly to the Public Transport Service Corporation and maxi taxis at commercial rates. The Ministry also supports the provision of refreshments at national games, and reward students in the form of trophies and medals.

Mr. President, recently we formed a National Advisory Committee for Sports in Education, and I have the distinct honour and privilege to mention the composition of such a team they are as follows:

Alvin Corneal, former national cricketer and footballer and world renowned coach; Derek Murray, former Trinidad, West Indies cricketer, and I think he captained West Indies for a short while; Larry Romany, now President of the Trinidad and Tobago Olympic Committee; Ms. Annette Knott from Tobago, Secretary of the Trinidad and Tobago Olympic Committee; Ms. Cheryl Peters, former Trinidad and West Indies distinguished netball player, Hasely Crawford, former national Olympic 100 metres gold medalist, and Douglas Camacho, immediate past President of the Olympic Committee. They in fact, altogether are now advising the Minister of Education and the Ministry on the issues related to sports in the co-curricular activity and extracurricular activities in the education system of Trinidad and Tobago.

The Ministry of Education has no official line of communication with the Trinidad and Tobago Football Federation, but goes through the National Primary and Secondary School Leagues. It has not given cash, hon. Member, nor cash support to the Federation to support schools' football.

Further, the secondary and primary schools' football leagues have advised, that apart from the payment of affiliation fees or fees for attendance at coaching courses, they conduct no cash or non-cash transactions with the Trinidad and Tobago Football Federation. Thank you, Mr. President.

**Trinidad & Tobago Football Federation
(Financial Support of)**

24. Sen. Fitzgerald Hinds asked the hon. Minister of Sport:

- A. Could the Minister indicate whether financial support has been directed to the Trinidad and Tobago Football Federation and its predecessor

Oral Answers to Questions
[SEN. HINDS]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

organization(s) by his Ministry; and any other entity under the purview of his Ministry, for each of the past five (5) years?

- B. Could the Minister indicate the total cash contribution given to the Trinidad and Tobago Football Federation, in the run-up to and towards the efforts of our national football team for qualification in the last World Cup campaign?

Sen. Hinds: Mr. President, as I contemplate the direction of question 24 to the Minister of Sport, who is not here, I want to have this House know that the Leader of Government Business advised me that the Minister of Sport is stuck in traffic—some place, or some other frivolous explanation. He cannot be here and he has asked that I accept the response in writing. I reluctantly, Mr. President, do so, because I think it is a dereliction of duty, and the Minister should be here to answer questions for oral answer on behalf of the people of Trinidad and Tobago.

Vide end of sitting for written answer.

Dr. Gopeesingh: No supplemental for it? [*Laughter*] You could ask me I will answer for you.

2.15 p.m.

**TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO POSTAL CORPORATION
(AMDT.) BILL, 2012**

Bill to amend the Trinidad and Tobago Postal Corporation Act, Chap. 47:02 [*The Minister of Public Utilities*]; read the first time.

**MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS (PENSIONS)
(AMDT.) (No. 2) BILL, 2011
(Withdrawal of)**

The Minister of Public Utilities (Sen. The Hon. Emmanuel George): Thank you, Mr. President. I beg to move that the Municipal Corporations (Pensions) (Amdt.) (No. 2) Bill, 2011 which was introduced in this Senate on Monday, June 27, 2011 be withdrawn.

Question put and agreed to.

**TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO POLICE SERVICE
(FIGHT AGAINST CRIME)**

[Third Day]

Order read for resuming adjourned debate on question [October 25, 2011]:

Be it resolved that this Honourable Senate take note of the strengths and deficiencies of the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service and its impact and potential in the fight against crime.

Question again proposed.

Mr. President: Those who spoke previously are: the mover of the Motion, Sen. Fitzgerald Hinds, Sen. The Hon. Brig. John Sandy, Sen. Dr. Rolph Balgobin, Sen. Penelope Beckles. On Tuesday, November 22, 2011: Sen. Penelope Beckles, Sen. Dr. Lennox Bernard, Sen. Rabindra Moonan, Sen. Terrence Deyalsingh; Sen. Dr. James Armstrong spoke for eight minutes and he has 37 minutes of normal speaking time left.

Sen. Dr. J. Armstrong: Thank you, Mr. President. I discontinued my contribution the last time at the point at which I was about to make some observations with respect to the Commissioner of Police, and I got to the point where I was indicating that as far as I am concerned, it seems to me that we are in need of external assistance or expatriate assistance, and I mentioned that the cost for such will be exorbitant.

I would like to continue from there, and the question that I was about to raise had to do with the terms of reference, job description if you will, for the Commissioner of Police. I have since been advised that the Commissioner of Police is actually on a line position as opposed to being an advisor. For quite some time now I have been hearing discussions taking place about an evaluation, and the fact that the Commissioner of Police would be evaluated based on the situation with crime. That is not satisfactory to me. I do not think that we can fairly evaluate the commissioner, or the police service as a matter of fact, simply on the situation with crime, because, as I said a long time ago, I do not think that we can police our way out of the crime situation that we have found ourselves in.

I have also heard recently that criteria are being considered with respect to the actual evaluation, and it would seem to me that this is something that should have been available a long time ago when this assignment was given to this expatriate. I simply do not want us to shift the responsibility for the crime situation in the country to one individual or simply to the police service. I think that in looking at the manifesto of the Government, before they came into power, and indeed the three-year policy framework, it is recognized in that document, in the policy framework, in chapter 3, I believe it is, that crime is a much wider concern or issue, and a number of recommendations were made in that document as to how crime would be tackled.

What is of some concern to me, is that since that document I am not getting a sense that there are any deliberate, well-orchestrated interventions to address the problems of crime as set out in that strategic document. I think that the objectives as outlined in that document are quite honourable. I have no problems with that document as a matter of fact. I have a problem really with the fact, whether it is being implemented, and if so, whether we can get some information as to what is actually being done to implement the things that are outlined in that document. In other words, what I am saying is that I am seeing a gap between pronouncements that are made by the Government in that document, which is the only thing I have to go on, and a gap in terms of what is actually happening on the ground.

I also mentioned briefly the fact that I was quite pleased to discover that there is a strategic plan in the police service as well. What really pleased me about that is the fact that they have set some targets, and I would like to briefly, with your permission, Mr. President, read out some of the things they have here in their strategic plan and then try to make some suggestions as to what I think should happen in addition to this.

The strategic plan of the police service, 2011—2013; it says: An agenda for change. The police service has indicated that they intend to reduce the number of reported serious crimes in all categories by 10 per cent; increase detention rates by 10 per cent over the previous 12-month period; increase the conviction rate by 20 per cent over the previous 12-month period; reduce the number of road traffic accidents; reduce the number of fatal road accidents by 15 per cent; increase detention of impaired drivers by 20 per cent; increase the number of police community crime prevention initiatives by 10 per cent; increase the public satisfaction index by 60 per cent.

Now, these are very noble targets. What I could not understand from this, however, and if we are to improve the service, I really would have liked to see in this document a little more information on methodology, the strategies and the input side, as to how you are actually going to achieve these things. That was not very clear to me, because you cannot keep doing the same thing over and over again and expect that you get different results. When I talk about the input side, I really want to look at things like the intake of officers into the service and how we treat, really, with the development, the professional development of a police officer to deal with the crime situation that we are faced with.

One of the things that I would like to suggest, Mr. President, is that we perhaps look at raising the bar, the level for people entering the service. We might not be able to do that and attract sufficient people into the service. In that case I would like to suggest that we look at young, bright persons in the society, perhaps

coming out of the university, to whom we can give specialized training. In fact, some time ago, quite recently, I heard the hon. Brig. Sandy talking about the process in the military, in the defence force, where people are trained, and I think he said if you have one course you have one stripe, two courses you have two stripes. I found that rather fascinating.

I am aware of the fact that when I left high school that two of my fellow students actually went into the defence force and proceeded to, I think it was called Sandhurst or something like that, and came back as officers. Therefore, I think that for the types of crime that we have to deal with we really need to look at bright, young people at the degree level, give them appropriate specialized training, and when they return appoint them at the appropriate level commensurate with their experience and qualifications. I do not know what that might be, whether it is going to be at the level of an inspector, whatever. But I do not think that for the types of crimes that we have to deal with today, that we really can continue in terms of the people that we are attracting into the service.

Now, this does not preclude, of course, in-service training of officers who are already there with some potential that we can, perhaps, again, include in that sort of training, so that we can actually have specialized expertise in the service. I would suggest that the police service, the Commissioner of Police or whoever is responsible for this, or the Police Service Commission, should go back to this strategic plan, really, and one, look at the methodologies, revise those outputs that we have here—in fact, I am not too moved by this 10 per cent, 12 per cent, but I think it is a good indication of where they are heading and to try to really develop a service that is efficient, effective and up to the task that we are faced with.

The other thing that I want to touch on briefly is something that came to mind quite recently, and, in fact, it happened again this morning. I was looking at the television this morning and I saw the captain who is the—I think he is called the national security advisor to the Prime Minister, and I was quite confused by what I was hearing. He was saying that on a weekly basis he has presentations made to him on different interventions that can be made in terms of how we deal with crime, how we solve crime and so on. [*Interruption*] I was quite confused by that, because I do not quite understand how that could be happening. And who is in charge? Clearly, there are too many cooks in the kitchen. [*Desk thumping*]

If this is what is happening and this—they were actually discussing the situation with this recent thing about the plane, the purchase of an airplane, it would seem to me that if you are an advisor—and this is why I was trying to

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. DR. J. ARMSTRONG]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

ascertain, really, the position of the Commissioner of Police and the fact that he is the Commissioner of Police on a line position, he is not the advisor, so I do not have a problem with that.

2.30 p.m.

As was indicated, he has certain authority. He is the accounting officer. That is clear. So the authority is vested in that office. What is not clear to me is what authority is vested in the office of the National Advisor to the Prime Minister. And quite apart from the Advisor to the Prime Minister, I was wondering, and maybe someone might enlighten me, is it also an advisor to the Minister of National Security? Is it also an advisor to the National Security Council? Is it also an advisor to the Police Commissioner of Police. These things are not very clear to me, and I do not think that we are going to get any place very fast, unless we resolve these issues. [*Desk thumping*]

I do not want to comment on the business of the technical suitability of the aircraft or anything like that, because I really do not know. But, I also want to mention the business of procurement. From reading the papers and hearing what I was hearing this morning, something has to be wrong with that approach. So, that again, I think it is—we need to very clearly indicate who is responsible for what, who is advising whom and address those problems very, very clearly. Too many people are talking about too many things.

The other point that I want to raise, Mr. President, has to do with this business of crime, hanging, and so on. I was reading recently that the Commissioner of Police said, “Well you know, crime is only in certain areas”. In other words, if you are not in the line of—if you are not involved, you have nothing to be worried about. And, I thought about that. He called them “hot spots”. I have been contemplating since this debate started about whether we should hang or not hang for murder, as one of the most serious crimes committed, and which clearly has been going up significantly—we are averaging more than one a day and I am of two minds. I really do not have a problem with someone who commits a serious crime of a certain type.

I heard again Sen. The Hon. Brig. John Sandy talking recently about a young man who raped a child, went out smoked a cigarette, went back in, raped her and she died. I really do not have a problem with taking him out. What I am beginning to have a problem with, however, is that, if you are telling me. “Yes, we have crime but it is targeted, it is in a hot spot,” I have said on several occasions in this Chamber, “Tell me where those spots are. Pinpoint them for me.” I know what you are going to tell me. I know where you are going to show me. And, if that is what you are going to do, in the same way that you say: “Look, state of emergency, I am going to lock you up.” Now,

what you are telling me is: "I cannot deal with the crime situation; I am going to kill you." I am not buying that. I am not going to support that. Go back to the plan that you have in your strategic; your three-year plan. It is laid out there. All the issues are there; how you are going to deal with it, they are all there. And if you are not doing that, do not come and tell me we have to hang people.

So, I also have some concerns about that and I am signalling very early, that if you want to hang people you have to be doing something else to justify, because, I have said on occasions as well, Mr. President, you cannot beat down on people for years, neglect people for years—and I am not into this business: of who is responsible and who was there. The point is that we have a Government in place now. I know the history of this country very well. I know what has happened. You cannot have a situation where deviancy flourishes, and do not say: "Why? And; "How are we going to deal with it?" If you are doing that effectively, I believe that this problem that we are having with crime, we are going to make some progress.

Crime is not something that just happened overnight. It is something that has been developing over a period of time now, and it is not going to disappear tomorrow. I have said that over and over again. It is going to be a gradual process. But what I want to see is that there is some action, constructive action, in that regard.

I want to conclude, Mr. President, by, again, just citing a quick point in the three-year strategy document; under "crime", chapter 3, it also talks about: "Resocialising away from crime." That is the wording of it. There is a distinction between social planning and development and social welfare, and we are confusing the two things and assuming that welfare, handouts, "gallerying" are going to address the problems of crime. What we really require is exactly what is stated there: "Resocialising", so that we move away from this business of handouts and welfare. I would suggest that we go back, for instance, and read *Behind the Bridge* which was edited by Selwyn Ryan and some other contributors, McCree and so on, so that we see exactly what has transpired over the past several decades and we cannot continue to do that and then "figure that we going" somewhere.

Mr. President, that is my contribution with respect to the alleviation of crime. We go back to the drawing board, go back to the strategic plan of the police service, we look at proper training, bringing in bright people, strengthening our institutions and that we form friendships with the communities where we know we are having problems and that we try to really attain the sort of development that we can all be proud of as a people.

I thank you very much, Mr. President.

The Attorney General (Sen. The Hon. Anand. Ramlogan SC): Thank you very much, Mr. President. This is a very timely Motion brought by my colleague, Sen. Hinds, and I want to start by highlighting the wording of the Motion, because it states:

“Many of the problems that exist in relation to the police organization cannot be reasonably expected to be resolved with any quick fix”.

I think the drafting of the Motion sets the tone for the debate and I think Sen. Dr. Armstrong, who just concluded his contribution, made the point that we are in a continuum and crime did not arrive on the doorsteps of this administration overnight. It did not start in May of last year. So, what we are here to do, really, is to look at some of the issues that have affected the police service and I would like to delve a bit into what the People's Partnership administration met, upon assuming office in terms of the police service and its ability to fight crime and then take us into how we have been unravelling that, under the distinguished leadership of the Sen. The Hon. Brig. John Sandy.

When the constitutional machinery of the State that is meant to protect and defend the rights of citizens, and the constitutional machinery of the State that is meant to underpin the rule of law, is undermined, it has ramifications and implications far beyond the omission or action that has taken place originally.

There was a time in this country when there was a virtual silent constitutional crisis that affected law and order and undermined moral authority of the police service. It undermined the very concept of the rule of law. And not many people realized the piecemeal erosion that was taking place and the surreptitious manner in which it was occurring.

2.45 p.m.

Let me highlight an example to illustrate the point. If someone wanted to report some form of criminal activity on the part of, for example, a high public official, one would have to go to the Integrity Commission to report that matter. For over a year there was no Integrity Commission. Had there been an Integrity Commission—if the Integrity Commission had received that complaint and investigated the matter, it would have then made a recommendation to the DPP. At that time, the nominee of the Judicial and Legal Service Commission for a DPP was vetoed, not once, I think, but twice. So we had an acting DPP. If you had a confirmed DPP who would have had the security of tenure that comes with the substantive appointment as a DPP, he would have been able to receive the reference from the Integrity Commission, and he may have then been able to contact the Commissioner of Police to launch further investigation into the matter that was referred to from the Integrity Commission.

Alas, there was an Acting Commissioner of Police. There was no confirmed Commissioner of Police. Now, when someone is acting—acting appointments in these serious critical offices connote something to the person who is acting; it sends a signal to the wider population at large, and it carries with it a certain undermining of the authority of the institution of the State that is involved. So that was the Integrity Commission—none for a year, making a reference to the DPP; vetoed once, twice: Carla Brown-Antoine; had somebody acting.

Then you go to the Commissioner of Police—acting Commissioner of Police. If we had all those three offices filled and the police were conducting their investigations and the person who made the complaint found that the police was biased, they would have made a complaint about the police conduct, or misconduct, to the Police Complaints Authority. For two years, no Police Complaints Authority. Not one! For two years! No Integrity Commission; no confirmed DPP; no confirmed Commissioner of Police and no Police Complaints Authority for two years. The Police Complaints Authority is a natural and critical counterpart to an effective police service, because without a functioning Police Complaints Authority you cannot have citizens who may feel victimized—police brutality—or want to complain about any form of police misconduct; they have no redress.

So, if that had been the case and they had a Police Complaints Authority, then the chain of events would have followed through. But add to that innocent citizens; the business community, in particular, who felt they were under siege, if they applied for a firearm licence, and in some cases somebody asking for a bribe or they get turned down on legitimate grounds, their only recourse in law was to appeal that decision to the Firearms Appeal Board. Some police officers have license, personal FUL licences. Some apply and they do not get it, and they could then appeal to the Firearms Appeal Board. Guess what? No Firearms Appeal Board for two years!

The whole institutional framework for governance and constitutional authority of the State was severely undermined, and that is what we confronted. No Integrity Commission; Acting DPP; Acting Commissioner of Police; no Police Complaints Authority for two years; no Firearms Appeal Board for two years, and for over four years—not one, not two, not three, but for over four years—they refused to make a substantive confirmed appointment in the critical office of Solicitor General and Chief Parliamentary Counsel. They had people acting on rotation.

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. THE HON. A. RAMLOGAN SC]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

So what they did was to have all the apparatus of the State in a state of vacillation and in a state of suspense where you created a situation where law and order that is serviced by these critical institutions, broke down. Not many people undertake this type of analysis to understand the piecemeal and systematic undermining of the constitutional authority of the State which impacts on the rule of law itself. But those are the facts. [*Desk thumping*]

What did we do? Among the many things, but among the first thing we did, I remember Sen. The Hon. Brig. John Sandy arguing that you cannot have an Acting Commissioner of Police. So you may recall that the People's Partnership administration—its first choice was Stephen Williams. It was an open secret. But the Opposition, the PNM, vetoed and blocked the appointment of Stephen Williams. That is how we landed up going back into the system that we had with Penn State University, and we then got Dwayne Gibbs appointed as Commissioner of Police, Deputy Commissioners of Police, Jack Ewatski, Deputy Commissioner, Mervyn Richardson and Stephen Williams. Nobody acting there! They are all confirmed. [*Desk thumping*]

So when I hear this nonsense about, “Oh, the Commissioner of Police is beholden to the Government”, you see, it reflects their own mindset, because their mindset was to keep everybody acting; leave a loophole here by not appointing an Integrity Commission for a year; “doh” appoint a Firearm Appeals Board for two years; “doh” appoint a Solicitor General for four years; “doh” appoint a Chief Parliamentary Counsel for four years, and to undermine the institutions of the State, and they think that that is our *modus operandi*.

The fact of the matter is, we were the ones who changed all of that, to have people confirmed in their position by bringing to the Parliament of the country the names that were put forward by the independent Police Service Commission after interviews were done. Nobody in the People's Partnership knew who Mr. Gibbs was, who Mr. Ewatski was; we knew who Stephen Williams and Mr. Mervyn Richardson were. And, again, we rushed to confirm Mr. Mervyn Ricardson as Deputy Commissioner of Police.

We could have created a loophole and a situation as a new administration by not going to the merit list, and we could have had our own interviews to cough up a candidate under an interview process that took place under this Government. We did not do that! [*Desk thumping*] The Brigadier and the hon. Prime Minister, as head of the National Security Council, we took the names that were given to us, coughed up by an interview process conducted under a previous administration, and we ran with it.

So if the top brass of the police service has to be accused of any political favouritism, then the Opposition must take the credit for that, because the interview process took place whilst they were in government, and we have simply gone ahead with the appointees. But more than that, it reflects the intellectual bankruptcy that comes from the Opposition that they will have to resort to that kind of disingenuous argument. You see, because not only did we appoint a confirmed Commissioner and three Deputy Commissioners, but we went ahead and we made the Commissioner of Police the accounting officer for the police service. Then we went ahead and gave him autonomy over his own budget in the police service. So that we have created him—it is like a virtual CEO of the police service, with executive authority in a way that he did not enjoy before. He does not have to come running to Sen. The Hon. Brig. Sandy to sign off on buying a paper clip. That used to happen under the PNM, not the Partnership.

He does not have to come to get approval for everything little thing. He has autonomy in terms of his budget and he enjoys the position and authority of an accounting officer. Compare that, mind you, to the situation that existed before where the Prime Minister wanted to hand the letter of appointment to the Commissioner of Police. They want to talk about political bias; they forget their own past! [*Desk thumping*] They bypassed the Police Service Commission and “running quick, quick, to pose for picture and hand the Commissioner of Police his letter of appointment”, as if to say, “We appointing you, eh; we; we.” “And you coming to talk?”

You see, they have a very short memory. But not only did we make confirmed appointments; not only did we give them the administrative and financial autonomy, but we also went ahead and we have given every single police officer a special allowance of \$1,000—non-taxable. [*Desk thumping*]

We have signed a deal with a US software company to provide services to assist in gathering intelligence to help fight crime. We have increased the human resource capacity of the police service. But permit me to make a point. Whilst we have been increasing the number of graduates coming out of the police academy, I believe for the period 2006—2009, for three whole years, they produced 211 graduates. For the period 2009—2010, 390 persons have graduated. That figure will be doubled to almost 800.

But when we speak about inefficiency in the police service, I accept that there is inefficiency. It is clear that there is room for improvement. I say so, because when one looks at the ratio in terms of police officer to citizen, in Trinidad and Tobago we have a police service of roughly over 6,000 officers—about 6,167. That means, roughly, we have about one police officer to service every 200 citizens. It is 198 citizens, so one police to every 198—200 citizens.

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. THE HON. A. RAMLOGAN SC]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

In the United States of America, that ratio is one police to every 440 citizens. In Canada, where we have our Commissioner of Police coming from, the ratio is one police officer to every 520 civilians. In the United Kingdom, it is one police officer to every 341 citizens. Trinidad and Tobago has a better ratio in terms of police to citizen than most countries in the world. That is why, if we have more, a better police to citizens ratio—I accept that there is inefficiency in the system, in the procedures and in the administration of the police service, because by parity of reason we should be getting better results, because the crime rate is lower in those countries.

So I accept that, and that is why I commend my friend, Sen. Hinds, for bringing the Motion. On the flip side, continuing with the concept of a police service operating at optimum capacity, you will never hear in Trinidad and Tobago anything about a fire power deficit. You will never hear that. The police service in this country is well stocked and well armed, make no mistake about it. In terms of vehicles, the police service in this country, in terms of police to vehicle ratio, we are again above average in accordance with international norms. The police are well equipped in terms of vehicles.

In terms of computer equipment, we are in the process of reviewing the IT of the police service, and that is why I mentioned before, we have signed a deal with a software company in the US and that is to improve on the efficiency in the IT area.

3.00 p.m.

One of the things I know we have to look at is that, although we have a better police to citizen ratio, because of the shift system, I think that results in roughly, 1,400 officers being on duty at any given time. So that shift system needs to be at, looked at, in my respectful view. But that again is what we met, we met a shift system. We met a promotion system that was largely ineffective, that was in itself a disincentive to performance, because you appeared before a promotion advisory board, two persons nominated by the commissioner, and the cry of the police population was that seniority was ruling the roost. So to transform the police service, you needed to transform, how people were recruited and promoted.

I did many cases before the courts with police officers who felt they were victimized, unfairly treated, and/or victims of outright discrimination. Now, that process is being reviewed to try and have a more modern and efficient system for recruitment and promotion. Of course, the problems we inherited with respect to disciplining dismissing police officers, with all those things, there were some changes to the regulations, but we have not seen the benefits of the implementation of them.

So we have formed a committee. Miss Donna Cox, from the Opposition and, Mr. Samraj Harripaul SC, Chairman of the Law Reform Commission, serve on that committee. The Police Service Commission, together with a number of stakeholders and consultants, is looking at the regulations as we speak, to try and review and reform the process, because clearly, what was passed before is not working the way it should.

Why did we inherit a police service that was so demoralized, so demotivated? Management guru, Stephen Covey, said, that when you break a man's spirit you can never ever get committed performance. Ask a man to prepare a 100-page thesis on any subject, and when he comes to deliver it, pay him twice the amount you promised. But then take his dissertation, run it through the shredder and see what happens to him. You break his spirit. The PNM broke the spirit of the police service, and, I will tell you how.

They recognized the inefficiency, they recognized the corruption within the police service, the maladministration. They were there for eight years. In fact, they have ruled this country in all, for almost half a century, so they knew about the problems, they recognized them. but instead of trying to confront the problems and fix them,—and this is perhaps the most fundamental mistake that the PNM made—instead, of trying to rectify those problems within the police service, they tried to create a separate parallel police service in the personification of the Special Anti-Crime Unit of Trinidad and Tobago (SAUTT). That is what they did. They tried to create a parallel to the police service, rather than fix the police service. They took police officers, many of whom they felt may have had political affiliation to them. They took them—[*Interruption*]

Sen. Hinds: This is an insult to those officers.

Sen. The Hon. A. Ramlogan SC: —no and they gave them a \$5,000 non-taxable allowance on top of their police salary. You know what that did to all the regular police officers on the beat? You could imagine doing the same job, being called upon to perform the same hours and more, and watching the next man, getting \$5,000 more, without having to pay any tax? You know what that does to your spirit? It breaks you. That is what they did to the police service. They completely demoralized and demotivated the police service.

And they have the unmitigated gall and temerity to criticize us for dismantling SAUTT. One good thing that the People's Partnership administration did, was to dismantle and do away with SAUTT. [*Desk thumping*] And we make no apologies for doing that; SAUTT was a failed institution. They tried to put an intelligence agency, a

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. THE HON. A. RAMLOGAN SC]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

forensic centre, a paramilitary organization, a high-tech surveillance agency, a university and police service all lumped into one. That is, what they were trying to do, without any strategic vision, direction or management, nothing. That is why, despite pumping almost \$2 billion into SAUTT, while they starved the police service, crime continued to soar. [*Desk thumping*]

I recently had a visit from a Trinidadian citizen who is now serving very high in the military in the United States of America. He said that experiment in the United States was like taking the Federal Bureau Investigation (FBI), the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), the District Attorney (DA), the Drug Enforcement Agency, the United States Special Forces, the Navy SEALs, Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) and the University of Ohio for good measure, and lumping them all in one. It could just never work, it cannot happen. [*Interruption*]

Sen. Hinds: What is Homeland Security about?

Sen. The Hon. A. Ramlogan SC: It cannot happen. Well, you all clearly did not know, otherwise, you would not be sitting there and asking. But you see, to add to the confusion, whilst they were spending all that money and starving the police service of the resources it needed, the homicide rate reached epic proportions. They were doing all this in a very surreptitious manner. That is why they left all those offices open, because they refused to bring to this Parliament any legislation to legalize SAUTT.

They want to talk about light plane and light aircraft and all kinds of things. They spent almost \$2 billion through SAUTT, without bringing a single Bill before the Parliament to legalize SAUTT, to give it any sort of financial restraint or structure, nothing—\$2 million. And where are the results? The crime rate continued to soar to astronomical proportions.

What was the reality? The corruption, the inefficiency, and the maladministration that they tried to avoid in the police service reincarnated and replicated itself in SAUTT. It simply transferred from the police service into SAUTT. The same bureaucracy, the same inefficiency, the same maladministration, and the same corruption simply transferred. But with that \$2 billion, had they not made the huge mistake of trying to create a parallel police service and make a political army out of SAUTT, then they would have perhaps solved the problems in the police service.

Instead what happened, Mr. President, SAUTT was compromised. There was passing of information on raids and activities, leakage, misappropriation of funds, diversion of resources for private ends. Of course, we had perhaps to crown it off—I hear them talking about the Canadian Commissioner of Police, and the

Deputy Commissioner of Police, Jack Ewatski, what did they do, really? “I doh know dat Prof. Mastrofski, come from Laventille or Debe.” More importantly, I do not know that any of the retired British officers that they rushed to bring down here, to say that they were the panacea for all the ills of our society, “I do not know dat none ah dem made any difference in the fight against crime.” Concerning these people that they brought down, I will come to it.

They also tried to create a SAUTT Canine Unit which was meant to have top quality certified dogs that could sniff out narcotics, firearms, do bomb detection, you name it. You know what happened? These dogs were sourced at such an exorbitant cost, “when de dogs reach”, it turned out that the people SAUTT hired—were not qualified, and they had to take them to the same Police Canine Unit, the same regular police service that they turned their backs on. It is the regular police officers who had to train dem dog and dem, and send dem back.” All of that, while the people who they hired to train the dogs were getting an extra \$5,000 allowance, and could not train the dogs; that was the reality.

What have we done? We have dismantled SAUTT, and we have taken crime scene investigators and the Special Evidence Recovery Unit, and we have fed them into the Homicide Bureau. We have strengthened and reinforced the Homicide Bureau as a unit of the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service.

Mr. President, there is something called the Police Service Act of this country. It is the fountain of all legislative power, and authority, for the police service. When we take the assets of SAUTT and the human resources and put them in the police service, we are fortifying a legally recognized institution. What they were doing was sweeping under the carpet \$2 billion, in a paramilitary organization and a parallel political police service they created named SAUTT, that was not giving us value for money. The canine assets will now be transferred to the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service. The SAUTT major incident room would come under the command of the police service, and training, of course, will now also come under the police service, the Minister of National Security and Sen. Fazal Karim’s, Ministry. So the police service is being fortified and reinforced in a way like never before. *[Interruption]*

Sen. Hinds: You know you cannot blame SAUTT for the—*[Interruption]*

Sen. Karim: What about the—*[Interruption]*

Sen. The Hon. A. Ramlogan SC: I know SAUTT is very dear and close to Sen. Hinds because he served as a junior Minister of National Security.

Hon. Senator: Junior?

Sen. The Hon. A. Ramlogan SC: I know he does not like the word “junior”, but it is an elevation in light of the fact that he was once called an apprentice.

Sen. Hinds: I like your morbid shirt. I like your shirt.

Sen. The Hon. A. Ramlogan SC: When they criticized us for dismantling SAUTT, they said it was a big mistake, SAUTT was working well. [*Interruption*] Well, forget the statistics for the moment, forget the statistics. Let us forget the fact that crime did not drop, let us look at the integrity of SAUTT itself. Mr. President, yesterday a file was brought to my attention. In any other country this would be the subject of a comedy fest. “Is ah joke.” Listen to this; in 2006 whilst you were power, an excavator was seized from a citizen—an excavator.

Hon. Senator: Moonilals’ own.

Sen. The Hon. A. Ramlogan SC: The excavator weighs 21,000 kilogrammes. It is over 22 tonnes. People who used to cut cane will remember how much a tonne of cane weighed. This was over 22 tonnes. The bucket in front of the excavator is over four feet wide—it is a big excavator. The tracks are over two feet wide on either side that the excavator runs on. The bucket could go up to 20 feet in the air, and at its fastest speed that excavator could only achieve seven kilometres per hour.

In 2006, the excavator was seized from a citizen by SAUTT, and lo and behold the Office of the Attorney General received a legal letter about it because it was not returned. Do you know what happened? When they got the letter saying, “Well look, you did not return the excavator. You seized it, you did not charge me, you seized my excavator. SAUTT, yuh eh charge meh, I want back meh excavator.” They went in search of this excavator, which weighs over 22 tonnes. You know what happened. It was being kept at the headquarters of SAUTT, at the base, which is most protected in Cumuto, most protected. You have to drive miles to get in there, off the main road.

3.15 p.m.

“Dey look high, dey look low, dat excavator up to today, dey can’t find it. “An excavator weighing 22 tonnes has disappeared and vanished into thin air, cannot be found—[*Crosstalk*]

Sen. Hinds: “How much de piano weigh?”

Sen. The Hon. A. Ramlogan SC:—so much so that the Solicitor General said that when they asked for instructions, SAUTT indicated that they are unable to say anything about the whereabouts of the excavator.

Sen. Hinds: “How much de piano weighing?”

Sen. Moonan: Who was the junior minister then? [*Laughter*]

Sen. The Hon. A. Ramlogan SC: Now, I really have to ask the question, you know, they could not drive that excavator out; its highest speed it could achieve is seven kilometres an hour, so they could not drive that out from the SAUTT site.

Hon. Senator: “It out run dem!”

Sen. The Hon. A. Ramlogan SC: “Dey couldn’ lift it up because it was too heavy. Dey couldn’ put it in dey car trunk and tote it out, it too heavy, it wouldn’ fit. Given how the blimp was close to my learned friend’s heart, I went to see whether it could fit in the blimp. The excavator could fit in it. I even checked to see given the specs of the blimp, whether it could lift up the excavator and fly it out ah dey base so that nobody eh see wha happen tuh it. “Because these are the highly trained men that Sen. Hinds said, “You know, this was the best thing since sliced bread for the country.”

“Mr. President, this is not ah zaboca dey thief eh, not ah mango, this is ah excavator [*Laughter*]—dat up to today, disappeared into thin air and nobody from SAUTT could say what happened to the excavator.” As a result of which, on the instruction of the Solicitor General, not under our tenure, under their tenure, judgment in default of defence had to be entered because the State had no defence. “Wey yuh go say?” An excavator just poof, vanished into thin air, under the nose of SAUTT.

Sen. Al-Rawi: “Like ah piano, poof!”

Sen. The Hon. A. Ramlogan SC: Yes, if we had it, who knows, we might have been able to lift that and deliver it to them. But you see, the joke and fun apart, the legal claim against the State which I now have to deal with—the replacement cost is \$1.3 million, but the loss of use claimed is about \$54,000 per month. The claim itself against the State right now is over \$6 million because of that act and that dereliction of duty. “Where de excavator gone?” We do not know. I do not know if somebody in SAUTT wanted to dig a drain behind their house, “dey” wanted to move a pile of rubbish, “yuh jus’ doh know”. An excavator in this country, on a high security compound, in an elite paramilitary organization named SAUTT, just disappeared into thin air and never resurfaced. Nobody knows where it is. Nobody.

Then, mind you, they come to quarrel about light aircraft and light plane. “Dey doh tell yuh abou’ de” excavator under their tenure and, you know, that is probably why “dey” dealt with it in a certain manner. This matter was dealt with in a certain manner, no instructions given, “yuh cyah” locate its whereabouts, enter judgment in default of defence and so on. Let us sort it out quickly—pardon, no pun intended on the word “SAUTT”.

Sen. Hinds: Quiet settlement.

Sen. The Hon. A. Ramlogan SC: Quiet settlement. You see? Then “dey” want to defend and “dey” want to come and ask, “Well, why all yuh fire certain people?” The man should have been fired back then.

Sen. Hinds: They would have paid the damage quietly back then too.

Sen. The Hon. A. Ramlogan SC: Do you think in any serious country, the head of an organization could have presided over excavator disappearing and nothing happened? Boy, that is misconduct in public office, I tell you that much, on the part of those who retained him.

But more than that, between the period September 2008 to May 2010, SAUTT had a Homicide Investigation Task force. They dealt with 132 gang-related murders because that was their focus. The irony is that that represents just 13.7 per cent of the murders committed in the country during that time, just 13.7 per cent because their focus was on gang-related crime. So they are only concerned with 13.7 per cent of the murders—“gang man shoot gang man. “Forget about the innocent people and who are not in involved in gangs and so on. That was their focus. The policy focus of SAUTT was to focus on gang-on-gang violence. So whilst innocent people were losing their lives, the focus was on “which gang man shooting which gang man”—13.7per cent.

Sen. Hinds: “Oh lawd!”

Sen. The Hon. A. Ramlogan SC: Now, they detected, to be fair, 28.8 per cent of those murders. That amounts to 38murders out of 132. So, if you do the maths, the country invested \$1,578,825,250 to solve those 38 murders. It works out roughly to about \$41,500 per murder. That is what it works out to. Sorry, \$41,548,000 per solved murder. So we spent, under the PNM, “ah lil” over \$41 million to solve one murder.

Sen. Hinds: This is “ah” Attorney General speaking, boy!

Sen. The Hon. A. Ramlogan SC: You see, they gave no legislative empowerment in the fight against crime.

So we appointed people, we have confirmed them we have given them financial autonomy, we have given them the wherewithal, but apart from that, we have given them the tools. Police need the tools to fight crime. One of the main tools that they require is legal tools. And that is why in this Parliament, under the People’s Partnership, we have passed the Interception of Communications Act

which, of course, dealt with illegal wiretapping; the Firearms (Amdt.) Act; the Financial Intelligence Unit (Amdt.) Act; the Miscellaneous Provisions (Remand) Act to extend the period of remand; the Miscellaneous Provisions (Kidnapping and Bail) Act to extend the time for no bail; the Bail (Amdt.) Act; the Trafficking in the Persons Act; the Anti-Terrorism Act; the Anti-Gang Act and the Administration of Justice (Indictable Proceedings) Act.

Sen. Hinds: And you had 40 murders in January.

Sen. The Hon. A. Ramlogan SC: “Doh worry, we coming to dat.”

Sen. George: “All yuh talking money”, just now we will go down in the *Hansard*.

Sen. The Hon. A. Ramlogan SC: You see, whilst they talk, whilst we have the glib rhetoric coming from them, by just dismantling SAUTT, even the people in SAUTT themselves were happy when we actually sent back the retired British pensioners whom they hired. Even the people in SAUTT were happy when we did that. It is almost as if they suffered from some post-colonial inferiority complex that they had to bring all those people here. *[Interruption]* Yes, it is a post-colonial inferiority complex. “Dey ran and bring down all these British pensioners!” *[Desk thumping]*

Mr. President, the remuneration for the British pensioners whom they brought down, of whom Sen. Hinds was so fond and proud, one year’s salary amounted to \$28,422,480—that is for one year. For one year, that was what you were paying. Do you know how many officers we are talking about? When you hear \$28.4 million in one year, you are probably thinking hundreds of people. It was 33 officers; 33 people getting \$28.4million each year, under your administration, under Minister Hinds in the Ministry of National Security and then they come to talk about Sen. Brig John Sandy dismantling SAUTT? That \$28.4 million, do you know what that money has gone to? We have taken that money and we have given the \$1000 allowance to all police officers across the board. *[Desk thumping]* Across the board! *[Crosstalk and interruption]* It seems as though the ex-minister knows where the excavator is. He is talking too much. *[Desk thumping and laughter]*

We have appointed a steering committee to oversee the rationalization of SAUTT, and we intend to establish the National Security Intelligence Agency and the Financial Investigative Branch of SAUTT, the idea is to make it an investigative unit in the Ministry of Finance. Of course, we have the National Security Training Academy which will be under the Ministry of National Security and the Ministry of Science, Technology and Tertiary Education.

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. THE HON. A. RAMLOGAN SC]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

I heard my learned friend, Sen. Hinds, talking about the murder rate. One murder, one innocent life lost, is one too many for this Government; one too many. So any murder is a matter of concern. But, what are the facts? In 2010, for the month of January—there has been a lot of media hype about this murder rate, “it’s a spike” and so on. But, these are the facts. For the month of January, 2010, the murder rate was 46.

Hon. Senator: What!

Sen. The Hon. A. Ramlogan SC: For the month of January, 2011, it was 47; for 2012, it is 38. It is the lowest in three years. That does not mean that I am boasting and beating my chest, no. What it means, however, is that the hysteria that is being created, as if to suggest that we are doing worse now than ever before, is simply not correct. [*Desk thumping*] The month of January this year has had the lowest murder rate in three years.

The reason we do not go on a PR campaign with these things is that we are working on the ground quietly. [*Laughter*] Sen. Brig. John Sandy, Mr. Roy Augustus and a hardworking team—they hit the ground in the crime hot spots areas. Tomorrow, the hon. Minister of the People and Social Development is going to be in Laventille with people from the police service, going into the community to meet and assess the needs of citizens. So we are working on the ground. So whilst we understand that, “Look, good news may not sell”, the fact of the matter is, the hysteria is simply not justified or borne out by the statistics. It simple is not!

Mr. President: Hon. Senators, the speaking time of the hon. Senator has expired.

Motion made: That the hon. Senator’s speaking time be extended by 15 minutes.
[*Sen. The Hon. F. Karim*]

Question put and agreed to.

Sen. The Hon. A. Ramlogan SC: I am grateful, Mr. President. I cannot help that my learned friend, Sen. Hinds, is not thumping his desk for the extension but I can understand why. I looked at the *Guardian* of Thursday, December 22, 2005, the Trinidad and Tobago Chamber of Industry and Commerce devoted an entire column to deal with the then junior Minister in the Ministry of National Security, Sen. Hinds. This is what the Chamber of Industry and Commerce had to say, and I quote:

“The chamber read Clevon Raphael’s recent interview in the *Guardian* with junior Minister in the Ministry of National Security and was extremely astonished at the paucity of information volunteered by him during the course of the interview. This,

in our opinion, provided a golden opportunity to present the Government's position from where the Minister sits as opposed to converting the interview into much ado about nothing or trying to browbeat the interviewer. ”

Which is his style. [*Crosstalk*]

Hon. Senator: “But he do it here!” [*Crosstalk and interruption*] Since that time, you are doing that. [*Desk thumping*]

Sen. The Hon. A. Ramlogan SC:

“In response to what the Government is doing in fighting crime and why we”—are—“not seeing the tangible results of these moves on the ground minister”—Hinds—“answered that”—my—“suspicion was that”—you should not be talking “about results was the 2005 statistics on murder which”—by that time they said had—“crossed the 350 mark one cannot really measure the success”—of the police service and—“police work purely by counting the number of murders in society.”

Such self-righteous indignation from the Senator who now wants to hang his coat on the very statistical data that he once condemned. He went further:

“Minister Hinds also indicated that a number of murders are domestic violence”—related—“that there are thousands of crimes which take place in that context and that it is ‘impossible for any government or policeman to know which husband is going to kill his wife tomorrow.’”

This is the Chamber of Industry and Commerce. They then said, and I think this is what, amazed them the most.

3.30 p.m.

“Hinds then turned to the controversial blimp by stating that it works not only in the air. He does not rule out the possibility that it could work on the ground.” [*Desk thumping and laughter*]

Hon. Member: Shots! Shots! Shots!

Sen. The Hon. A. Ramlogan SC: “Ah blimp wit no wheels could work on the ground.” [*Desk thumping, crosstalk and laughter*] No, no, so now we know de blimp probably pull de excavator”. [*Desk thumping*] “It probably give it ah tow out of de SAUTT compound.” You see, at seven miles an hour. But the Chamber of Industry and Commerce notes:

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. THE HON. A. RAMLOGAN SC]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

“When pressed by the interviewer as to whether the blimp could, in fact, operate on the ground, the minister replied that he suspected so but was not in a position to say so.” [*Laughter and desk thumping*]

And the Chamber concludes:

“What exactly is the mystery about this airship and why can’t Hinds simply answer whether or not it works on the ground?”

Today I ask you, Sen. Hinds, with the benefit of your years, in a moment of pause and detached reflection, are you in a position to tell us; did the blimp ever work on the ground? Can it work on the ground, Sir? We would like to know? [*Laughter*] “So dat is why when dey have the temerity to criticize Sen. Brig. John Sandy for selling off the blimp, I say something have to be wrong, something gotta to be wrong.” Because what is the reality about the blimp? The blimp provided a surveillance platform for up to eight hours at any given point in time, but the problem is that the high definition imaging that it was capable of producing could not work in the night, and the majority of the murders that they were trying to solve were being committed in the night. “Dey spend all dat money to buy ah blimp dat de quality of the imaging was so poor, dat it could not be used in the night really, dey could only use it in de day.”

Sen. Al-Rawi: What about the audio?

Sen. The Hon. A. Ramlogan SC: The audio was good. “If de blimp over yuh house, yuh could hear it like ah Farmall and an ah excavator making noise.” [*Desk thumping and laughter*] “Yuh know, it gi’in’ de criminal enough time to run. It was as if de excavator engine was in the blimp, yuh see. ”

And “dat is why when dey” come to talk about this light aircraft, the Government does not have any control over a purchase made by the Commissioner of Police. But I am advised that the Commissioner of Police had indicated that with the assets they had acquired from SAUTT, they intended to create an air support unit. That air support unit which has been in place on a trial basis, has led to the apprehension of 178 suspects, the seizure of firearms, arms, ammunition and narcotics. Because the helicopters were so expensive to operate, and because even when SAUTT was in existence the helicopters would be in operation as and when required, they felt that they needed something different. When they did their consultation, the International Law Enforcement Aviation Association and other international law enforcement bodies were now using something different, not a helicopter, but there was a new form of aircraft referred to as a light sport aircraft.

This aircraft has a short take-off and landing, low fuel burn and extremely low stall speeds and so on, and it had most importantly a low operating and maintenance cost as compared to the helicopters. So in an effort to be fiscally prudent, they leased it on a trial basis from the Trinidad and Tobago Air Support Company Limited for a 12-week pilot project. It is a 12-week pilot project.

“So wen dey say, well, de amount ah money yuh paying which is TT \$900,000 could ah buy de ting.” “Dat is not correct.” The cost of it I am advised is more in the vicinity of US \$250,000. “Now, if dey did try out de blimp first before buying it, and dey did realize it cyah work good in de night, and most ah de murders taking place in de night, then de country would not have been saddled with the cost of the purchase of the blimp.” But the Commissioner of Police, learning from the mistakes of the PNM, did not go and purchase the aircraft for US \$250,000, the man leased it on a trial basis. He leased it for 720 hours of aircraft use for TT \$900,000. Suppose during the lease period it turns out for some reason that it cannot work? What we are doing as well is putting some of the SAUTT technology onto the aircraft. We have to ensure it is compatible; so far it is. We now have to run this as a test to see what is happening. After we see on that lease if it is effective and good, then we could consider buying it or having a longer term lease arrangement, as the case may be.

But the criticism is entirely misconceived to suggest that by leasing it for a trial period we are doing the wrong thing, “we shudda buy it outright.” That was the old PNM way of doing things. “Buy de blimp without trying it, den to learn it cyah work good in de night and den de country have to sell it years later for US \$50,000.”

This issue about Deputy Commissioner of Police Mr. Ewatski, “dat de man fly de plane” almost as if to conjure up images of Mr. Manning in the Repsol jet, “an all dem kinda foolishness.” “Listen, dat is not the case.” I spoke to Mr. Ewatski on the matter, and I am advised that he has been the holder of a Canadian Aviation Private Pilot’s Licence for 12 years. It is a hobby of his; “dat is long before he come to Trinidad and Tobago.” And as part of maintaining that licence—and for those who are pilots they would know you must have a certain number of flying hours every year. So at his own personal expense, meaning “he pay for it out ah he pocket,” the man, as he always does as part of his routine training to maintain his pilot’s licence, went on a trip. “And it have nothing to do with the contract dat dey are talking about.” Nothing to do with it! The man paid for it himself. He was going, as part of his requirements to maintain his aviation licence. So you know, “wen dey talk about corruption” and malign persons like that, perhaps they should seek to get the facts first and talk about their prehistoric Fred Flintstone blimp. A hotair balloon would have done a better job than that blimp.

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. THE HON. A. RAMLOGAN SC]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

The other problem “wit de blimp” was not just the poor quality imaging in the night, you know, “but it was dat de blimp” could not, in fact, give you real time viewing of the imaging; you could not have real time viewing. So what you could not have simultaneous coordination for rapid response patrols on the ground; and that in itself affected its utility. Eventually, of course, it was costing us \$40,000 a week to keep the blimp afloat. We paid US \$12.6 million for it “and we had ah choice, is either we keep dis ting and spend \$40,000 a week on it, knowing that it cyah really help us in de fight against crime, or sell it.” Eventually having put it up, it fetched a round handsome price of US \$50,000; that was what it was worth.

“Buh when dey criticize us and dey go into making all these allegations of political corruption”—I heard in the other place a former minister, Miss Cox, making all the allegations, but you know people forget when they were in government what they did. You see, Mr. President, I am advised when they were in government, that they used the resources of the State as though they were their personal resources. The prison service complained in one of the meetings we had about the fact that they were being forced to go to the home of that Member of Parliament to do landscaping. Prisoners going to a private residence to do landscaping and “pruning lawn and hedge, buh dey doh talk about dat.” Miss Cox!

Vehicle number TBL 7437, driven by prison officer Seedath, left the prison service with a destination pass for Golden Grove and then Diego Martin on Tuesday, October, 05. Four prisoners went: Carl Lau, Dexter Bennett, Leon Jackson and Sheldon David escorted by prison officer W. Phillip. Approval was given by prison supervisor Andrews. And what did they go for? They went to do landscaping and to help out to maintain the premises.

Hon. Senators: Oh! Oh! Oh!

Sen. A. Ramlogan SC: When we enquired about “why prisoners are being taken from de prison to go and prune people lawn, who were in government under de PNM, yuh no wat dey say?” “Dey write it off in de prison records as ah community support event. “ I demand and call upon Miss Cox to tell the nation why prisoners under guard of prison officers “was cutting she lawn and she fence in she private residence and if dat is ah community related event?” [*Desk thumping*] Those who live in glass houses where the glass is so thin “dat ah hard breeze could blow it down,” ought not to cast boulders in the direction of the Commissioner of Police, Deputy Commissioner of Police, and hon. Minister of National Security.

Sen. The Hon. Brig. John Sandy has led to a reduction in crime in the homicide rate and has hit the ground running. The hard-working team in the Ministry of National Security under his distinguished leadership they had to first right the wrongs of the past, and dismantle, recreate and chart a new strategic direction for the police service. They have been able to achieve with a measure of conspicuous success, a reduction in the homicide rate; reduce crime and victimization, provide a citizen-centered police service, become a model of efficiency and effectiveness and improve roadway safety. Those are the challenges, the missions and objectives that they are looking at, the 21st Century Policing Initiative you have heard about.

The Professional Standards Bureau that is being established in the police service to look at police misconduct and to provide support to the Police Complaints Authority “dat dey did not appoint”—it is there. The Gang Suppression Unit, it is there. The Trinidad and Tobago Training Academy, a national road safety plan, new communication equipment, it is all there. So that there is, in fact, as noted by Sen. Dr. Armstrong a situation where there is a new strategic direction and focus for the police service. It has been absorbing the SAUTT model, and has now been charting a new course and a new way forward for the police service.

Mr. President, we are not happy with the level of crime in this country. We consider it to be unsatisfactory and unacceptable, but we also say that whilst you judge us harshly and put us under the public and political microscope, we also say be fair to the Government. We also say look at the facts. Statistics it is said is like a woman’s bikini, what they reveal may be rather provocative, but what they conceal are vital.

The fact of the matter is that the statistics being provided, if you look at the month of January, are the lowest murder rate for three years; “dat is ah fact. “ We are not saying we are happy because people lost their lives, but we are saying it is a moment to pause, for a moment of quiet and cautious optimism. We are not beating our chest about it, we are not triumphant about it, but we are cautiously, hopefully optimistic about it, because at least we know we are going in the right direction.

Mr. President: You need to wind up now.

Sen. The Hon. A. Ramlogan SC: Yes. So, Mr. President, in closing I say, I wish to commend the hon. Minister of National Security and the hon. Prime Minister who Chairs the National Security Council, for the excellent job they

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. THE HON. A. RAMLOGAN SC]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

have done thus far. Based on what I indicated, we inherited what was a national security apparatus and a police service that was demoralized and demotivated, and what we have done now is to pull up ourselves by the boot straps. We are looking forward to a safer more peaceful Trinidad and Tobago in 2012.

I thank you very much. [*Desk thumping*]

Sen. Faris Al-Rawi: Thank you, Mr. President. It is always a joy speaking after the hon. Attorney General, because in fairness to him and with credit to him, he manages to elevate—at least the sound in the Chamber, if not the content, regrettably. [*Desk thumping*]

Mr. President, I do say that today I have to agree wholeheartedly with the hon. Attorney General at least in one part, that the timing of this Motion is very fortunate. I wish to offer an open compliment to Sen. Fitzgerald Hinds in having the foresight to bring this kind of Motion for national discussion in this Chamber. [*Desk thumping*]

3.45 p.m.

The hon. Attorney General stood his ground today and, in demonstrating and in articulating what he put as his arguments, he started off with a reflection of what he considers to be a constitutional area. He then went into a rationale as to what he considered to be the failings of the last Government and the need to address that situation. Then he went on to say, lastly, that there was good justification for the dismantling of SAUTT, the Special Anti-Crime Unit of Trinidad and Tobago; that there was a conspicuous success in the reduction in the rate of murders; that there was a 21st Century police initiative; that a gangs support unit was in place; and that there was a new strategic direction. He said that there is a new way forward. He said that the statistics for January are the lowest for years.

Mr. President, my learned friend is a capable advocate and, if you were to listen to him carefully, you would be persuaded by his tone and his conviction that he is making sense. Regrettably, I beg to differ and I wish to state openly that the fallacy in the hon. Attorney General's argument is evidenced by his conspicuous avoidance of all forms of relevant statistic material. [*Desk thumping*]

Let me show you why, Mr. President. The hon. Attorney General has flagged, by way of success marker for him, January 2011 versus January 2012 murder statistics. He said that in January 2011, there were 41 and in January 2012, there were 38 murders. The day is not yet done. God forbid that there were to be more; the statistics I dare say are quite the same.

What the hon. Attorney General has not done, which he could easily have done, was to bring forward the information, for example, as to the statistics in the month of August 2011 versus August 2010. He will notice that, if he wishes to peg his pin or hang his hat upon the bona fides of statistical comparison, it is a very misleading and dangerous thing to do. The real statistics to have view of, Mr. President, is the detection and conviction statistics and dare I say that the detection and conviction statistics do not even form a part of his contribution; not a part of his contemplation because he wishes to trivialize the fact that you have to catch people. You have to detect the crime first; you must take them through the process and convict them. [*Desk thumping*] So, really and truly, Mr. President, it is an exercise in smoke and mirrors.

May I turn to the issue of the constitutional positioning? The hon. Attorney General has studiously avoided the interarticulation of how our Constitution operates with the Police Service Act. The Police Service Act is, as I am sure you are aware, Chap. 15:01. This Act came about in 2006 and replaced an earlier Act.

In the Police Service Act, Mr. President, there is specific reference, by way of articulation with the Constitution of Trinidad and Tobago. In fact, the Commissioner of Police is to be appointed under the Police Service Act, under the Constitution of Trinidad and Tobago and I wish, in addressing the constitutional point, to point the learned Attorney General to the Constitution of Trinidad and Tobago, in particular to two sections of the Constitution.

The Attorney General fails to take on board that the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service is not an island unto itself and it must articulate in coordination with the Government of Trinidad and Tobago. In that regard, I agree openly with my learned friend, Sen. Dr. Armstrong.

Under the Constitution, in particular section 123A says:

“the Commissioner of Police shall have the complete power to manage the Police Service and is required to ensure that the human, financial and material resources available to the Service are used in an efficient and effective manner.”

It then goes on to state the powers of the Commissioner of Police to appoint, to transfer, et cetera.

So the hon. Attorney General, when he boldly says, “We did this to empower the Commissioner of Police”, meaning the UNC Government that he is a part of, what is he talking about? The Constitution of Trinidad and Tobago vests in the Commissioner of Police the authority to manage everything. He shall have the complete power to manage the police service and is required to ensure that human, financial and material resources are available to the service.

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. AL-RAWI]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

So regrettably, Mr. President, without even having condescended to the particulars of his argument, he makes a brash statement that the People's Partnership has somehow miraculously empowered the current Commissioner of Police with financial authority, missing the point entirely that the national debate is about procurement and the procurement of a plane in particular, currently. [*Desk thumping*] We are not talking about power to manage.

In fact, now I dare say that the hon. Attorney General would recognize squarely that the reason that there were limits and observations to the Commissioner of Police under the PNM's regime was to avoid the very scandal of public procurement that is now descending on the population. That is a scandal which echoes, not only with respect to procurement of an aircraft, but also procurement echoing in, by way of example, the Ministry of Planning and the Economy with respect to the Invaders Bay Project. It echoes with the procurement under the Minister of Transport with respect to the light rail that is now to go over the Priority Bus Route with four weeks to respond. So you need to understand, Members of the Government, what the real issue is and do not imbibe your own rhetoric to the point of inebriation in yourself. [*Desk thumping*] You have to understand that the issue is procurement.

Mr. President, whilst I am on the Constitution, the hon. Attorney General was also conspicuously silent on the role and responsibility of the executive arm of the State in articulating how the police service is to have strength or deficiency. He has omitted to appreciate the true impact of section 75 of the Constitution.

Let me refer him to section 75 of the Constitution. Section 75 of the Constitution, under Chapter 5 of the Constitution, Executive Powers, says:

“(1) There shall be a Cabinet for Trinidad and Tobago which shall have the general direction and control of the government of Trinidad and Tobago and shall be collectively responsible therefor to Parliament.”

Sounds innocuous; some in the national community may ask, “What is this about?” But the fact is, by way of executive authority unto the people of Trinidad and Tobago, this Government has an obligation in its interarticulation of support and processes, to the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service. Why do I say that? I say that because the history of this country will show that the People's National Movement was bold enough to state that reliance and obligation openly.

Martin Joseph when he sat as the Minister of National Security, in dealing specifically with the issue of SAUTT, in the very Red House that we used to sit in and now are sitting here, in December 2008, December 13 to be precise, dealt with the issue of the lawfulness or legality of the Special Anti-Crime Unit of Trinidad and Tobago.

In his presentation, he invited the national community to reflect upon the fact that the Special Anti-Crime Unit, despite the allegations of the members of the UNC, was properly and lawfully clothed by virtue of three facets of our law: the first facet being the common law; the second facet being section 75 of the Constitution; and the third facet being bifurcated between the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service Act and the Defence Act.

Specifically, I wish to put on record again that if the Special Anti-Crime Unit was unlawful as my learned friend the Attorney General constantly repeats, why has there never been in the land of Trinidad and Tobago, in our courts, a single challenge on anything that the Special Anti-Crime Unit did? Why? [*Desk thumping*] The facts must speak for themselves. This is an institution born in 2003. In the near 11 years, 10 years, a decade—let us put it at that—of its existence, why has there never been a challenge on the lawfulness of the institution? If it were so pellucidly clear to those so-called luminaries opposite, why was there never a challenge?

Let me tell you why. Under section 75, our Cabinet has the authority, by the very section I have just read of our Constitution, to appoint units. Under section 5(1)(c) of the Defence Act, Chap. 14:01 the defence force may form units and the President, by discretion and then by notification gives you that.

Secondly, the Police Service Regulations, which were saved when this 2006 Police Service Act came into effect, at Regulation 10 says:

“The Police Service shall consist of such Divisions, Districts, Branches, Sections, Stations or other Administrative or Operational units as may be approved by the Minister.”

And section 75(1) says that the Cabinet shall have general direction. Why do I refer to that? Because the Special Anti-Crime Unit, as it was constituted, was comprised of a unit of the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service, a unit of the defence force and then authority for funding, vision, planning and implementation via the Executive or Cabinet of Trinidad and Tobago.

So the People’s National Movement, recognizing by virtue of the six reports done on the police service ending, as you are well aware, with the O’Dowd Report, up latest to the Mastrofski Report, recognized that you have to grab the bull by the horns. You have to come up to the plate and take responsibility as a government with executive authority. You have to be bold enough to articulate a plan and put it into action. That is what the Special Anti-Crime Unit was about.

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. AL-RAWI]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

Now my learned friend, the hon. Attorney General, has gone on a tirade to bleed off some form of statistics, which I have no conscience of in the sense of its relevance to the truth of the Special Anti-Crime Unit's performance, because he has studiously avoided the very work of the Special Anti-Crime Unit, which I will come to shortly.

I wish to say that, in November 2003, when the Special Anti-Crime Unit was clothed by the Cabinet, giving force to its inception, marrying, therefore, the TTPS and the defence force into a special unit, recognized its moral and lawful responsibility in the social contract to the people of Trinidad and Tobago to protect them, but recognized that this could not happen overnight.

When you analyze the reports, the six reports done on the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service, you will recognize that there is a common theme that the perception of the Trinidad and Tobago Police Force with the ratios being as they are, 1:198 citizens, better than Canada, better than England, better than many countries in the world; the reason for its inefficiency has been because of difficult issues in our public service and in our articulation. The hon. Attorney General raised them when he said that there were allegations of corruption and inefficiencies.

4.00 p.m.

So, in 2003 the Cabinet of Trinidad and Tobago clothed and authorized the Special Anti-Crime Unit, but it came with a conscious reflection that you needed to have a wider criminal justice reform, and in effecting criminal justice reform, the People's National Movement engaged the issue head-on.

Up to 2007 and 2008 there were reports published. In 2007 the Crown Prosecution Service published a report under the hand of Patrick Stevens, dated September 12, 2007. It was followed up by May 12, 2008 with the Joint Report of the Trinidad and Tobago delegation on a visit to London hosted by the Crown Prosecution Service; joint recommendations by the hon. Mr. Justice Mark Mohammed, Chairman of the Remand Court Committee; Mr. Geoffrey Henderson, the DPP; Mr. Gary Kelly, Court Executive Administrator; Mr. Gilbert Peterson SC, Director of Legal Aid and Advisory Authority; Mr. Robin Riley, Project Manager, AG's office; and Mr. Roger Sealy, Information Technology Manager, AG's office. There was a conscious reflection of the need for wider criminal justice reform.

Mr. President, let us go on to demonstrate the real facts of the Special Anti-Crime Unit as the hon. Attorney General has raised the issue. The Special Anti-Crime Unit (SAUTT), as it is called, the hon. Attorney General took great pride in

trivializing the involvement of the UK branch. He reflected, he said, upon billions being spent on the Special Anti-Crime Unit. By his argument, he says if that money were poured into the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service that it would have been better spent; by his argument that spending by the Ministry of National Security has now been saved.

Point No. 1, why is the budget with respect to national security now larger than before? Why is it that the statistical information brought to this House under the Appropriation Bill, just last week, refers to savings—as the Government calls it—of \$99 million or \$91 million with respect to the Special Anti-Crime Unit? [*Desk thumping*] Why is it that they say that the SSA performed under par and they had a savings of \$7 million as they called it? So, point no. 1, why is the budget the same if you are not expending the same?

Point no. 2, if his argument was true let us look at the real figures. When you looked at the budgetary allocation given to SAUTT that represents a transfer and subsidy via the Ministry of National Security, and that subsidy as at 2010—that is when the People’s Partnership came into power—represented 12 per cent of our national budget, that is, \$4,742,834,850. What was spent on the Special Anti-Crime Unit should be put on the record carefully.

In the period 2003—2010, a total of \$1,578,825-odd was spent on SAUTT, but what was spent there? It is lovely to create sensational headline and say, “\$1. 5 billion was spent”, but what was it spent on? Of that figure, Mr. President, 24.6 per cent was spent on infrastructure; air operations; operational expenses; information technology; fleet transportation; training in forensics—8.0 per cent, 17.9 per cent, 9.6 per cent, 7.4 per cent, 6.5 per cent; and 2.2 per cent. What was spent on the UK project? Mr. President, 18. 6 per cent of that entire budget from 2003—2010 was spent on the UK staff.

If you want to have a proper appreciation of value for money, what are the triumphs of the Special Anti-Crime Unit? The hon. Attorney General says there were none. They painted a picture in the national community of retired, old white men on a beach frolicking somewhere. It has happened in debates elsewhere in this House, Mr. President. But what did we see, Mr. President? We saw kidnappings, if the hon. Attorney General does not remember, drop from 60 to zero. [*Desk thumping*] We saw that homicide investigation under SAUTT had a 60 per cent detection rate. [*Desk thumping*] He did not want that in the national community. We saw a 25 per cent reduction in homicides in the few months that the Homicide Investigation Task Force operated. Let me go further.

Sen. Oudit: Standing Order 35(5). I think it must be clarified that the hon. Attorney General did not use the word “white” in his reference to the gentlemen on the beach.

Sen. Hinds: He did not say so. The Senator did not say so.

Sen. Oudit: I think we need to clarify that, please.

Sen. F. Al-Rawi: Mr. President, I would eliminate the issue for you in case there is an impression that I said the hon. Attorney General did, I withdraw. I did not actually say that.

Sen. Hinds: Right, okay!

Sen. F. Al-Rawi: What I said is that it has been in this Senate and elsewhere. [*Desk thumping*] So I thank my learned friend for her keen intervention into this debate. [*Desk thumping*] Lucid as always!

Mr. President, when we are dealing with the Special Anti-Crime Unit, the Attorney General did not pause at all to talk about the establishment of the Specialist Crime Academy in July 2006; the Leadership and Management Institute on March 26, 2007; and he did not for one moment pause to reflect upon what that latter institution had an effect on.

The Leadership and Management Institute was intended to bridge a gap relative to mid-to-senior level management and leadership trainings. Prior to its establishment, the cost of one national participating in the International Strategic Leadership Programme in the UK exceeded TT \$212,290 for one person. Since 2007, four training cycles under the Special Anti-Crime Unit were conducted [*Desk thumping*] at a cost of \$97,000 per course.

The hon. Attorney General did not bother to tell the national community how many persons were trained by the Special Anti-Crime Unit? Let me tell him those figures, Mr. President.

Sen. Cudjoe: He said forget the statistics.

Sen. F. Al-Rawi: Yes, he did say forget those statistics. Let me tell the hon. Attorney General that he must be a little more forthright with the national community, relative to what the people of Trinidad and Tobago have spent. The Special Anti-Crime Unit—and permit me to obtain that figure—engaged in the training of approximately 7,000 officers. [*Desk thumping*] Mr. President, 7,000 officers passed through the Special Anti-Crime Unit training. Not one, not two, not three, not four as he says, but 7,000 plus persons were trained; multiply 7,000 by \$213,000, are we not beginning to come closer to the concept of value for money?

What else did the Special Anti-Crime Unit do that my learned friend, the Attorney General, invites us to forget by not reflecting upon statistics? It established the Security Studies Institute in July 2008. In fact, I was looking for the figure, 7,527 persons were trained and 50 per cent of that figure was from the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service; 3,792 to be precise. Of that figure: 28 per cent were other institutions, comprising Customs and Excise Division, immigration, the Judiciary, other factions and 22 per cent relative to SAUTT.

So, Mr. President, when you really want to say, what we spent money on, the hon. Attorney General must be faithful to what his obligation as a Government is in demonstrating what the people of Trinidad and Tobago are paid for. [*Desk thumping*] Let me tell you why. You must have reflection for what they paid for because it was thrown away. [*Desk thumping*]

The hon. Attorney General says with some form of glib pride, “We take no shame in saying that we dismantled SAUTT”, but let us talk about the manner in which SAUTT was dismantled and also the effect of the dismantling of SAUTT.

You would recall, Mr. President, on September 20, 2010, the hon. Prime Minister, at the airport on her way to the United Nations to give a speech, almost in a pique I would say, had the pleasure of firing Brig. Joseph, the head of SAUTT, at a press conference in the airport, [*Desk thumping*] doing things differently, of course, because the People’s Partnership, the UNC, of course, never does these things. So the Prime Minister is at an airport and fires Brig. Joseph.

What happens next? September 27, 2010, the hon. Prime Minister appears at the United Nations—splendidly attired because she was, of course, going to get an award elsewhere—said in her speech to the United Nations and I am quoting here from a commentary, reflecting upon that, written by Richard Ramoutar in the *Sunday Guardian* of January 29, 2012, when he said in his headline: “Rhetoric must be backed by action.” He reflected upon the Prime Minister’s address to the United Nations on September 27, 2010.

“Newsday reporter Sean Douglas pointed out that Kamla Persad-Bissessar called for ‘tough action against the trade in illicit drugs and firearms’, that the UN’s Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) be used to stop the trade in illegal firearms, and that the International Criminal Court (ICC) be empowered to try drug traffickers. In a speech hailing global co-operation, Persad-Bissessar stated that, ‘rhetoric must be backed by action.’”

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. AL-RAWI]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

Bold words! [*Desk thumping*] So what did the hon. Prime Minister do? She fires the hon. —I call him honourable—Brig. Joseph at the airport. Seven days later she was giving a speech, lots of beautiful words, but today, what happens? I read from the *Daily Express* dated Thursday, January 26, 2012, surely with your permission. The headline says: “AG: Joseph’s \$1m payoff national security matter”.

Now, I want the national community to remember, the allegation then against the Special Anti-Crime Unit was, that it had engaged in some form of political spying. When you go through the plethora of information on the Special Anti-Crime Unit, you will note that whilst they had the ability to intercept communications, it was recorded with a digital footprint. And when that issue came to the Parliament, Mr. President, which resulted in the Interception of Communications Act being debated, a lot of song and dance happened; list of names. My name was called out in the Parliament as being someone supposedly spied upon. The Government said that it had evidence of political espionage repeated today by the hon. Attorney General without condescending to particulars. Those were the allegations.

Let us refresh the memory of the national community. What happened next? Two unidentified Israelis made into a highly secured institution and ran away with all the evidence. [*Desk thumping*] Sounds familiar! [*Desk thumping*] The hon. Attorney General has the temerity to stand here today and talk about an excavator disappearing from a highly secured compound. Perhaps he ought to look for the excavator in the HDC and see if they used it to bulldoze the crops in Pineapple Gardens, Mr. President. [*Desk thumping*]

Sen. Hinds: Aw!! [*Desk thumping*]

Sen. F. Al-Rawi: Perhaps it is the yellow of the symbol of the United National Congress, Mr. President. [*Desk thumping*] Anyway, Mr. President, he talks about high security items being guarded! This information of spying is in the bosom of the UNC. Material, serious enough to be brought to the Parliament, the highest forum of the land, and to unidentified Israelis make away with it, and then the hon. Minister of Justice has the gall not even to explain—or the hon. Attorney General, what is going on with the Government of Israel.

Surely, by way of mutual assistance, which the hon. Attorney General is clothed with the responsibility of managing, he could have by now made enquiries of the Israeli Government relative to these two Israelis who went off with our information. Mr. President, that is to descend to a level of debate that, unfortunately, I must respond to, but I must point out how shallow the hon. Attorney General’s argument is.

4. 15 p.m.

And when you reflect upon the Special Anti-Crime Unit, let us go back further to what they did. The Special Anti-Crime Unit engaged in bringing to Trinidad and Tobago a professionalization of crime scene processing and evidence recovery. It enhanced inter-agency cooperation. It dealt with kidnapping for ransom, conclusively. It targeted gang-related homicide. It provided investigative and operational supports. It engaged in anti-crime operations. It used an airship, referred to as the blimp, in respect of which every single hour of operation time was accounted for, every single hour.

It is here in the Special Anti-Crime Unit documentation, which I know my learned friend and big brother, the Hon. Minister of National Security has.

Mr. President, in dealing with the airship hours, the demonstration of what it was used for, is set out in the record. I wonder if the Special Anti-Crime Unit's helicopter usage can be accounted for, or the Agusta Westland helicopters. And by the way, I will pause for a moment and stick a pin on the argument of the successes of SAUTT, and reflect upon that issue.

We have a national security apparatus of which the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service is one element operating with helicopters for disposal. We have two helicopters brought in at a cost of US \$246 million. It is in our budget material; both of them on the ground: one with no air worthiness certification. But, in any event if it had, it could not fly because the engine burnt in November last year, still not fixed. [*Interruption*]

Sen. Hinds: The Prime Minister burnt it.

Sen. F. Al-Rawi: The second one: what is its status? Grounded! Foreign object digestion. Something came into the engines—cannot fly. The Special Anti-Crime Unit, with its tactical operation that this Government is now fighting over; every man jack wants it. Those two helicopters are being used, currently, by general allegations, by the Prime Minister, but we would ask the correct questions. We will ask for the number of hours. [*Interruption*]

Sen. S. Ali: [*Inaudible*] Check if she admitted it.

Sen. Hinds: She admitted using it.

Sen. F. Al-Rawi: Whether she admitted or not, I want to know, and we will ask the question: how was it used for crime fighting in Trinidad and Tobago? [*Desk thumping*] Because, Mr. President, I want to put on record, the AgustaWestland helicopters have only been flying on training missions. They

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. AL-RAWI]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

have the 9-Yankee tag and, the 9Y Trinidad and Tobago registration, but that is under Bristow, and it is only for training missions. So, they are not being used for crime fighting. They were bought with two kits, one kit for operational outfit—put the men in the helicopter—and the other kit for VIP transportation. When the Prime Minister flies, the VIP seats go in and they are locked in. But, if it cannot fly other than for training missions, what is it doing?

What has this Government done to ensure in the discharge of its constitutional responsibility, as empowered by section 75 of the Constitution to equip Trinidad and Tobago with the services that our taxpayers have paid for? [*Interruption*]

Sen. Hinds: Put “ah” icebox on it.

Sen. F. Al-Rawi: The first thing they did was got rid of the OPVs that the helicopters are meant to land on. Second thing, they have not accelerated the air guard in making sure that it meets the requirements with respect to the maintenance and servicing of the helicopters.

So, this Government has a long list of what it did not do. But, let me refresh the national community before I get back to the success of SAUTT. Let me refresh the national community’s memory, relative to what this Government promised. It is set out in bold yellow print all over their manifesto of 2010. I thank my learned colleague, Sen. Dr. Armstrong, for raising it.

The manifesto signed on by five members; five partners of the social contract with the people of Trinidad and Tobago, which surely, the UNC Manifesto and the People’s Partnership Manifesto represent, said this relative to crime and national security and the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service. They reflected in their “*Seven Interconnected Pillars for Sustainable Development*” at Pillar 3, thoughts on the “National and Personal Security”. They then, were bold enough at page 11, I believe it is, of their manifesto, to set down in black and white, “120 DAYS OF IMMEDIATE ACTION”; item (11):

“We will prepare an immediate action plan for containing criminal activities and reducing the number of murders — this first phase will be from June 2010 to December 2010. (14), ...we will establish five (5) model stations as the pilot” project. (16), We will strengthen the National Security Council to link intelligence gathering and assessment with strategy and execution in crime fighting. (27), We will establish a legislative agenda, aligned to our one-year action plan to establish the sequence of flow of bills to Parliament in the first year. (28), We will establish a timetable for constitution reform beginning with consultations. (30), Within the 120-day period, we will also share with our citizens our priorities for action during our first budgetary period.”

Let us examine that. The first act that the People's Partnership does, relative to strengthening the National Security Council, is that it comes in; it makes wild allegations of political espionage; it brings the whole concept of surveillance into issue; it engages in a debate, two Israelis seen running off with the documents, first act.

Second act, relative to the now, ripped apart SSA. The first act of stability that they do is to appoint Resmi Ramnarine. [*Desk thumping*] The Chairman of the National Security Council, headed by the Hon. Prime Minister, receives a curriculum vitae from a technician lowest in rank and promptly appoints her, and embarrasses my learned colleague, the stoic, Sen. Brig. Sandy; makes people apologize in the Parliament for that.

Further, the National Security Council says openly on September 20, 2010:

“Brig. Joseph, take ah fire from de airport. “

September 27, 2010, UN Conference, the hon. Prime Minister:

“Rhetoric must be backed by action”—almost.

What happens next? They then get the same Julie Brown who is a recommender for Resmi Ramnarine to sit on a four-man committee, to now decide upon its restructuring. So the first thing you do: “yuh” fire the head of the SAUTT; “yuh” shut down the institution; “you” turn off every surveillance device in Trinidad and Tobago—because you could have done it without turning it off—you lose the digital footprint, which conclusively proves that you are not spied on at SAUTT; you make a wild allegation; you appoint Resmi Ramnarine, and then you come to appoint a four-man committee, using the same recommender for Resmi Ramnarine, Julie Brown.

What happens next? We see in that report an operational plan to reorganize and structure the Special Anti-Crime Unit of Trinidad and Tobago, published to the Minister of National Security on December 28, 2010, We see recommendations that say: “We recognize that they did really good work. They trained thousands of people, but you need to send everybody back and the faster you do it the better. And we recommend that you put in a national academy. “Mr. President, lots of recommendations. Today I want to ask. In the period 2010 to date, where is the implementation of those recommendations?

Point to one aspect that has been implemented relative to this plan. They cannot tell you.

Sen. Hinds: Ask Gary. Gary could tell you.

Sen. F. Al-Rawi: What they can tell you, is that when they shut down the Homicide Investigation Task Force, which was equipped, at maximum in its heyday, with 120 people. They shut it down, they locked it out of operation from the TTPS, and then what do we see?—the detection rate steadily falling in Trinidad and Tobago. Not only have you thrown away that which the citizens have paid for in budgetary allocations from 2003 - 2010, but you see the effect of it, which was my second point, as to the consequence of running a country without a brain; a brain for criminal intelligence-gathering coordinated operation, all heralded in the report of December 28, 2010.

You see the effects, and where are the effects that I am speaking about? You see, August 2011; 11 people murdered. The Attorney General jumped from January 2011 to January 2012, skipped over August, of course, conveniently; no reflection about the murders then, how high they were, what the detection and conviction aspects were. None at all! Thumping his chest like He-Man, that the difference between 38 murders and 41 murders is a marker of success. I say it is luck. It is stupid blind luck. I hope that is not unparliamentary, Mr. President?

So what happens? August 2011, state of emergency declared. Citizens of Trinidad and Tobago are told—in PP-UNC management style, what are they told? They are greeted by a Prime Minister, honourable as she may be, who says: “You know what, tomorrow I am going to organize a state of emergency in this country, just in case they have criminals outside there. I just want you to know tomorrow it is coming. His Excellency will decide then. “No lockdown! The Commissioner of Police, of course, travels August 19, 2011, to Brazil; gets locked up in Brazil, because he did not have a visa. He may have given a DNA sample there, I do not know.

The Commissioner of Police out of the country, 69 Trinidad and Tobago police people in a march past in New York, nobody recalled, under an acting Superintendent—Commissioner of Police. None of that is recalled, no lockdown before the state of emergency. State of emergency called. Constitutional rights suspended. We see the famous dose of salts that the hon. Attorney General is proud to talk about, constantly, applied to the corpus UNC. We see the intestinal discharge in the form of a rapid pass through of everybody grabbed under the anti-gang legislation. And why? Because the Special Anti-Crime Unit, which was working with the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service, had been cancelled and thrown away.

Announce it first and figure it out later. We are still trying to figure it out, because according to the People’s Partnership’s Manifesto, I am yet to see a legislative agenda aligned to their one-year—“We will strengthen the National Security Council...”—time frame. Lots of fancy words, words meaning anything that they want it to mean,

much like the reflection of Alice in Wonderland and Humpty Dumpty, where words mean exactly what you want them to mean. But the fact is, the purging of citizens through the machinery of the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service happened at the hands of the Government, [*Desk thumping*] who advised His Excellency to put this into effect, and badly so. And how did it end? A detention order on several citizens in an allegation that there is an assassination attempt, and what happened? Not one charge offered. [*Interruption*]

Sen. Hinds: No evidence.

Mr. President: Hon. Senators, the speaking time of the hon. Senator has expired.

Motion made: That the hon. Senator's speaking time be extended by 15 minutes. [*Sen. F. Hinds*]

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. President: I propose to suspend the sitting of this House for the tea break, and we will resume at 5.00 p.m.

4.30 p.m.: *Sitting suspended.*

5.00 p.m.: *Sitting resumed.*

Mr. President: Before the tea break, Sen. Al-Rawi was on his legs. His time had just been extended by a further 15 minutes. I now call on Sen. Al-Rawi.

Sen. F. Al-Rawi: Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, hon. colleagues, for the extension of time.

Mr. President, before we took the break, I was reflecting upon the difficulties experienced by the nation as a result of the removal of the apparatus which gave assistance to the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service, in the form of the Special Anti-crime Unit of Trinidad and Tobago. My argument as I was hoping to present it, was that the country suffered disastrous consequences through the removal of intelligence gathering capability which was coordinated in the way that the Special Anti-crime Unit was, that being an institution which provided meaningful and material assistance to the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service.

By way of demonstrating that argument, Mr. President, I was looking, in particular, at the effects that we saw in the timeline come forward, taking us through the state of emergency, and then coming down towards its end, and that is the point where I left. In dealing with the state of emergency, we saw at the

beginning a parade of statistics, as to the number of people that were arrested. That was held up as some form of success marker by the Government. And I do say Government because in fact the hon. Attorney General was most present in the early days of the state of emergency [*Interruption*]

Sen. Hinds: As winners.

Sen. F. Al-Rawi:—giving conferences to the national community as to how many people were arrested, where they were going to, et cetera. In fact, Mr. President, it was, perhaps his duty to do that, insofar as the national community was fed a number of stories relative to the reason for the state of emergency being called that included the hon. Attorney General's statement that there was a clear and present danger. There were statements to the fact by Dr. Roodal Moonilal, Member as he is of the House, speaking on the morning show with Fazeer Mohammed, stating that there were weapons of some type never seen before.

Sen. Hinds: Mass destruction.

Sen. F. Al-Rawi: There was a statement by one Ms. Griffith, as she then was, and also, Mr. Jack from Tobago, speaking to the fact that these were lessons learnt from the coup, and that decisive action was required. There were all sorts of reasons put forward.

In demonstrating the statistics of success, the hon. Attorney General was at pains to draw some link that the arrest rate reflected the success of the state of emergency. In fact, Mr. President, the hon. Attorney General in explaining in his public statement then, why people were not seeing immediately the kinds of results that they were looking for, said, "Look, we are going to catch big fishes", and I am using my own expression, and, "We will do so by catching little fishes and squeezing them". Of course he did not pause to reflect then, nor does he now, that on the first night of the state of emergency, four people were arrested for a stolen vehicle, and that of all the little fishes caught, and that passed through the nets of the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service, Mr. President, none of them were of the kind of catch that one would have referred to as "big fish".

Then there was the subject of a commentary by Michael Harris—I believe it was—in his very fitting headline that said, "Little fish, big fish in the sea of lies", Mr. President. It encapsulated in that headline the national feeling that the state of emergency was a glorious and complete failure. And that is so, contrary to utterances across the floor, now, Mr. President, because the fact of an aberration of statistics was upon us.

In locking down your entire country, Mr. President, you cannot take statistical points to demonstrate that there is a reduction in crime, because you locked it down. You launched your largest nuclear weapon in your constitutional armory, you locked down the people of Trinidad and Tobago—under a state of emergency, and we had not have a single fish caught, relative to a major drug bust. In fact what we had was a drug bust where nobody was caught—a port sitting with a container filled with drugs that did not go where it was supposed to, and nobody caught.

We had, Mr. President, a dramatic display of the seizure of eight vessels alleged to have been involved in the bunkering of diesel. That came up as a huge issue in the budget which we debated under a state of emergency. The AG made no pause to reflect upon the fact that those eight vessels were released, mysteriously, in the quiet calmness of direction from the Ministry of Energy and Energy Industries. Those eight vessels were released, Mr. President.

Drama relative to statistical information which they say, points to success, all passing through the nets, Mr. President. Fishing vessels released, all small fishes caught and released, not one big fish caught and kept. No seizure of major note relative to proceeds of crime. No matters proceeding through the court. Even, Mr. President [*Interruption*]

Sen. Hinds: Empty jails.

Sen. F. Al-Rawi:—something as large as an issue of detention of people alleged to have hatched a plot relative to assassination. Not one man [*Desk thumping*] in the very large Santa Rosa facility, which featured in our figures as costing the taxpayers of this country \$50 million, Mr. President, where the only running water is as a result of the rain that falls through the roof and wets the inmates. Not one mention, not a pause from the Members opposite, so they really do believe. If you strip down the hon. Attorney General's contribution, and you take away the expression 'PNM' from him, what do you have left?

He has not spoken to the real issue. And what is the real issue, Mr. President? That for the institution that is the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service to be successful, it must be endowed with the gift of confidence. And how do you get confidence in the TTPS, Mr. President? The first thing you do [*Interruption*]

Sen. George: By appointing the commissioner—

Sen. F. Al-Rawi:—is that you give it—I agree, appointing a commissioner is one of the markers.

Sen. George: That is right.

Sen. F. Al-Rawi: But that is not to detract from the fact that the Acting Commissioners of Police—as much as I may agree with you—did their job, and did a sterling job of it. In the Attorney General’s distraction to demonstrate his so-called, constitutional undermining point, he did not to pause to even say, “thank you”, persons who carried out the functions in the various State departments, admirably [*Desk thumping*] where the legislation brought in the period 2007—2010 and prior, under the PNM, shows a blistering track record of success, Mr. President. He did not pause there, the confidence issue to the TTPS being the point.

The first thing that you ought to do relative to building confidence is that you ought to give it a budget that it can manage, something by which it can achieve its success. But you know what the PNM did, Mr. President? It approved in two successive budgets the allocations made to the Ministry of National Security and to the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service. We approved it, Mr. President. In the first budget that came in our first year in Opposition, we were at pains to defend, the fact that we empowered this Government with the licence to spend money, on national security and the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service. So the budget being the first point of confidence, is a given, we have supported that.

The second issue relative to confidence, Mr. President, is an important one, and that is, perhaps, the crux of this discussion: the Cabinet of Trinidad and Tobago representing the Executive of Trinidad and Tobago.

Sen. Cudjoe: Five minutes.

Sen. F. Al-Rawi:—that Cabinet, Mr. President, must have the courage to enunciate its plan. Trinidad and Tobago finds itself as described in Latin, in a *circulus inextricabilis*; we are going round and round in a circle. And why are we? Government, and the Minister of National Security, says, ostensibly, “Commissioner of Police, you come up with a crime plan”. Commissioner of Police says, “Government, where is your crime plan?”

Sen. Cudjoe: Uh huh.

Sen. F. Al-Rawi: No explanation is made of the fact that the People’s National Movement, by the very demonstration of the Special Anti-Crime Unit in November 2003, had the courage to say, “Here is your crime plan”. Here is the interarticulation, of all aspects: criminal justice reform; boarder security protection; radar blanket protection; prisonsreform; rehabilitation; reduction of recidivism, Mr. President. None of that has been explained by this Government. [*Desk thumping*]

It has not even been explained in the context of their manifesto which was bold enough to set out in many points that they claimed to have had a plan, but regrettably, the only plan that we have seen, is as we would say in Trinidad—a plan to mash up de place.

Sen. Hinds: Party, spend and tell lies.

Sen. F. Al-Rawi: Party, “lime” and fete, Mr. President. It is very critical for us to understand the issues of confidence in the Government having the courage to articulate its crime plan. That is the most important thing to drive the confidence to restructure the TTPS. That is the same kind of confidence that the Government ought to be demonstrating in moving the economy forward, Mr. President. That is the confidence which is lacking and which the hon. Minister of Finance was at a loss to understand why. No reflection of not having spent the budgetary allocations, Mr. President.

So it is untrue in the extreme to say that the Special Anti-Crime Unit as a mechanism incorporating the TTPS, assisting the TTPS, comprising members of the defence force, and young recruits of the type that Sen. Armstrong asked for, the young recruits, nearly 100 of them, brought into the body of the SAUTT, Mr. President—it is untrue to say that they did not provide assistance to the people of Trinidad and Tobago which demonstrated value for money. To say that is to say that crime, by way of kidnapping, did not go to zero. To say that, is to say that the 60 per cent reduction—60 per cent reduction—in criminal gang activity, did not happen. To say that is to say that the 90 per cent reduction in aspects handled by SAUTT alone, did not happen. To say that is to say that the 7,200 people trained by the SAUTT divisions, Mr. President, did not happen, and that is a tragedy of the greatest kind, and that is something which this Government should be ashamed of, Mr. President.

The fact is that we as a nation must have the courage of the type demonstrated by Sen. the Hon. Brig. Sandy in his first budget contribution, to say, “I met good things in place, I kept those good things and I have moved on. Regrettably, that is not an infection shared amongst those opposite, Mr. President. I think that my learned colleague is suffering properly the Stockholm syndrome of his captors, because I know him to be a good man.

The fact is that we have to boost confidence, we have to stop the blame game. The hon. Attorney General started by saying that crime did not start last year, forgetting that he has been nearly two years in office. [*Desk thumping*] And whilst he says that the PNM did not put things in place for two years, by his status as the Attorney General, the second most important person under our Constitution after the Prime Minister, he did not have the courage to say, “We have not articulated our crime plan, and therefore, we have failed to inspire confidence in the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service.”

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. AL-RAWI]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

He did not apologize to the hon. Members opposite or to the national community for the shortcomings of this Government, which, I think are best encapsulated by an article that I saw recently, which, relative to the celebration of the grandeur of the hon. Prime Minister, not even the collection of the partnership which sits opposite us, but the cult of personality, relative to that celebration, Sheldon Peter Waithe had to say, in the *Sunday Express* of January 29, 2012—with your leave, “A celebration of mediocrity”. [*Desk thumping*]

5.15 p.m.

That was because, Mr. President, in his own words:

“It takes either guts or blinkers to speak so fiercely about the effect that a government has had on crime when faced with the type of murder statistic that was widely expected following the conclusion of an ineffective State of Emergency.”

I do not know this gentleman. I do not know him to be a Balisier wearing man—

Mr. President: Senator, could you proceed to wind up.

Sen. F. Al-Rawi: Much obliged, Mr. President. So in the celebration of mediocrity opposite us, I ask the Government to pause, to reflect, not to throw the baby out with the bath water, and to have the courage to step up to the plate and act. That is what we expect of them, that is what is required of them.

With those few words, Mr. President, I thank you. [*Desk thumping*]

Sen. Subhas Ramkhelawan: Thank you, Mr. President, for giving me the opportunity to join this rather lively debate on the question of the efficiency, strengths and deficiencies of the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service. I will keep my contribution to the rather narrow area of the organization and the management of the police service rather than delve into some of the matters already raised by the hon. Attorney General and Sen. Al-Rawi.

But permit me first to correct some misconceptions in respect of a statement made by the Attorney General as regards the Integrity Commission. It is not the Executive that is responsible or accountable for the appointment of the members of the Commission. [*Desk thumping*] Therefore to say that a period of one year would have elapsed and the government was delinquent is a misrepresentation at the very least. [*Desk thumping*] That remit lies squarely in the hands of His Excellency the President. So, I just want to clear up that misconception, if, for anything, that I am a former member of that Integrity Commission and had some understanding of how appointments would have been made.

But I want to move to the substantive part of my contribution and ask the question, because this debate has been one of pointing fingers and blaming one another for what is the state of the police service, its strengths and its deficiencies. I want to direct the attention of the national community and, of course, the Senators of this Senate to, essentially, the structure of reporting relationships, responsibilities and authorities that lie in respect of the police service.

First of all, the Minister of National Security, of course, would have to come here very often to defend what is taking place in the police service. But, clearly, he really has no real authority over the police service in the context of our Constitution.

Sen. Al-Rawi: Section 75.

Sen. S. Ramkhelawan: By section 75, yes, but in particular the various aspects of the Constitution really provide for a relationship where it is the Police Service Commission, as it was recently, shall I say, reconstituted by legislation in 2007. It is the Police Service Commission that has oversight of the police service.

So if I can take you through a bit of history for the benefit of the national community, prior to the 2007 legislation, Act 7 of 2006 amended by 13 of 2007—let us get this matter as clear as my understanding would allow. Prior to 2007 there was a situation where, in accordance with the then section 123(1), the Police Service Commission had the:

“Power to appoint persons to hold or act in an office in the police service established under the Police Service Act, including appointments on promotion and transfer and the confirmation of appointments, and to remove and exercise disciplinary control over persons holding or acting in such offices and to enforce standards of conduct on such officers shall vest in the Police Service Commission.”

That was prior to the 2007 legislation.

What has evolved now is a situation where the Police Service Commission does not have direct oversight of all police officers for appointments, for discipline, for termination and so on. The Police Service Commission that is empowered to oversee the police service now has direct jurisdiction or oversight on the Commissioner of Police and the three Deputy Commissioners of Police, four persons; only four persons in a force of some 6,000 persons. That has been made very clear.

So, the role of the Police Service Commission is quite pivotal, because what the Police Service Commission has lost in terms of oversight of every single appointment, its remit has been strengthened in terms of oversight of the Commissioner of Police and the three Deputy Commissioners of Police. I will come to that in terms of the extent of oversight as we go along with the adjusted legislation. So, the first question when we speak of deficiencies and strengths, effectiveness and efficiency of the police service is really who is responsible for the police service? Who is responsible for the hiring and firing within the police service? So while my good and learned friend in the law, Sen. Al-Rawi, speaks to section 75 of the Constitution for the general oversight, the fact is that the Minister of National Security cannot hire a police officer, he cannot fire a police officer and he cannot discipline a police officer. So, I want to make that very clear as we get into this discussion and this debate.

The question then is, who is responsible? And it is clear that that mandate and that remit has been given to the Police Service Commission for the top four positions. Everything else in terms of appointment, in terms of discipline, in terms of training and in terms of termination is the responsibility of the Commissioner of Police; now that is a very significant break from prior 2007 to subsequent 2007. So, it would be irresponsible of a Commissioner of Police now, to say, as has been said before, that he is a “toothless bulldog”. In fact, I would make the argument that he is extremely powerful and so powerful that he does not really fully understand and grasp up to this point in time the extent of his power in oversight of the police service. And so, the question of who is responsible has been disaggregated into two parts.

Now, Mr. President, there is the right of appeal in two main instances. Where the Commissioner of Police appoints someone—and some person is aggrieved that he or she may have been overlooked for appointment, that person can make a case to the Police Service Commission. So that the right of appeal beyond evaluations taken by the Commissioner of Police or any tribunals related to the Commissioner of Police is in the hands of the Police Service Commission. Then, of course, there is the other matter of discipline. If the Commissioner of Police takes certain actions relating to discipline and that is not accepted by the police officer, then, that matter of disciplinary charges, an appeal can be lodged with the Police Service Commission. I stand to be corrected, but this is my understanding of the matter.

So, since 2007 we as a nation have found ourselves—while putting in legislation—vacillating to a great degree as to first of all the appointment of a Commissioner of Police. Now, you will recall, Mr. President, prior to the 2007

legislation, the appointment of the Police Service Commission, if I recall properly, was one where the President made certain selections, consulted in some form or fashion with the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition and the matter would have been then settled.

In the current situation, the President makes certain selections or makes certain recommendations, I should say, and those recommendations by notification come to the Parliament— at a particular part of the Parliament, the Lower House, not to the Lower and Upper Houses—and it is the Lower House that decides acceptance of members of the Police Service Commission. I am speaking in two parts, the Police Service Commission and then I would speak to the Commissioner of Police; so all the members of the Police Service Commission are now subject to the scrutiny of the Lower House.

In the case of the Commissioner of Police and the Deputy Commissioners of Police, there is a selection criteria, and a recommendation is made by the Police Service Commission to appoint these four persons or any of these four persons, and it goes, as I understand it, to the President, then notification and then it comes to Parliament—again to the Lower House—for debate.

So, let us be clear, I want to reiterate the point that the Executive, for whatever reason, is in a way, some distance from the direct oversight. By dint of members of the Executive being in the Parliament they do have a say with regard to appointment, but I do not see that the new approach, which took place from 2007, really adds anything, because if the Prime Minister accepts, then what you have is a situation—if the Prime Minister accepts a recommendation as was in the old case, then what would the Lower House do differently, except to debate it?

So, if there is need for disclosure and transparency, yes. If there is need for an Executive decision as far as accepting or not accepting, I see no real value added in terms of the organization and management, as the case may be. But having said that, who is responsible?

We have spoken about the Police Service Commission for the upper echelons which would be the Commissioner of Police and the Deputy Commissioners of Police and we have spoken to every single position below that would fall under the responsibility and authority of the Commissioner of Police. It has already been clearly stated that the Commissioner of Police, with the new legislation, has his own accounts, he is responsible for his own accounting, budgets and so on. So, the role that the Minister of National Security played before in terms of dispensing funding and so on, on an ongoing basis to the police service has now been dispensed with, and now we have a situation of a clean break.

5. 30 p.m.

We are now in a situation where the question is not whether there is legal authority and power in the hands of the Commissioner of Police; the question now is enforcement and unrolling of the new regulations that have been put in place under section 78 of the Act, which gives him so many powers. I ask the question: Is he utilizing the powers for the benefit of the national community in ensuring that the deficiencies of the police service are ameliorated and that the strengths are given further impetus? That is where we are today, in 2012, after 5 years of vacillation.

Now, we really have to come to the question of responsibility and authority and ask whether that responsibility and the authority given are being properly and fully discharged. And that is where we come to this critical juncture of enforcement, because we have been arguing, and sometimes quarrelling, about who is to blame, who is to bless, who is responsible and who is not responsible. The fact is that there is great clarity that is being obfuscated by the discussions and the debate that is taking place in this honourable Parliament. As I said, Mr. President, I want to limit my discussion along the lines of organization and management.

Let us speak in the context of organization and management to the question of recruitment. Whereas prior to the 2007, legislation, the Police Service Commission was deluged and I should say hamstrung, by seeking to deal with recruitment/appointment decisions for 6,000 people as a commission, that burden of responsibility has now been removed from them and is with the Commissioner of Police. So, recruitment is very clear. Then there is the question of performance appraisals in terms of the performance of officers from constable right up to the level of assistant commissioner. They are all under the purview of the Commissioner of Police for determining performance, discipline and so on.

In “re-looking” at the legislation and the framework, there may have been, in my view, some over-exuberance in giving to the Commissioner of Police the mantle and the power to deal with succession planning in the police service at the highest level. What happens now is that the Police Service Commission would determine who fills the various positions from that of assistant commissioner down to that of constable. That is the assistant commissioner, senior superintendent, assistant superintendent, which is the First Division, and then all the other positions. If I were to draw the analogy in terms of deficiencies and strength of the police service, I do not believe that that remit of succession planning for the future, 10, 15, 20 years from now, should be left in the hands of someone who may be contractually appointed for a period of three years. It does not make sense. It does not make management sense and organizational sense.

Let me draw an analogy, Mr. President, you being from the private sector and having had such success in dealing with corporations and their legal issues. For corporations that are interested in efficiency and maximizing efficiency, the question of succession planning is left to the board—the highest level. So that the organization knows what is the next level below the CEO and what are the next two levels below the CEO in terms of management, at the very least. What happens is that the CEO—does not make the decision, but recommends the filling of these various positions, these senior positions, and a board or the committee of the board responsible for human resources would evaluate and either concur or veto those decisions.

We have the reverse in the legislation. We have under 17A. (3) of the Act:

“A police officer shall not be appointed to an office in the First Division if the Commissioner objects to the appointment of that officer to that office.”

So whereas in other institutions the power of veto lies in the hands of the highest—shall we say, the highest authority which is the board in this case the power of veto does not lie in the hands of the Police Service Commission. The power of veto lies in the hands of the CEO, the Commissioner of Police. When one studies this from an organizational and management perspective, it is troubling, because you leave succession in the hands of that one all powerful person, without any reference to the Police Service Commission which in fact has the power to terminate the service of the Commissioner of Police. It is a kind of back to front legislation. It is a kind of back-to-front organization, management and efficiency.

I know that many of my colleagues on that side in the Government do make a strong claim to being excellent management and organization experts, and therefore, I draw it to their attention that, five years down the road, as we need to look at the oversight and the legislation in the police service, as something that needs to be corrected very early in the game.

Performance assessment, appointments—let us look at the question of discipline in the service. Again, discipline falls under the Commissioner of Police. So we must remove that notion that the Commissioner of Police is a toothless bulldog; is the most powerful person, who may not yet know how to use his powers. It is like an elephant or the 800 pound gorilla in the room, certain of its strengths, but not sure how those strengths could impact a weaker person in the room. So, I think these matters rest squarely at the feet of the Commissioner of Police in terms of discipline. He has tremendous powers under the regulations. He has tremendous powers in terms of disciplining and termination and so on; probably much stronger than would have been the case prior to 2007.

Mr. President, this seems to be a very well-guarded secret. Nobody seems to know that the powers of the Commissioner of Police have been strengthened so much. Everybody seems to think—and we hear it outside in the national community—and nobody wants to correct that impression, that it is not the Minister of National Security, it is the Commissioner of Police. If he is not doing his job, what can we do?

The legislation and the regulations make provision—since 2007—for the oversight of the performance of the Commissioner of Police, by the Police Service Commission, in much stronger terms than may have applied before. And let me just read the amended 123(1) of the Constitution, amended by Act 12 of 2007—123(1)(d):

“The Police Service Commission shall have power to”—apart from appointments—“monitor the efficiency and effectiveness of the discharge of their functions;”

That is the Commissioner of Police and the Deputy Commissioners of Police. But under (1)(e):

“The Police Service Commission shall have the power to—prepare an annual performance appraisal report in such form as may be prescribed by the Police Service Commission” itself.

We have not seen or heard as yet of any such performance appraisal of the Commissioner of Police and the Deputy Commissioner of Police, but I believe it has only just been about one year since the Commissioner of Police has been in office. I think it would have been September 2010, and I can say, being a member and indeed having the honour to be Chairman of the service commissions parliamentary committee, that I look forward with bated breath to hearing of that report and to seeing that report for the benefit of the nation: how well has the Commissioner of Police performed and what is the assessment of the Commissioner of Police by the Police Service Commission. Because they have the power, the commission that is, to terminate for ineffectiveness and non-performance. They have the power to terminate the Commissioner of Police under certain circumstances and through a certain process.

So, let me continue and I will deal with some of the other areas as we go along. I wanted to bring to the attention of this honourable Senate, certain other factors that need to be reconciled as we go forward. Having taken away the heavy burden of appointment, performance appraisal, discipline and termination from the Police Service Commission, there is a lot more that the Police Service Commission can now do in terms of assessment of the efficiency of the police service. I question now, the role of

the Police Complaints Authority where it is set in our jurisdiction. I wonder whether that function of dealing with complaints cannot be elegantly placed in the context of the Police Service Commission to ensure that we have an integrated approach to management. Because many of the problems that we face in the public service and in the police service and in the various governmental institutions, lie with fragmentation and disintegration and a lack of harmonization in the whole approach to management.

So forgive me, Mr. President, if I do not engage in the banter about who is to blame and who is to bless. I want to focus very squarely on how we as a nation can improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the police service with the institutions that are now here before us, and within the existing law and within the existing Constitution.

5.45 p.m.

So I want to, if I may, just put for the consideration of the Senate—because Parliament has a very significant role in the effectiveness of the police service because, remember, it is the Parliament, as currently constructed, that determines whether a recommendation from the President, via notification, will be accepted, not only for the Commissioner of Police but for the Police Service Commission. Therefore, we do have a significant rule, as constructed. And I want to suggest that for the question of succession planning, that at least all members of the First Division should come under the scrutiny of the Police Service Commission for appointment—for promotion.

I want to touch on another area that has concerned so many people in discussions, about the nature of the police service, and Sen. Armstrong raised the point—he alluded to the point. We have a situation, as far as succession planning goes, where, by the time somebody coming up from the ranks of the police service gets to a position of assistant superintendent, he or she would be—the statistics would bear me out—very often very close to retirement.

So you have a turnstile in the police service that is one where, when you get to a senior position, you are near to, or about to retire. Remember, if I understand it correctly, if you do not go beyond the level of an inspector, which is the highest rank in the Second Division—and I hope the hon. Minister would correct me—by age 55 you are automatically retired. Am I correct? So what happens is that if you get to that position of assistant superintendent and so on, very often you have three years, four years or five years to go. And I am sure the former junior Minister in the Ministry of National Security, would have those statistics; the average age.

Now, I am raising this point, and I am belabouring this point to say and to suggest that there is the thinking that the police service cannot recruit persons directly into the First Division from outside the police service, and it is a myth that continues to be perpetuated, that you cannot inject additional resources—capable and competent resources—into the police service from the level of assistant superintendent, go right up.

The fact is that there is that provision where the persons can be taken from outside of the service and be brought in, and I think it is very important, with the question of succession, with the question of quality of resources at the level of management—I think Sen. Al-Rawi referred to it as the brain of the service—that there is room for adding to the stock of competent officers through the approach of appointment from outside of the service.

It is made clear that somebody who has to go into the First Division—and I cannot pick up the particular regulation at this point in time—would have to have, coming from outside, a bachelor's degree to get into the First Division. But let me refer to 9(1) of the Police Service Regulations made under section 78, I believe, and it speaks to the appointment to the First Division—very clear; very, very clear.

“A candidate for appointment to the First Division may be selected from among—

(a) officers in the Second Division;”—coming up the ranks; or—

“(b) persons outside of the police service.”

And if you come from outside of the police service, that is a person who is appointed under this sub-regulation (1), that person is required to undergo, according to 9(3), “an appropriate course of training in police duties, but the Commissioner may exempt from training a person appointed under subregulation (1)(a)”, that is, a person coming from outside of the service.

So I strongly support the idea of a police officer school where we can accelerate and expand the capabilities within the service in order to make it a stronger police service, and that is not to say—hear me very, very clearly—that those who have laboured long and hard in the fields ought not to move up the ranks. That is the case now. But if we need to add capabilities and strengths, it is already there in the legislation and the regulation. Why not use it?

So in the military, as I started with Sen. Armstrong—there are provisions for persons to come into the military at the level of officers. I am sure the hon. Minister of National Security who has had much experience in this area and, indeed, had the honour to lead our defence force, would concur that there is something to be said in

bringing in talent from outside, and that talent must come by way of meritocracy, as is enshrined in our Constitution. Because we could talk from now until the cows come home, if we are not prepared to do something about it, then the situation may not improve, and we have the tools in our legislation, in our regulations and in our Constitution to give effect to that.

Why is it that this is not being considered? Is it that we are happy to go out to the public and say, "I am a toothless bulldog. I do not have the powers", when, in truth and in fact, that power lies with the Commissioner of Police? On behalf of the citizens of this country, I want those questions answered. I want to know why that is not happening. Four years have gone; we are into the fifth year. Why are we not seeing the injections of capability resources and so on, into the police service? We are totally silent on that particular aspect.

So it might be time for the hon. Minister of Science, Technology and Tertiary Education to consider working with the police service to set up special schools for this purpose. We have 6,000 men and women in the police service. We have need for strengthening the police service. Why I say that, there are many reasons. If you look at the whole question of detection and prevention in the police service, there seems to be a totally blind spot for what we call white-collar crimes. We cannot seem to solve white-collar crimes, and maybe it is that we need to inject expertise into the police service that could assist in the resolution of white-collar crimes.

The world is changing at quite a rapid pace. Prior to 2000, we did not have money laundering legislation; prior to 2000, we did not have anti-terrorism legislation; prior to 2000, we did not have the 40-odd rules of the Financial Task Force (FATF). So all of these things are changing, and it speaks to if we want to have a more effective and efficient police force, we need to move with the times, because if we do not move with the times, we will not solve the problems of this country, and many of those problems are in white-collar crimes. What a shame it is that persons from outside question our commitment to solve issues of money laundering in this country. Why? Because they have not seen what statistically should be the number of charges for money laundering in this country.

If you have open borders, and those open borders we speak about drug transshipment being a main concern in this country, it stands to reason that there is a high correlation between drug transshipment and money laundering. Yet still the statistics will show that we have not been able to up the ante in terms of detection, and the legislation is there for freezing of assets.

So I am concerned that the issue is not legislation. I am concerned that the issue is not regulation. I am concerned that the issue is more operationalization of what we have on the books. I understand, and the national community understands, that while we were twiddling our thumbs, collectively as a nation for some three years to determine who should be the Commissioner of Police, we have lost a lot of time. So, now, the Government and Opposition quibble about whether 41 homicides is higher than 38 homicides, and what will happen on this, the last day, whether we will have some equivalency in terms of homicides, 2012 versus 2011.

I ask the Parliament, in debating this rather critical Motion, to really consider how, as scrutineers for what the Executive is doing in one capacity, and as scrutineers for what the Police Service Commission is doing, and, indirectly, the Commissioner of Police, to take cognizance of these matters that are very much before us, because while we quibble about statistics we are not working hard enough to move our regulations into a state of enforceability, and until we do that, we are going to find ourselves well behind the eighth ball. Until we do that, we are going to find ourselves scrambling and arguing with one another as to “who is to bless and who is to blame.” We will find ourselves arguing in a debate that 38 is less than 41, and arithmetically it is quite clear.

So these are some of the thoughts that I wanted to share. In concluding, I would want to speak again to the power of veto of the appointment of First Division officers by the Commissioner of Police. I believe that that is something that should be taken up to the level of the Police Service Commission, but that may require some amendments, but amendments to the regulations, not necessarily the legislation.

I think, to reiterate, that the succession planning in the police service is very, very critical, because if we want to change direction and effectiveness, it is not going to happen in one year. It is going to happen through a very concerted process of determining who the persons are who populate the level of the First Division officers, from assistant superintendent going straight up to assistant commissioner.

If we do not get that right, we cannot get the direction of the police service right.

6.00 p.m.

I have spoken about the question of the Police Complaints Authority, since it was set up before this amended legislation, in 2007. The Police Complaints Authority was set up in 2006. The hon. Attorney General, made it quite clear that some of the challenges, in terms of the Police Complaints Authority were in

appointments. There is no need, in my own view, to have this separation. I think it can be done more effectively if those responsibilities fell with the Police Service Commission.

He mentioned, as well, the question of the Firearms Appeal Board, and he spoke to the non-appointment of the Firearms Appeal Board, even after we would have made certain amendments to the firearms legislation. But let me just suggest that the Firearms Appeal Board can only adjudicate on a matter of who should be accorded a firearm, only if that person is turned down by the Commissioner of Police. We have a situation that is developing here, and I am sure the Minister of National Security may want to have a look at that. How many assessments for firearms were actually made? Because, unless, the Commissioner of Police says no”, it cannot go to the Firearms Appeal Board, and I would ask the question: how many matters have been adjudicated by the Firearms Appeal Board since it has been reconstituted? I hope the Minister of National Security would consider that, and at some point in time give me some feedback and advice, as far as that is concerned.

Mr. President: Hon. Senators, the speaking time of the hon. Senator has expired.

Motion made: That the hon. Member’s speaking time be extended by 15 minutes. [*Sen. C. Baptiste-McKnight*]

Question put and agreed to.

Sen. S. Ramkhelawan: Thank you, Mr. President. I was about to conclude, but you have given me a second wind. I do not have much more to say though. I just want to suggest, in concluding, that we have enough—I use the term “firepower” advisedly—firepower to make the changes that are necessary in the police service. We have the power of enforcement. What we need to do now, is to make sure, that our officers, when we implement these changes, are sufficiently motivated, the discipline is there, to do what is in the best interest of the nation, in protecting and serving our citizens, so that we can move away from this idea, this stigma, that the police is not doing anything; when you call, they do not have a motor car or anything like that. I think now is the time for us to do our part to ensure that that stigma is removed.

I want to say one last thing in concluding, I was pleasantly surprised in going to a police station, Yesterday, it was, finding myself on the receiving end of a motor car accident. I was pleasantly surprised, when I went to the police station and made the report, I actually received a receipt for my report. And, I was always

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. RAMKHELAWAN]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

concerned about this. In previous reports that I had made to police stations, the officer would say, “Okay, I would write it in my diary and then I would transfer it to the police log”. I think if nothing else, while it is a small matter, I think, it is an improvement, because the next time I go, I can produce my receipt and say: I did make this report on so and so. And you signed for it and stamped it. “ So, some small things are taking place in the police service, but some major things have to take place for us as citizens to feel reassured that progress is being made. And, yes, very soon, our police service will be something for us to all feel very proud of. I thank you, Mr. President.

Sen. Lyndira Oudit: Mr. President, at 6.05 p.m. on this Tuesday afternoon for what is considered a lively debate, thus far, I thank you, for the opportunity to contribute.

Mr. President, with your permission, I would like to respond to some of the statements that were made by Senators on the opposite side. Unfortunately, I do not have the Latin term that was used but, Sen. Al-Rawi, referred to “round and round in a circle. “ And, I agree, because, it seems as if, with one single item, namely the Special Anti-Crime Unit of Trinidad and Tobago (SAUTT), this seems to be the only marker of success of the former administration, because they have taken such personal and deep umbrage to the dismantling and redeployment of SAUTT. I would like to refer—now, I am not a lawyer, like Sen. Al-Rawi but I certainly believe that Dana Counsel—Dana Seetahal SC, sorry is in fact— [*Interruption*]

Sen. Al Rawi: One and the same now.

Sen. L. Oudit:—one of the best. I would like to refer to an article on August 07, 2005. So you see, I do not understand why we keep going round and round in this, because the underlying principle is not why, or “shouldn’t, or couldn’t”, it is because it was an illegal entity. Let us make that very clear. You could try to legalize the activities of organizations by trying to talk about it, you cannot talk it into legality.

I want to refer to what former Sen. Seetahal SC had referred to, in her article in 2005, and the article says, “Is SAUTT an illegal unit?” So we keep going back to that. Mr. President, according to Dana Seetahal SC she says that:

“SAUTT is not a unit in the Police Service, since it is made up of members of the Defence Force and the police, and as such was not established as a special unit through a departmental order or otherwise.

Neither the Police Service Act nor its Regulations make provision for the creation of units that comprise the combination of police officers and persons who are not.

The power to create the SAUTT does not exist in any of the acts which govern the bodies from whom the members of the unit are drawn.” [Interruption]

Sen. Al-Rawi: Wrong!

Sen. L. Oudit: In closing—if it is wrong, Sen. Al-Rawi, then you would have to take that up with, Senior Counsel. In fact, she closed off by saying:

“...it is open to be utilised as a ‘political tool’ of the Government...”
Remember this is Dana Seetahal SC. This is not my words.

“...it is open to be utilized as a ‘political tool’ of the Government of the day which spawned its creation.

...there is no law authorising creation of the SAUTT there are no published policy guidelines...” [Interruption]

Sen. Al-Rawi: Rubbish!

Sen. L. Oudit:—This ... is subject to abuse.

The authorities simply cannot ... bury their heads in the sand and refuse to consider or contemplate these issues.”

You know, this was said in 2005, and I am hearing Senators opposite saying: “rubbish!” [Interruption]

Sen. Al-Rawi: Yep.

Sen. L. Oudit: —It is not true, and again, in 2005, the allegation is, that the authorities, and I am repeating the words of Dana Seetahal SC,

“The authorities cannot simply just bury their heads in the sand and refuse to consider or contemplate these issues.”

In fact, had you all listened—do you know what her last sentence in that article says?

Had you all listened:

“The fact remains, however, that it is necessary to ground SAUTT in law.”

That is it. That is all. [*Sen. Hinds raises his hand*] No, please. [Interruption] Sen. Fitzgerald Hinds identified in his own statements, and I want to read a few of the things. But, before, I do that, earlier, the Attorney General, referred to an interview that took place, and I myself found it very interesting—on December 04, 2005—and although, what I would say is that he was basically cut in his reference to CLR James, you were trying, on several points to make a reference to CLR James and so, Mr. Raphael, had to tell you, and I am quoting:

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. OUDIT]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

Excuse me, Mr. Hinds, we do not want to get into the philosophizing, at this time, and what CLR James statements has got to do with runaway crime.

And, do you know what? You turned around and you said, and I have to agree with you and Sen. Hinds, in that interview who was junior Minister of National Security, Fitzgerald Hinds, in 2005, said, and I agree with him.

So CLR James pointed out quite correctly that economy prosperity does not guarantee social and political prosperity.

Now, even though he was basically shut up, I have to say, I agree with him. But, you know what was also very instructive in that particular interview? And I have to give credit to Mr. Raphael for really, a lively interview. He says:

And Sen. Hinds whips out a small file from which he itemizes several things and he says: "Let me tell you some of the things you should give us credit for". So he is telling Mr. Raphael,

Let me tell you some of the things you should give us credit for.

And, so, he went into, as Mr. Raphael, says: he whips out the small file and he proceeds to really talk about the Ministry of National Security work. And this is, Mr. Raphael's response. He says:

Finally, Mr. Hinds, with all the initiatives and plans, that you have spoken about, how soon do you think the crime would be brought under manageable control?

So, Mr. Raphael is asking former junior Minister,

"...with all the initiatives, and plans you have spoken about, how soon do you think the crime would be brought under manageable control"?

Do you know what his response was, Mr. President? I have to say poor soul. This is the response of the junior Minister of National Security in 2005, and this ended the interview, I think Mr. Raphael, might have been a little bit too shocked to continue. This is Mr. Hinds, former junior Minister of National Security, he says,

"I wish I could answer. I wish I could answer you in the same manner in which you have asked the question. And, with all the plans we have in place, I am hoping one day would come sooner, rather than later"

And this is the assurance that the junior Minister of National Security was giving.

I wish, I could answer. [*Interruption*]

Sen. Hinds: What is your point? What is your point?

Sen. L. Oudit: The point, Sen. Hinds, is that, “I wish I could answer” [Laughter] And let me tell you what wishes were. They said, if wishes were wings, then buffaloes would fly. If wishes were wings. So, you have said and you have summed up the response of the former—[Interruption]

Sen. Hinds: And, what about witches?

Sen. L. Oudit:—administration, of which you held the post as Junior Minister in the very Ministry of National Security, and your response, the sum total of your response, “I wish, I could answer.”

6.15 p.m.

And this is taken from an interview in 2005.

Sen. Hinds: So what is your point? [Interruption]

Sen. L. Oudit: Let me tell you. [Interruption]

Hon. Senator: What is Raphael [Inaudible]

Sen. Hinds: The AG fired him. That was her speech-writer.

Sen. L. Oudit: Mr. President, I do not want noise from the other side to distract me. [Crosstalk and laughter]

I would like to tell Sen. Al-Rawi, I saw *Alice in Wonderland* myself. I thought the recent one was quite good. So he talked about *Alice in Wonderland* and saying words that mean nothing. [Crosstalk and interruption] At some point, I may seek your permission for protection—[Interruption]

Sen. Hinds: Protection?

Sen. L. Oudit:—because I cannot hear myself.

Sen. Hinds: Provocation!

Sen. L. Oudit: Mr. President, I am referring to the *Hansard* contribution of Friday, February 8, 2008; Mr. Subhas Panday, the then Member of Parliament for Princes Town North, had asked the hon. Minister of National Security:

“Could the Minister, with regard to the blimps and/or sky ships, state:”

And there were several questions. Mr. President, the fourth question posed by Mr. Panday was whether or not the blimps “assisted in solving any of the murders so far for this year; and if so, which murders?” I would like to read it again

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. OUDIT]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

because it was recorded in the *Hansard* but I would like to record in this debate what was the response to whether or not the blimp or blimps assisted in any crime solving for that time. The answer given by Sen. The Hon. Martin Joseph, former Minister of National Security, and I want Sen. Al-Rawi to listen to this and tell me if *Alice in Wonderland* comes to mind—

Sen. Al-Rawi: I read that contribution.

Sen. L. Oudit: It says here and I hope somebody could explain what he is saying:

“With respect to 19(d), on the question of whether the airships have assisted in solving any murders, hon. Members are advised that an airship is an operational tool in a law enforcement regime, not an independent asset.

It is part of a holistic information and intelligence-gathering programme that involves all the assets of law enforcement agencies in Trinidad and Tobago. Notwithstanding, this intelligence-gathering capability has proven to be of tremendous use as an investigative aid and as a resource in the crime management.

While extensive details relating to its operations cannot be disclosed. I will like to assure my hon. colleagues that the airship remains a valuable asset and that its contribution towards helping to alleviate the current crime situation cannot be underestimated.”

Sen. Hinds: Well put! well read! Very well read! [*Desk thumping*]

PROCEDURAL MOTION

The Minister of Public Utilities (Sen. The Hon. Emmanuel George): Mr. President, I beg to move that this Senate continues to sit until the conclusion, hopefully, of this debate.

Question put and agreed to.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO POLICE SERVICE (FIGHT AGAINST CRIME)

[Third Day]

Sen. L. Oudit: So, Mr. President, the last statement I made was the response given by the then Minister of National Security.

Sen. Hinds: And you read so elegantly.

Sen. L. Oudit: And you know, elegance aside, it says nothing. It says nothing because the question was very clear. The question was: Has the blimp assisted in solving any of the murders so far? Plenty words, but nothing. No substance, because no answer was given. You know, Mr. President, this thing about talking plenty words—[*Crosstalk and interruption*]

This Motion is one very dear to my heart, simply because it touches on so many aspects that I have been personally involved with in terms of the teaching service, as a parent, as a person who is involved in the communities, and, you know, we laugh, Mr. President. This Motion is like what Sen. Ramkhelawan said, “It is not a small issue, it is a very, very important issue.

Mr. President, I want to quote for you, with your permission.

Sen. Hinds: Alice in Wonderland again.

Sen. L. Oudit: And you will be amazed at who said it. The quote says:

“The police service, in the last 20 years, terribly lagged behind developments in the society, and did not meet the expectations of the society. “

Let me read that back for you, please, for the purpose of the thing.

Sen. Hinds: “How you only reading so. “ We want a debate.

Sen. L. Oudit: “The police service, in the last 20 years, terribly lagged behind developments in the society, and did not meet the expectations of the society. ”

Sen. Hinds: Give me the Standing Orders please, the Vice-President does not know that.

Sen. L. Oudit: I am quoting a second one. Get your Standing Orders.

Sen. Karim: “Yuh” just wake up, take a little time. [*Laughter*]

Sen. L. Oudit: This is the second quotation, and it says:

“Failure to transform the economy, failure to transform the police service, ineffectiveness of our institutions, an antiquated police service all of these are to be dealt with, it falls to the Government in order to do so. “

Mr. President, I am quoting—[*Interruption*]

Sen. Hinds: Reading/quoting.

Sen. L. Oudit:—the contribution of Sen. Fitzgerald Hinds.

Hon. Senators: Oh, you again!

Sen. L. Oudit: “Trinidad and Tobago Police Service” on October 25, 2011. This is October 25, 2011, where Sen. Hinds admitted that the police service in the last 20 years—these are your words, Senator, these are not mine—the failure, in fact, one, two, three, four—four times you used the word “failure”.

Sen. Hinds: And what are they speaking about the UNC?

Sen. L. Oudit: You have indicated that the failure to transform the economy and all of the—transform the police service, ineffectiveness of our institutions, antiquated police service—it falls to the Government in order to do so. You know what? I say you are right. I say you are absolutely right! I say that from 1976, from the time we became a republic and we had our own Constitution, it fell to the government of every decade.

Mr. President, I do not know if at some point the Government here is only a government that started in, let us say, 2010. I cannot imagine, but somehow I would like to feel that based on the contributions I have been hearing, that we would like to make this country forget. I hear the call by many people who say, “No, do not go back, do not point fingers, do not talk about blaming.” You know, there is a book called, *Our Iceberg is Melting* written by John Kotter, and it is a fable, but sometimes you have to go down to that level of understanding. Let me tell you what the Welcome address says—and this is why, it bases why we must go back. There is no question about it, all of us must go back. It says:

“Handle the challenge of change well, and you can prosper greatly”—but—
“Handle it poorly, and you”—will—“put yourselves and others at risk.

All too often people...don’t see...They don’t correctly identify what to do, or successfully make it happen...Businesses don’t. School(s) don’t. Nations don’t.”

You see, Mr. President, this underlies why we must go back because this iceberg, our iceberg, did not start to melt 20 months ago. Our iceberg has been melting, and I call on this nation to understand what has been happening. You know, I have not really enjoyed Sen. Hinds’ contribution sometimes.

Sen. Hinds: You are in the wrong place; you should be in the Chair.

Sen. L. Oudit: Sen. Hinds, on November 22, 2011, brought a motion on hot spots. Mr. President, there is an old saying: “Yuh doh know if yuh coming or yuh going.”

Sen. Hinds: “Like de Prime Minister send you for me?”

Sen. L. Oudit: Sometimes I cannot imagine, and I will tell you why I am saying all of this. We are here to debate a Motion that seeks to take note—even to do anything else—of the strengths and deficiencies of the police service. Mr. President, on November 22, 2011, Sen. Hinds closed his whole contribution of maybe 15 minutes on the hot spot areas and said, he was quoting from Anthony B:

“You don’t have to say you are sorry for all the wrongs you have done, we don’t want to hear no sad story because the damage has already been done.”

You know, in everything you say, I agree.

Sen. Hinds: Is that right?

Sen. L. Oudit: I agree, the damage has already been done. Mr. President, these are the words of a former junior Minister who not only said he wished he could answer, but the damage had already been done and he made reference to 20 years. I realize now why you have not been in the Parliament for some time, because you have admitted, and there is for me a glimmer of hope because it tells me that somewhere along the line you do know what is wrong.

Sen. Hinds: The Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago.

Sen. L. Oudit: In all its manifestations.

Sen. Hinds: Well said! Well said! [*Desk thumping*] [*Interruption*] There is a thing called “respect”.

Sen. L. Oudit: Mr. President, Sen. Ramkhelawan says that somehow we have a blind spot for what is called “white-collar crime”, and I would like to agree with him. All of these things that I just spoke about and quoted of the same Sen. Hinds, was because I was really disappointed in the wording of this Motion and the opportunity—[*Interruption*]

Sen. Al-Rawi: But the AG said it was good.

Sen. L. Oudit:—that you missed. I believe this is a missed opportunity because you are a lawyer, one and you were a former junior Minister, therefore you should have really asked the right question.

Sen. Hinds: I am a PNM and I am proud.

Sen. Karim: No red tie today.

Sen. L. Oudit: We fall under the umbrella of the United Nations and therefore all our definitions et cetera. It was briefly referred to by Sen. Al-Rawi, and I think that was very good, the fact that there is an umbrella called the “Criminal Justice System”. The United Nations and all its members—and, as far as I am concerned, Trinidad and Tobago is a participating member of the United Nations. The Criminal Justice System identifies that there are several attributes. Resources: it identifies the police and prosecution personnel, professional judges and prison resources. The Trinidad and Tobago Police Service is one single item of resource.

The other element of the Criminal Justice System is the performance, quantitative productivity: how do you measure. You know what they look at? So you do not really say how many persons are prison officers in the population alone, there are a number of factors.

6.30 p.m.

The United Nations identifies the rate of persons suspected per police officer, persons prosecuted per prosecutor and persons convicted per prosecutor. The United Nations also identifies something called “systemic punitivity” which is the rate of total persons incarcerated per total persons convicted.

Mr. President, the United Nations identifies that there is an underlying dimension, and it is an enabling dimension. This enabling dimension is made up of people and philosophies that engender and generate or empower enabling institutions. In total, this is referred to as the “political will” and I believe the political will has been sadly lacking for over four decades.

This Motion speaks to the impact of the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service in the fight against crime. I propose, Mr. President, this is not a fight, this is a war. This is war because the potential of the police service to deal with any aspect, is a direct reflection of all of our institutions to deal with those things that either enable or disable the environment in which Trinidad and Tobago finds itself.

I want to really pay tribute this afternoon. We have one Minister present. Yesterday, I attended the sod-turning ceremony for the south UWI campus at Debe. Mr. President, I told the Minister after, had he really seen how I looked, he would have noticed there were tears in my eyes. And, there is a simple reason for that, because it speaks of understanding the philosophy required to change our institutions.

I want to publicly say to the hon. Minister of Science, Technology and Tertiary Education, the Hon. Fazal Karim that I have full confidence that, under his stewardship, the institutions under him, will make the changes necessary—[*Desk thumping*—]to enable transformation. I do believe that.

For over 50 years, we have waited for the recognition and the understanding that half of our country has suffered from the lack of a campus, of the University of the West Indies in Trinidad and Tobago. So, I say hats off to you hon. Minister. Please keep it up.

Mr. President, I would like to say that we have to go back and we have to ask the right questions. You know, I keep saying, especially to Sen. Hinds, we have to start asking the right questions. We are not asking the right questions. At which point

in Trinidad and Tobago's history did we become a haven for organized crime? At which point did transshipment become part of our vocabulary? At which point in this nation's history did the DEA and the FBI become interested in our operations?

Mr. President, the United Nations report—and I know Sen. Al-Rawi likes statistics.

Sen. Al-Rawi: “Yes man!”

Sen. L. Oudit: *The International Statistic on Crime and Justice*, this is the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime Report 2010. Page 16 of that report—and it is highlighted in pink, if you can read it. Let me tell you what it says:

“countries in the Central America and Caribbean sub-regions such as Belize, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, as well as in Venezuela, show significant increases in homicide rates in recent

Years Increases in homicide rates in the Central America and Caribbean sub-regions may be linked to homicide associated with gang, drug-related or organized crime. The drug trade fuels crime in numerous ways, through violence linked to trafficking, by normalizing illegal behaviour, by diverting criminal justice resources from other activities, and importantly...by contributing to the widespread availability of firearms.”

Mr. President, this is the 2010 report. Let me just identify what they have indicated to be the means by which this is done. We have the United Nations identifying that we have significant issues. This is the Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and Development Estimates, this is a report again, funded under the umbrella of the United Nations. It went back from the year 2000, and you know it is amazing. So, the figure that we are looking at is the intentional homicide rate per 100,000 population. For Trinidad and Tobago in the year 2000 the rate it was 10; in 2001, it was 13; by 2003, it went to 20; in 2005, it went to 33; in 2008, it went to 46; 2009, 43; and most recent as in 2010, that figure was 43.

Mr. President, we were the only country out of nearly—in fact, all of the countries that fell under the ambit world that represented such an increase from the year 2000—2010. Our figure went from 10 in 2000, to 43. In fact, just under that is the information for Colombia.

The information on Colombia started off in the year 2000, with 64 intentional homicide rate for 100,000—64. It went to 39 in 2005, and it remained at 39. Colombia moved from 64 to 39 over the same period that Trinidad and Tobago moved from 10 to 43, and yet we are now asking—the Opposition is now saying do not go back, but we must.

How many successive Ministers, magistrates and state agencies have woefully lamented a lack of resources and clout when it comes to dealing with crime? How has institutionalized corruption, over the last five decades in this country, allowed for international criminal organizations to enjoy undisturbed comfort on our shores? And to what extent has corruption from as far back as the 1960s, Mr. President, ensured that we offered only a token response, so we can as they say “spin top in mud?” Underfunded, under resourced and perpetually weak institutions, ensured the status quo of the real power brokers.

Why did successive administrations in the 1970s, 80s, 90s and the last decade, of which 43-odd years fell under the People’s National Movement—why did successive administrations fail to sufficiently provide for crime fighting at all levels? What was this unspoken message? What was the message that we were sending? In fact, if you identify, what were the faces of crime that we were seeing. Sen. Ramkhelawan spoke about having a blind spot for white-collar, and I fully agree with him.

What were the faces of those who perpetrated the crime as portrayed for over four decades, over 43 years? Decade after decade? We have reports of street crimes, petty crimes, gangs and gang violence. This is a main face that was put forward to the psyche of this nation, as the perpetrators of crime, but we were never shown, Mr. President, the business of crime. We were never shown the money. We were never shown the money behind crime. The crimes that we saw reflected in this country were all associated with low income, underprivileged and those who simply did not have at an economic level. The crimes sent a message that poverty, Mr. President, was the root of crime.

I want to say, and I dare anyone from any academic or social discipline to tell me otherwise. If I am wrong, I will admit, but I do not believe that poverty has ever been, it is not now, and it never will be the root of crime in this country; it is not.

Through indirect omission, denial and outright silence, successive administrations in the 70s, 80s, 90s, have generated and perpetrated a myth—*[Interruption]*—that is not funny at all. They have perpetrated a myth and ignored the realities of crime, violence and deviant behaviours within our homes and our families.

Mr. President, poor actually did serve a purpose. The poor provided the body bank of warm bodies. That is what they did. It provided the avenues for exploitation. You see, we have to make the distinction between crime for need, or

deviance because of need or necessity and the power-broking behind it. Need and necessity may very well be a reasonable explanation for why some may have actually been involved in crime. So, the poor provided a bank of warm bodies to ensure perpetration and exploitation.

The World Bank, Mr. President, and the Commonwealth Secretariat identify what is called small state syndrome. The World Bank and the Commonwealth Secretariat identify that “small state syndrome” is directly related to developing countries, with populations of less than 1.5 million. According to these, in relation to how our Trinidad and Tobago Police Service was ever able to have real strength, and to impact in any tremendous way, we have to understand and bear in mind that it was just one of several things and resources which I identified earlier on. It was one of the resources.

So, the sovereign developing states with populations of less than 1.5 million, according to the United Nations, Mr. President, identified that—*[Interruption]*

Sen. Hinds: Standing Order 35(1).

Sen. L. Oudit: “Yuh brave? Yuh got to stand.” *[Laughter]* According to the United Nations and the Commonwealth Secretariat, Sen. Al-Rawi and Sen. Ramkhelewan spoke of it, in fact, Sen. Ramkhelewan, in his contribution just a while ago, spoke about open borders when he referred to the blind spot. The United Nations and the Commonwealth call it a permissive environment. So, it is what Sen. Ramkhelewan said, it was an open border. But, these bodies identify it as a permissive environment.

6.45 p.m.

Mr. President, do you know what they have identified? They have identified that such a permissive environment is characterized by rampant corruption, weak state institutions with underskilled and underpaid state employees, inadequate or unsuitable education and a generally divided population.

Mr. President, I am sure this sounds familiar and we, therefore, have to ask the question: how many of our social and economic studies have identified even these same characteristics for Trinidad and Tobago?

One gentleman, who is really not liked by the People’s National Movement, is a gentleman called Daurius Figueira. I did this as a student at the university. *[Interruption]* I really, really feel that respect must be shown at all times and words like “useless” and “waste”—these people have a contribution to make. These people have made their contributions. You do not have to agree with them, certainly not, but present the alternative that is honest and reasonable and, certainly, we will take into consideration.

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. OUDIT]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

Daurius Figueira, I realize it is true—this is what I was told; that the PNM does not like him. So I guess it is true. Mr. Figueira, in 1997, identified Trinbago in the narco-economy. In 1997, this is what Mr. Figueira had to say; that on July 03, 1996, *the Newsday* reported a CANA report that insists that some 200,000 kilos of cocaine pass through the Caribbean each year for markets in the United States and Europe. A report on the United Nations International Drug Control Programme, in the *Express* of May 22, 1996, identifies that the major trans-shipment route as the Guajira Peninsula of Venezuela, via small boats through the waters of the Caribbean Sea and the island chain, to markets in the US and in Europe.

Mr. President, this was in 1977 and the information went on. That UN Report went up to the year 1995. [*Interruption*] I agree. Round and round in circles we go.

Sen. Al-Rawi: Without the OPVs.

Sen. L. Oudit: I will come to the OPVs and I will tell you how shallow that argument is. I will really tell you how shallow that argument is.

This is what was written in response to a question—in fact, the *Express* newspaper quoted that the then Attorney General, in 1996, the hon. Attorney General, Mr. Ramesh Lawrence-Maharaj, identified that:

A conservative estimate places the Caribbean at the leading edge of the world's narco-economy; for every year some US \$10 billion to US \$18 billion of products are trans-shipped through the region at the wholesale end of the market.

This was not in the last 20 months. This was not last year. [*Interruption*]

Hon. Senator: We know that.

Sen. L. Oudit: If you knew this, what did you do?

Mr. President, I want to tell you this because this is recorded. You know what is one report you will hardly ever hear from the other side? It is a report called the Scott Drug Report. In 1986, 10 years before that 1995 article, the Scott Drug Report said that the most striking development during the 1980s—we are going back you know, 1990s, now we are in the 1980s.

“The most striking development during the 1980s has been an explosive increase of cocaine use in Trinidad and Tobago...”

Epidemic proportions. That commission of enquiry started in 1984. It was commissioned in 1984. We have to understand what is going on. We cannot keep—

Mr. President: Hon. Senators, the speaking time of the hon. Senator has expired.

Motion made: That the hon. Senator's speaking time be extended by 15 minutes. [*Sen. The Hon. E. George*]

Question put and agreed to.

Sen. Hinds: No!

Sen. L. Oudit: Thank you very much, reasonable Members of the Senate. [*Desk thumping*]

Mr. President, I would suggest that for everyone who wants to really understand what we call the narco-economy that you get a book called *Cocaine and the Economy of Crime in Trinidad and Tobago* by Daurius Figueira. It is very, very interesting reading.

You know, we are not singularly distinctive as a region and so we have had the experience in a world of similar economies. The Trinidad and Tobago Police Service has had its hands tied. We have talked about the various means by which enabling environments were kept. I believe we have had systemic corruption that has allowed for powerbrokers of organized crime to taint and to limit the entire criminal justice machinery and so it never did have any real teeth or any real biting power.

So if our institutions were deliberately kept weak by a 40-year-old administration, who benefits if we continue to look away? Why is there—and I ask this honourable Senate—so much, for want of a better word, discombobulation when we talk about the sins of the founding fathers? If those questions are not asked, then you on that side and we on this side as they say, your own colleague, will be going round and round. We have to ask the right questions, Sen. Hinds.

When we look at the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service and its deficiencies, it is a gross oversimplification to even suggest that the OPV cancellation, the dismantling of the 360 degrees radar and the infrared disabling account for any increase in crime. These are tools that are used.

Mr. President, in fact, I propose that those persons who are actually caught by those are considered the weakest link in the chain. In fact, on Friday last, in this very Parliament, a Member of Parliament advised the House that the fishermen killed recently may have—and I am quoting because I heard it—“just been at the wrong place at the wrong time”. That was said in this Chamber. I shudder at the casualness of that remark.

Where were the real issues, the real programmes over the last 40 years? Certainly if any of those programmes had worked, international agencies would not have been now, today, 2012, asking whether or not Trinidad and Tobago is the drug capital of the world. That is the discussion at the international stage. If those things had worked; if they had asked the right questions—you cannot transform—in fact, it was Sen. Al-Rawi and Sen. Hinds who said that for the last 20 years; I say, with all due respect, it is not 20 years, you have to go back 40 years. So I am agreeing with your honourable colleague, Sen. Al-Rawi. It is not 20 years. Your own honourable, Sen. Hinds, identified the failure of the last 20 years.

You have to dismantle. You have to go back to the drawing board. I believe that the discussion from the Opposition right now is an attempt to keep the population at a very superficial level of discussion. We are being asked to look only in the last few years. Maybe, this Motion for me is like calling for the Commissioner of Police, who is a foreigner. I do not know. Maybe it is because he is not pliable enough. Maybe it is because he is asking the right questions and so we want to know. Is it that he is asking the right questions and somehow he is not as pliable because those who manage the system do not want him?

I propose that the tree of criminal activities is rooted very deep in our institutions and so these institutions are unable to detect and audit or prevent crimes of finance, patronage, nepotism and even passive corruption.

I propose that our electoral system has systematically compounded this from the 1970s come up. If we do not know what needs replacing, we will continue to make the same mistake over and over, round and round we go like a weasel. That is what we will be doing.

From independence to recent times, Trinidad and Tobago has had its fair share of unqualified, weak or shoddy government representatives; poor decisions, uninformed and deliberate; unequal distribution of resources, deliberate, general maladministration; and a low capacity for over four decades; a low capacity for high integrity in public life has sustained what is called and known to be a permissive environment. This country cannot go forward with this yoke around our necks. Genuine efforts will be stymied as in the past.

One only has to recall Prof. John Uff recently and his pronouncements in the recent Uff Commission, the unfolding of several scandals that have been the subject of debate over and over and, for generations; I can assure you, this country and our children will pay the price.

In all of this is the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service which this nation touts as the agency to deal with crime. Surely this Opposition is not even suggesting that the TTPS bear the sole responsibility for fighting crime? If it is, if this is the suggestion by the Opposition, then shame on you! Shame on you for perpetuating the myth! You are the current incarnation of the Opposition and you must account for your stewardship. You must start with a genuine recognition of the sins of your fathers. What monsters have your fathers created for his children now? What monsters have been created over the last 40 years, so that the children of today, including all of us, have to deal with them?

This Motion is like doing root canal with a toothpick. These pitiful and misdirected calls come from an uneducated grasp of the root causes of criminal activity or the rantings of a politically-skewed psyche steeped in dishonesty. If the strength of the TTPS is not one man, neither could its weakness be one man.

7.00 p.m.

In fact, in his contribution in the Parliament on Friday, the hon. Colm Imbert was quite thorough. I thought he was quite relevant in his exploration of the societal and institutional weaknesses. The problem I have is with his timing of his grand awareness—this clarity of understanding of the social and economic roots of criminal activities in this country.

For years, where was the hon. Member of Parliament's precise and thorough understanding? Was it withheld? Was that understanding he had withheld for 40 years, 20 years or 10 years? I think the population today has a very low tolerance for such ministerial blindness and official indifference—all the plans—we had Anaconda Baghdad. We had a host of plans and proposals, but no implementation.

What was the vision? Really, whose vision were you promoting since the 1970s? Whose vision? If we have to understand this complex socio-economic political issue of criminal activity in Trinidad and Tobago, I suggest we must go back to our decision to implement the junior secondary and the senior comprehensive system.

Sen. Hinds: I beg to move!

Sen. L. Oudit: You should. [*Desk thumping and laughter*] Mr. President, what is the right question? In the 1970s, a former PNM administration took the responsibility to bring onto this landscape the junior secondary and the senior comprehensive system. What is the relationship? What is the relationship between

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. OUDIT]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

the introduction of that system and the proliferation of warm bodies required for the streets, I ask? Numerous historical studies would show, from the student population, a clear relationship between this particular educational system and patterns of behaviour associated with street and gang culture.

Students were in school for approximately four hours. I can tell you, because I was a teacher in the junior secondary system. I know full well, I was involved. So, I saw students who were in the school for an average of four hours a day were left to roam the streets and the malls, and do you know what those students did? They became prey for the scouts that were continuously on the lookout to continue street distribution.

Mr. President, we have to be really honest. We have failed as society generations of children, because we let them out there and we did not take them and protect them. We put them in a half-day system.

Sen. Hinds: Why were you transferred?

Sen. L. Oudit: You know, this is why you did not have the answers then. The hon. junior Minister as he was, did not have the answers in 2005. He did not know. In fact, he had wishes, well, today I say keep the wishes. Mr. President, this is a sad reflection of how many generations of our students fell through the cracks. Are we willing to accept the real and serious challenge and weakness of the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service; a real, real, weakness?

I heard the MP for Laventille East/Morvant, Miss Donna Cox, say on Friday—and I am quoting her—“The PNM is taking development and nation building seriously”. While I believe her contribution to be a little thought-provoking, I am compelled to ask, during which decade of the PNM administration did you really take this seriousness? When did you start? I do not know if the current Opposition woke up on May 25, 2010 and realized that at that point they should be taking the nation seriously. Let us not fool ourselves. Let us go back to the drawing; let us go back to the beginning. Each of us, including all of us here, we have to account for stewardship and history is never kind to those eventually known as thieves, vagabonds and crooks.

The Opposition is right we should not go back for eight years. I say we should go back 50 years and systematically undo the wrongs that have been institutionalized. We need to completely overhaul our system. This is not about the PNM, UNC, MSJ or COP. We need to ask all the questions. Of course, what were the reports from all the areas?

You talked about the OPVs and the radars, and this is a bane right now; the OPVs and the radars. Since 1995, Mr. Figueira identified again—

Sen. Hinds: Which book is that? Which document are you quoting from?

Sen. L. Oudit: The *Express* newspaper of June 15, 1996 reported:

“The *El Nacional* newspaper of Venezuela has featured an investigation on the drug running activities on the Orinoco River in Venezuela.

And the *Express* in picking up that article dated 16/5/96 identified:

A significant portion of this 15 metric tons, are shipped to the Cedros/Icacos area of Trinidad. The Orinoco River cartels are a major supplier of product for transshipment to the narco cartels of Trinbago.

You know, where were the OPVs in 1995? Where were the OPVs in the year 1986? Where were they? Mr. President, I suggest to you that talk is cheap, but from where I stand, the price has been very high. Why was nothing done in the last 40 years? I do not forget, and I do not take kindly to those who would like me to forget. You see, the attention is drawn to superficial elements.

Mr. President: Senator, you would have to wind up now.

Sen. L. Oudit: Sure. Mr. President, the preamble in our Constitution is very clear. I saw Sen. Hinds went back to Senate section 173, et cetera, but our preamble is very clear: and whereas the people believe the operations of the economic system should be subsumed to the common good; Mr. President, I do not believe they have been.

In closing, the UNESCO preamble says that:

“since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed.”

I believe we need to change what has been happening over four decades. With that, Mr. President, I thank you. [*Desk thumping*]

Sen. Sherrie Ali: Mr. President, colleagues and Madam Senator with a beautiful, beautiful, great statistics, in my opinion, very little relevance—[*Desk thumping*]—Handle the challenge of change well. My understanding of change is to remove an object and replace it with another. I ask you, what are you replacing? What is your Government, that is the UNC, replacing the things you are removing with? [*Desk thumping*] Give me one item; give me one plan; and give me a strategy that is coming to pass? Just one!

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. ALI]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

Let me take you back to the Motion, because I feel like we did go a little astray. The Motion says.

“this Honourable Senate take note of the strengths and deficiencies of the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service and its impact and potential in the fight against crime.”

As an expectant first-time mother—[*Desk thumping*—I am continuously disappointed, day after day, when I read in newspaper headlined articles about police brutality, police corruption and general police shortcomings. Putting aside the argument about whether the state of emergency was justified or not, we did witness the call of duty upon the service members that required a commitment above and beyond their daily routines. [*Desk thumping*]

As a matter of, our service members worked 24- and 48-hour shifts with compensation still to be agreed upon. The same state of emergency condition, through the same men and women, our fellow citizens—yes, I have an accent, but I am a citizen of this country, and I have proudly come back to this country [*Desk thumping*—and they put my fellow citizens again, into said headlines, questioning their daily and collective ability to fight and to stay off crime.

Having interacted and questioned these service members myself, I find myself begging to ask this question: what has this Government done to strengthen the strengths and weaken the deficiencies of the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service and have a true impact on the ongoing fight against crime? What?

My fellow colleagues have brought some valid arguments up; Sen. Ramkhelawan and Sen. Dr. Armstrong. Are we actively recruiting? Are we setting standards of recruitment? What? This one strikes particularly for me. What is the public image of our police service? I do not foresee it as being very good and this struck a chord with me when Sen. Dr. Armstrong mentioned that there was a plan to increase public satisfaction index by 20 per cent. What this tells me—let me loosely use my Masters in Business here—is that there is a 40 per cent opportunity if you want to increase it by 20 per cent. That is a poor rating. That is very, very, poor. Our public does not view our protective agencies well at all. Why? Compensation, continuing education and on-the-job training; where is our specialized expertise? Why are we outsourcing this? Why are we looking to borders that are not our own?

Upward mobility: are they getting promoted? Are they being recognized for their efforts? Job support: can they go to their supervisors and explain their conditions and ask for assistance and help the country help them and in turn—it cannot be just public perception.

My colleagues, these are not just fancy words, but these are the tools I believe will provide the men and women of the police service with a sense of ownership; make each one of them stakeholders, as Sen. The Hon. Ramlogan—Ramkhelawan referred to the commissioner as the CEO. These are the tools when implemented in one form or another, starting with more community involvement, public perception awareness, compensation promptly and consistently consistent with their performance.

Government provided continued education. Is there a criminal justice programme for these men and women? Is there a compensation for them in place right now so should they seek to further their education which may or may not be above CXC level? These things should be made a priority and that is not even taking into consideration the vague answers around technology and vehicle availability.

Herein lies what I believe our crime fighters can use and will use to fight crime better, because that is the core argument, as well as keep our nation from looking overseas for the talent that we are capable of growing in this country. Thank you. [*Desk thumping*]

7.15 p.m.

Sen. Corinne Baptiste-McKnight: I thank you, Mr. President, for the opportunity to intervene in what is a most interesting debate.

Mr. President, when I decided that I had to intervene in this debate, it was prompted by a personal experience I had with our police service going home on the second night of our debate in this House during the curfew, and well after midnight I got a flat tyre just outside of Movie Towne. So, luckily, I did have a cellphone on me and I called the police. The whole event was really something quite surreal. My interaction on the phone was amusing, to say the least, but to summarize, I was told—

Sen. Beckles: Do not summarize, tell us the thing, it is important.

Sen. C. Baptiste-McKnight: No. No. No. I was told; “Well you know, none of us could change the tyre for you”, and I was advised that I should learn to change a tyre when I got home.

Sen. Beckles: Tell us which station you called.

Sen. C. Baptiste-McKnight: No. No. No. However, a female officer called back and assured me that someone would come out to see me home. Within five minutes, bright lights and the police drove up, and to my pleasant surprise two young officers came out; “Ma’am how can we help you?” So, I explained; “Well

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. BAPTISTE-MCKNIGHT]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

look, I have this flat tyre, I spoke with the officer and he said that you all would get me home but you could not change the tyre”. One officer looked at the other one in surprise, looked at me and said; “No Ma’am, we are to serve and protect—*[Desk thumping]*—have you got implements? A spare tyre?” I said; “Yes, it is there, but I just cannot break the nut because it is too—They changed the tyre and I am thanking them and they said; “No, no, no, we have to get you home safely”. They followed me home and made sure that my gate was locked before I got inside.

Now, what this incident brought home, very clearly and graphically to me is that there is a tension within the service as to how they understand their vision, mission, role and their motto. On the one end, I am told; “We not into the wheel-changing business”, but the young fellows came and said; “No, not so. This is nothing, we can do it. “And this said to me that there is so much hope for our young police officers—*[Desk thumping]*—and I wondered, so I went and checked out the website and I saw that their mission statement, says:

“In partnership with the citizens of Trinidad and Tobago we provide for safer, more secure and healthy communities through focused leadership, service and policing excellence.”

But then their role is to maintain order, enforce law and detect crime. Something is missing there, but their motto is; “To Protect and Serve with P.R.I.D.E.” This got me thinking: what does the average citizen think of the police force? How do we react to them? My own experience brought it home to me that citizens react with the police always in situations that are stressful for them. It is either there is an emergency, or you are on the wrong end of an infraction, so that there is this unhealthy tension between the citizen and the police.

This is borne out by the fact that the average reaction to the police is that they are insensitive; they have no customer relations manner; they are brutal; ready to raid you; unsolicited and unwarranted. And I thought, there has got to be a deep-seated reason for this, and it struck me when I thought that our teachers, in a few years, would all have to be degreed people, and I said: “You know, it goes back to a perceived lack of professionalism in the police service. “The police service is not looked upon now as a profession. I guarantee that any parent you ask would not want a child to join the police service, unless there was absolutely no alternative. I think this is where we have to start. It is imperative that the whole idea of police service be changed in the minds of the citizens. This can only be done if emphasis is placed on professionalizing the police service. I will come to that in a little while because I have got some strong feelings and ideas on that.

Now, I looked at the 21st Century Policing Initiative to see if I could find answers as to where we are supposed to be going, because my gut feeling is that the whole idea of bringing three high-powered Canadians to run the police force was to introduce a new culture, and I thought that I would see this in this initiative. I have got to be honest. I have noted that there is a heightened visibility for the police in the communities and around town, and I ask myself; “Is it enough to be seeing more of the people whom you distrust?”—and I think not.

I looked carefully, I think, at the strategic plan, and I have got to admit that I have a lot of the questions for Dr. Gibbs, because as my colleague, Sen. Ramkhelawan has said, I too accept the fact that he is in charge of every aspect of policing and the police service in this country. Just as an aside, it says something to me, that given this fact, this is the third or fourth day that we are debating this and I have not seen one of his people around, following the debate. I think they will probably tell me they are following it on television, and probably taping it too. I hope he is.

But here are some of the questions that I would like to have answers for. What is the official style of this new policing? Now, do not tell me proactive, because the only thing proactive about it is the heightened visibility. It still seems to be largely reactive, and I note that part of the goals is to provide standards, which leaves me to believe that as of now there are no well-defined policies, guidelines and procedures that have to be followed. This is obvious, in the fact that at different stations, different officers have different interpretations of the same situation.

I would like to know what degree of discretion officers are allowed to portray, I should say, or is there a mandate for a zero tolerance period? I do not know. Are police officers allowed to give a warning? And if so, how is this monitored or documented that X has been given a warning for whatever infraction? You might have a tail light missing on your automobile, and I for one, find it a little difficult to be in my car driving at night and know that my tail light is not functioning, unless somebody tells me that. But one police officer would stop you and give you a ticket, another would stop you and tell you. Is there a policy some place? These are the things; it is the discrepancies that cause people to have this attitude towards the police officers.

I think that there is a problem with supervision. To what degree are officers subject to active supervision? When I say active supervision, I mean, are their supervisors leading them by example, or are they leading them at a distance from headquarters? What is the synergy among the police training, the field training

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. BAPTISTE-MCKNIGHT]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

and the actual police practice? One suspects that there is not quite the degree of synergy that ought to exist in this sort of functioning service that we would like to see. How is this monitored?

I think this is something that the head of the academy should be looking into. What is the breakdown between the officers assigned to core functions and those assigned to administrative support? Because both are important, but certainly, one gets the impression that a little greater emphasis could be placed on the core services. How do all of the great goals and strategies here affect, in a positive sense, the large backlog of investigations, et cetera, that have to be done?

I have not been able to see any new responses that are preventive in nature that would involve the private sector, service clubs and civil society in this new initiative. I think proactive policing must involve the community, every aspect of the community, if it is to be successful. Then I wonder, to what extent there is recognition of the limitations to effectiveness of patrols, rapid response, arrest and even prosecution, where there is not an element of active problem-solving in your attitude to policing.

7.30 p.m.

I note that it contemplates the use of technology, particularly in resolving the problem of traffic control. But one thing that I have not seen any place is an item that says, "close liaison with other Ministries in order to achieve these goals". The police service cannot implement an effective strategy involving technology for traffic control that does not involve the Ministry of Transport, because it is their records that should help the police to identify problems that they meet from for time to time.

You know, I get the impression from this strategic plan, that the powers that be in the police service do not get the message or perhaps it was not transmitted to them, that their duty here, for the period of their contract, is to build the capacity that would allow us to have our officers do their jobs and continue to make this police service a successful one. I do not get that impression, because I feel that if they did they would have a greater emphasis on the recruitment and training.

Now, I realize, and very happily so, that there is a programme to train some 240-plus officers at different levels from associate degrees right up to post-graduate, but time is not our friend. I would go so far as to say, that time is our enemy at the moment. We need immediately, to include specialist training in areas that have been mentioned by Sen. Dr. Armstrong and Sen. Ramkelawan, to equip us to have an in-house capacity to provide what is necessary to achieve, to

fulfill, our commitments under international conventions, as well as to fulfil our commitment to ourselves, according to our legislation. We need people who have to be trained in investigative techniques, otherwise our detection rate is never going to improve. We need criminal intelligence on commercial crime, intellectual property, terrorism, human trafficking. All of these are areas that we need to have people trained in.

Now, you cannot take up a sergeant with five O levels and send him or her to do this kind of training. So it speaks to a new recruitment policy, and we do not have to look far. We had a delegation to Australia last year, and there is the place where we could find the state-of-the-art model for training the police. New South Wales Police Department, they have their own university which is recognized worldwide. They even have campuses in Canada—Charles Sturt College, and that police department recruits people after they have achieved their associate degree in police practice.

It cannot be difficult for us to adopt that model. Mr. President, COSTAATT already has an associate degree in criminal justice, so we have got something to work with. You have a police academy which is not state of the art yet, but it is a good training institution. My suggestion is that you get the police academy, COSTAATT, UTT, make contact with Charles Sturt in Australia work out the curriculum, and start recruiting people for your First Division. They come in with the minimum qualification of the associate degree, and do like in New South Wales, after recruiting, you come in on two years' probation, and during that two-year period, you have to complete your full bachelor's degree.

And guess what? The bachelor's degree from Charles Sturt is only available through distance education. Hello, are we distant? It seems as if we can use that. It is a matter of collaborating with them. We have good relations with them. They have a High Commission here. We are all part of the Commonwealth. I am sure that something can be worked out. This is the way that we start by professionalizing our service.

Now, providing that sort of entry, when they have completed their bachelor's, and they are made permanent, they get their first promotion, and then they are placed in various units, and according to their aptitude or preference, you allow them to do postgraduate work, in all of these different specialties that we need.

What are we doing when we provide this sort of career path? We are telling young people that you can enter the police force and you can have a career path that can take you up to the doctorate, and you can look forward to being CoP at

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. BAPTISTE-MCKNIGHT]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

some time. We are providing locally grown people for our service. The side effects: the citizens would now have greater respect for the police because they would be sure that in every police station, there is someone who can competently take their statement, which they could sign.

I have been to a police station to make a report, and I would be very honest with you, there is no way that I could have signed what was shown to me. So, I said, "Okay, lad, if it is okay with you, I will write it over, read it back for you and sign it." The fellow smiled, inasmuch as to say, "Ma'am, why did you not offer that before?"

The thing about it is that we have to improve the confidence level of the citizens in the police. And I think by professionalizing the service in this way, we would be achieving these two things, with minimum problems. As I said, the three gentlemen are probably aware of the Ontario campus, at least, of the Charles Sturt in Canada, and they might have some contact, so suggest to them that they follow it up.

In addition to that, I would really like to see the local police academy do much more, and it might be necessary for them to work in concert with the law faculty at UWI, with training police officers in the law. You cannot enforce a law that you do not understand, and it is obvious that this is the situation, not today, that has existed. The fact that we bring legislation here, in the debate, several people insist that before the legislation is promulgated, be sure that the police officers are trained so that they understand how to implement it. And what happens? Yes, everybody promises anything to get the vote, and then we have the nonsense that happened with the gang legislation. People are trying to say that it is bad legislation, but it is because the Members of Government did not ensure that the police officers were trained, and knew how to operate that law, that what happened, did happen. And I am not going to sit here and accept any blame for passing bad legislation, when it is bad management that was the problem. And that is not the only problem.

Why is it that people who are guilty, the courts free them? Because they were brought up on the wrong charge. That means that the system of training the officers in the correct law, and how to lay the correct charges, is lacking. That is not rocket science. That is something that has to be addressed, and not today, but yesterday.

Mr. President, I make these suggestions, not because I want to be critical, but because in the words of a colleague of mine who attends a programme that I do, I think that we need to give our police officers roots and wings. Roots so they are well grounded in the duties they are supposed to perform, so that there would be competence through knowledge, instead of incompetence through ignorance; and

wings, so that by giving them proper educational opportunities, they can blossom and achieve their full potential which is in our best interest. The service must be professionalized.

I want to refer, again, to what Sen. Ramkhelawan, and I think the one point that Sen. Oudit made, I do not make these recommendations because I do not recognize that crime is not the sole province of the police service, they have their place to play, but we must not forget that they are part of a continuum. It starts with the citizen, you and me, leading by example and doing the right thing. Crime is a result of a deviation in the hearts and minds of each one of us.

In addition to that there is the legal system, the whole criminal justice system. There is a lot of talk about reforms, there are lots of recommendations for reforms. Let us get on with the job and do the reforms because when the police are laying proper charges, and the courts cannot deal with them, the system is still not functional. We have to attend to everything. The hon. Minister with his mentorship programme, and various other programmes, is doing his bit to deal with the personal development of the citizens, but he is dealing with those who are at risk.

7.45 p.m.

The people who are driving on the shoulder of the road do not come under his purview as being at risk, you know. So, we have some government stations on television, use those to run programmes that would appeal to people to realize that each one of us has our part to do as well.

I want to close by just reiterating that I would like, along with all of us, to be part of a system that would give roots and wings, not only to the police service, but to all the citizens in the country.

I thank you.

The Minister of Energy and Energy Affairs (Sen. The Hon. Kevin Ramnarine): Thank you very much, Mr. President, for giving me the opportunity to join this very important debate, a Motion brought by Sen. Fitzgerald Hinds: “Be it resolved that this honourable Senate take note of the strengths and deficiencies of the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service and its impact and potential in the fight against crime.”

In preparing for this debate today I did a bit of research on the origin of policing and I was not surprised to find out that policing originated in ancient China, and it had its origins in what they called the “prefecture system”, and there

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. THE HON. K. RAMNARINE]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

were also early references to policing in ancient Greece. So, for some time now man living in organized societies, has come to the realization that in order to maintain law and order there is a need for a body of persons who would implement law and maintain order in that society.

We could go through the different theories, the social contract theory and so on, and speak about the different philosophers of the 16th and 17th Centuries on social contract theory, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, John Locke and so on, but I would not bore the Senate with that this evening, I would emulate the contribution of Sen. Sherrie Ali, and be very brief.

Mr. President, I would like to deal with the whole issue of the impact of crime on the economy because it has very significant variables as it impacts negatively on any economy and, of course, the impact on crime on the economy can be felt in terms of inflation, because criminal activity increases the cost of doing business. Businessmen would have to hire security and so on; it also has an impact on investment in Trinidad and Tobago and, as a person who once worked for a multinational company in Trinidad and Tobago, I know the tremendous cost burden that is placed on those companies with regard to protecting their assets, with regard to protecting their employees and so on. So, it has that impact on the cost of doing business, it has an impact on investment, it also has an impact on the labour force, in that young men may opt to, not join the labour force, but to enter a life of crime, thus making themselves unavailable for the labour force and creating shortages in labour.

When Sen. Lyndira Oudit spoke she made reference to the fact that there was an explosion—to use her words—in the drug trade in Trinidad and Tobago in the 1980s. I am not that young that I cannot remember the famous Justice Garvin Scott, I believe it was the drug report of the mid-1980s which made several allegations against persons involved in the drug trade. As I have said before, Trinidad and Tobago has several competitive advantages and as Minister of Energy and Energy Affairs I happen to know that one of them is our energy sector, but there is a competitive advantage in this country which is an advantage and it is also a disadvantage.

In my reading of a book called *Port of Spain in a World at War* by our famous historian Michael Anthony, he goes to great lengths to explain why the US Army decided to put bases in Trinidad and Tobago in the 1940s. It was not only because they wanted to protect the oil refinery at Pointe-a-Pierre, which, at the time was one of the largest in the world. It had a lot to do with the location of Trinidad and Tobago, the strategic location of the country with respect to shipping lanes and

our proximity to Panama. Of course our location has not changed, and that advantage of that location is still there, but there is also a disadvantage to being located where we are, in that we sit right between supply and demand of drugs in the Western hemisphere and, as a country, we have been a victim of that and that has led to not only a crime problem in Trinidad and Tobago, but indeed, a crime problem throughout the Caribbean.

Again, in doing my research for this report I came across a World Bank report from 2007, “Crime, Violence, and Development: Trends, Costs, and Policy Options in the Caribbean”, published in May 2007. I would just quote from that report:

“Crime impacts business and is a major obstacle to investment. In many countries”—in the Caribbean—“as crime increases, access to financing declines; spending on formal and informal security measures increases; and worker productivity declines. Estimates suggest that”—and this is important—“reducing the homicide rate in the Caribbean by one third from its current level could more than double the region’s rate of per capita economic growth.”

So there is a significant relationship between crime and the economy, not only in Trinidad and Tobago, but in the Caribbean.

As we are on the topic of the police, some of you all may remember there were several reports into the police service in the 1990s, I think it was under the tenure of the first Manning administration from ’91 to ’95, and there was a report done by a gentleman who is now, Sir David O’Dowd—the O’Dowd Report. He did a report in 1991 on the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service and in that report he cited several weaknesses of the police service, including weak leadership. This is way back in 1991—21 years ago—weak leadership, lack of internal investigations of misconduct, widespread accusations of corruption, lack of response by police after receiving calls for service, et cetera.

Two years later, Mr. President, there was another report by a gentleman named Mr. Seaby, who, I believe may have been from Scotland Yard, and he came to the same conclusion two years later, that, again, there were widespread allegations of corruption in the police service and so on. That report by Seaby was in response—the actual report is titled, Final Report for the Government of Trinidad and Tobago on investigations carried out by officers from New Scotland Yard in respect of allegations by Rodwell Murray and others about corruption in the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service. This was a long time ago before many of

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. THE HON. K. RAMNARINE]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

us were even dreaming to be in the Parliament of Trinidad and Tobago. So, for some time now we have known from the Scott Drug Report, which was published in the mid-1980s; we had known from these two reports here from O'Dowd and Seaby, that there is a problem with the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service that has to be rectified if we are to maintain law and order in this country.

I found another very interesting piece of research done by a group of people at the University of the West Indies, some of whom were my contemporaries while I was a postgraduate student there, and the report is titled "Serious Crime in Trinidad and Tobago: An Empirical Analysis Using Time-Series, Data Between 1970-2007." This is a report by Sandra Sookram, George Saridakis, Maukesh Basdeo and Kerry Sumesar-Rai, and the paper was published by the SALISES, the Sir Arthur Lewis Institute of Social and Economic Studies. In studying this paper they came up with four variables that contribute to crime. One of those variables is something they referred to as the clearance rate, which is used as a measure of the ability of the police to solve crimes.

The other variable they used in the analysis, and it was a statistical analysis, was the unemployment rate. The third variable they used was the percentage of females in the labour force, and the fourth variable, very importantly, was the percentage of the labour force with tertiary education. Those are four variables that they did their different regression analysis and linear programming and so on to come to their conclusions, but it is interesting the reference, of course, to tertiary education, because we on this side are firmly of the view that education is not only the way forward, but it is the only way for Trinidad and Tobago.

On that point I wish to commend and congratulate my colleague, the Minister of Science, Technology and Tertiary Education, for what was an historic day, yesterday, in Debe. He is not here right now but we congratulate him for strides he has been making in the sector that comes under his Ministry. [*Desk thumping*] Mr. President, I must note with some sort of disappointment that on January 25, 2011 it was reported in the *Trinidad Guardian* that the Leader of the Opposition was very much against the location of the campus at Debe. In fact, he said that the PNM had selected a site somewhere in Orange Grove. [*Interruption*] I believe that nothing is wrong with citing a university campus in Debe. There is economic growth taking place throughout the country and there is no reason why all the major tertiary education facilities should be in the north of the country. In fact, we are a small country and what we are really evolving into is a city state.

So, I support fully the location of the campus at Debe. I urge the Leader of the Opposition to also support the location of the university at Debe. I see he attended the “Fuad and Friends” fete over the weekend—[*Desk thumping*—]and we welcomed him, and he had a very good time there and we hope to see him again at “Fuad and Friends” next year. [*Laughter*]

He also said that he went to Moruga—I think that is the constituency of our colleague, the Minister in the Ministry of Education, Hon. Clifton De Coteau, a very competent Member of Parliament. He was able to win the Moruga/Tableland seat from one Peter Taylor who was a former Minister of Legal Affairs—and he said that he would dismantle the Ministry of the People and Social Development now, the Ministry of the People and Social Development, which plays a major role in poverty eradication in Trinidad and Tobago in addressing deficiencies in social services delivering and filling gaps and so. This Ministry is currently being run by the hon. Dr. Glenn Ramadharsingh in a very competent and efficient manner, and for the first time we actually have a Ministry of the People and Social Development and a Minister who is on the ground with the people. So, I do not think that it would go down well with the people of Trinidad and Tobago who have benefited from that Ministry, that there are plans by the Opposition to dismantle that Ministry.

He then went on to say that they would have a Ministry of Rural Development. Well, I came from a place called Cumuto in the eastern part of Trinidad and Tobago and if you want to know what rural neglect is you have to go to the eastern part of this country, which has remained over the last four or five decades largely underdeveloped. But, that underdevelopment, of course, was a creature of history and political policy that focused all development in Trinidad and Tobago along the East-West Corridor between—I would not even say between Arima and Port of Spain—Trincity and Port of Spain. So, there is a need for rural development, and that is actually taking place right now, I believe under the Ministry of Local Government and other Ministries.

Minister Emmanuel George has been bringing water to people who have never had water. A few weeks ago he was in Talparo with the Prime Minister and the Member of Parliament for La Horquetta/Talparo, and they turned on the taps in Talparo, and I think it was the first time in 100-plus years that people in that constituency had water. [*Desk thumping*]

So, when we talk about crime fighting, we talk about a holistic picture, we talk about education, and we look at what Minister Karim is doing, we talk about infrastructural development in the rural communities, we look at what Minister

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. THE HON. K. RAMNARINE]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

George is doing; and we talk about what Minister Ramadharsingh is doing with the Ministry of the People and Social Development, which, under this Government will not be dismantled but will be continued.

8.00 p.m.

Mr. President, first of all I want to congratulate in her absence, Sen. Sherrie Ali on her maiden contribution to the Senate of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago. [*Desk thumping*] She is a temporary Senator and she said that she recently came back home, and she was very shocked to see some of the headlines that in the papers. Well, it is clear that she has been out for some time. She probably was out of the country for the period 2002—2010, and wherever she was, she probably did not have in any Internet access, because in the year 2008, we had a murder rate in this country that hit 550 murders for that year. It has since started to come down.

What I found very interesting was the contribution of Sen. Faris Al-Rawi. After listening to him, if one were not aware, one would believe that the greatest thing to ever happen to Trinidad and Tobago since 1962, was SAUTT. And he extolled of course the virtues of SAUTT, how great they were and how many people they trained and so on. But it is interesting that we had our record high murder rates in the years in which SAUTT was at its highest strength, at its apogee so to speak.

Sen. George: Word boy. Repeat it.

Sen. The Hon. K. Ramnarine: If something is not producing results—and they say the definition of madness is doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different result—then you have to revisit it and that is simply what this Government has sought to do. [*Laughter and desk thumping*]

In closing—I said I would be short. We had a state of emergency last year. I am a member of the National Security Council; energy infrastructure is very critical to national security. We live in a country with five power plants in Trinidad, one in Tobago, one oil refinery, four LNG trains, 800 kilometres of natural gas pipeline, God knows how many hundreds of kilometres of oil pipelines, and we have drilled 12,000 wells in the last 100 years. So, we have a tremendous amount of energy infrastructure; we have ports dedicated to the energy sector. So the Minister of Energy and Energy Affairs' presence on the National Security Council is very important. Last year we declared a state of emergency, and of course as speakers on this side have said, we have no regrets. That state of emergency led to, I believe, a 25 per cent reduction in homicides. Every life is important in Trinidad and Tobago, therefore, speaking on this side the state of emergency was a great success even if it saved one life. [*Desk thumping*]

I just want to close off by addressing some concerns that “nothing is happening with regard to crime fighting,” and we “have no plan” and according to Sen. Sherrie Ali, change requires moving one object and putting another object. I thought we had done that on May 24, when we moved an object called Martin Joseph, and replaced him with a gentleman, Sen. The Hon. Brig. John Sandy. [*Desk thumping*]

Sen. Cudjoe: An object?

Sen. The Hon. K. Ramnarine: We removed a gentleman named Martin Joseph and replaced him with a gentleman, Sen. The Hon. Brig. John Sandy.

Sen. Cudjoe: Better!

Hon. Senator: A better gentleman.

Sen. K. Ramnarine: But, Minister Brig. John Sandy—and I work closely with him because there is a nexus, we are members of the National Security Council and so on, and we work on matters of energy security. Minister Brig. John Sandy, has been doing an excellent job. Minister Brig. John Sandy for the first time in this country, has put surveillance bays along the highway connecting Grand Bazaar to Golconda. There are 13 surveillance bays, and I understand that those surveillance bays would be powered by solar energy. So, not only are we increasing police presence along the highway, but we are doing it in a very 21st Century style, with solar energy. [*Desk thumping*]

As you drive along that highway from north to south, one of the things that strike you is that there is no gas station between Golconda and Grand Bazaar. One of the things that we intend to do is, we intend to commission a study to look at demographics and demographic trends and to ascertain the need for gas stations along the highway. These would not be small gas stations; these are intended to be large “quick shoppe” type gas stations.

Interestingly, the statistics for last year indicated that we put 25,000 new and foreign-used vehicles onto the roads of Trinidad and Tobago. So there is a need for more policing of our nation’s roads and there is a need for better infrastructure along those roads, especially our main arteries, the Churchill Roosevelt Highway, the Uriah Butler Highway, the Solomon Hochoy Highway, et cetera.

So, Mr. President, as I promised I will be very short and emulate the contribution made by our new Senator, Sen. Sherrie Ali, and I will end at this point. I will end simply. I want to thank former junior Minister of National

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. THE HON. K. RAMNARINE]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

Security for bringing this Motion which has allowed us the opportunity to air all these issues on crime and for us to appreciate and digest the good work that is being done by this Government to alleviate this serious problem.

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

Sen. Helen Drayton: Thank you, Mr. President. I will be as short as possible. Mr. President, hardly a day goes by without the question being asked whether by a journalist, a blogger, a letter writer, where is the crime plan? And sometimes you scratch your head and you wonder, because sometime in December, I remember a couple of senior members of Government asking the same question. Of course, some of us know that a strategic plan exists and therefore, I think it will make abundant sense if, when the police authority publishes in the newspapers details of its performance—which I think is a good thing to let us know what is happening—that it publishes the targets that were established in that plan, so that one could measure the performance against some objective criteria.

I say that because I feel that it is time we engage our law enforcement agencies and other government bodies on a different level. Yes, as I said, it should be objective criteria and in the context of the police service it should be efficiency and productivity targets.

So, this Motion, I think, is very timely. It has asked the Senate to take note of the strengths and deficiencies in the police service and the impact and potential in the fight against crime, and I would speak very briefly on this.

The public of course assesses the performance based on the number of murders they hear about; based on the experience in their community; based on what they see and hear. And generally there is a deep cause for concern, and generally there are levels or degrees of insecurity.

Also I heard the word confidence mentioned a short while ago. There is certainly very low confidence in the police service. And I just want to cite very briefly some statistics based on a research done by the UN last year, where respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with police performance at the community level in certain critical areas. In the case of rape and sexual assault, the confidence was very low. I should say as much as 62 per cent of the respondents had no confidence in the police in that regard. Domestic violence, 60 per cent; gang violence, 69 per cent; murder, 72 per cent and high level of fraud, 70.8 per cent. But, what was very disturbing about the results of this research was that the public was also asked to give their opinions with respect to the operations of the justice system in Trinidad and Tobago. And a statement was posed to them:

“I am confident that the justice system in Trinidad is not manipulated by politicians/does not yield to political pressure.”

And 60 per cent disagreed with that statement.

Further, another statement was read to them:

“The Justice system is unable to convict powerful criminals. Powerful criminals are likely to go free.”

Sixty-one per cent agreed with this statement.

And of course this one, the statement read:

“Politically connected criminals are likely to go free.”

Seventy per cent believed that statement.

So, when we speak of the issue of confidence, we can see how deep-seated are the levels of concern and the levels of mistrust among the community. So that one of the things I would liked to see reflected when performance is being put forward to the public: how does the performance with respect to confidence measure up with respect to the targets indicated in the survey? Because that is an objective way in which you can measure the progress of all the work that is being done by the Commissioner of Police and his team of very dedicated workers, rather than very emotional and partisan criteria.

I would also certainly like to know the estimated number of small arms that are coming into this country illegally, annually—[*Desk thumping*] and what targets, have been set to detect, reduce and eliminate. These are critical statistics. What are the improvement ratio targets for the time spent by police officers in the front line, actually policing, and other critical performance criteria which go to the core of capacity building?

I am not going to get into the area of recruitment again or training, because those two areas have been elaborated upon quite nicely.

Suffice it to say, when you are given the ratio of police to citizens which is an excellent ratio, it is clear that there are serious structural employment problems within the police service. It means that the skills you need for 21st Century policing are simply not there. And one therefore can see the heart of some of the problems.

I am very happy to know that there is a strategic plan and there are targets, and I would like to see the performance measured against these targets.

Given the response by members of the community with respect to the justice system, I would also like to know how the hierarchy of the police service will be insulated from unnecessary and debilitating political interference. And I think that it is a reasonable proposition to put out there. Now, of course there would always be some involvement given the structure of the National Security Council, given the fact that your Minister of National Security, who I think is trying very hard to turn things around, given the fact that the Attorney General, both are political appointees, so that it would be naive to expect that there would not be active engagement and requests and things like that. But, I am speaking about perceived, incompetent and debilitating political interference which would prevent the kind of behaviour that the Attorney General spoke about.

Now, if in 21st Century policing, it means less of that type of interference in our institutions— independent institutions of democracy, then I would say yes, yes there is change, there is meaningful change and that we are shifting towards a new paradigm.

I agree with the Minister of National Security that the strategy should focus on reducing crime gradually over a period. And that is exactly why targets are important. I heard what was said about the state of emergency, I am not going to go into that. Suffice it to say that quick and dirty methods are just that; quick and dirty methods, where you get dust in your face. [*Desk thumping*] The gains are difficult to sustain unless the underlying structures are fully in place to sustain that momentum.

Now, during that 107 days there were still about 50 murders—and one has to say yes; one cannot deny the fact that a lot of lives were saved—and since it was lifted, within the month, we have had 38. So, notwithstanding the fact that the period of the state of emergency was definitely an anomaly, we are told that the statistics are still trending in the right direction. That being the case, I think it is very encouraging, and it is that kind of performance that would yield confidence by the public. But I want to recall the words of the DPP as reported in the press some time in December, very quickly. I am quoting. He said:

“While the nation was bedeviled by crime and criminal activities, it is imperative to mount credible and reliable cases for gang related crimes the enforcement authorities must ensure:

- Proper preparation by law enforcement agencies;
- Co-operation rather than competition among law enforcement agencies;

- Proper and current police documentation of gang affiliation and activity;
- The developing of gang data bases;
- The employment of informants and the development of an Informant Policy;
- A close study of gang dynamics and group criminal behaviour;
- A proper appreciation of accessorial liability as it pertains to gangs;
- The development of a Gang Unit; and
- Effective surveillance strategies and, most importantly, gang experts who are thoroughly conversant with gang dynamics. ”

8.15 p.m.

Now, what struck me about this statement is that it implies that those critical strategies to combat criminal gangs and the activities are not in place or at least were not in place at the time. That is what struck me.

So one of the questions I feel that it is only appropriate to pose at this point in time is: what are the performance measures in those critical areas? How are we performing against that criteria? And, what is the current status with respect to an anti-gang unit? So it comes back to the whole process of performance evaluation and consequence management, discipline, and I have no doubt in my mind that the person who is accountable for the efficient functioning of the police service is, indeed, the Commissioner of Police, and if he succumbs to political influence, then he and he alone has to stand the consequences of that.

The killings continue to affect our quality of life. It is relentless. Progress is being made; I acknowledge that, and the police are making an effort to do their part. I think it is time the Government come to grips with the cause of migration of youth into gangs. In this regard, I know there is a Selwyn Ryan Committee on the subject, although I am sure the honourable Senator, Verna St. Rose-Greaves, can give them the Bible on the incubators; the preconditions and all the analysis, and where they are. I have no doubt that all the information is there.

So this is why you wonder whether, in fact, we are not reinventing wheels, because so much of that research is there. I am of the strong view that if we address those deep-seated societal factors simultaneously as we build capacity in the police service, the incremental gains, those gains that you are looking for, gradually over a period of time, I think they would get larger and larger. And do you know what? In five years we might be quarreling with you and beating you over the head for maybe 20 murders a year.

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. DRAYTON]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

With regard to the communities called hot spots, these hot spots are targeted for makeshift work, including, I have to say, very unimaginative government programmes which put people in a state of perpetual dependence, and I have to say, such as the thoughtless “orange programme” of \$300 million for 20,000 people. You know, there is a correlation, the more you put that kind of money into those communities, the more the crime goes up. So I wonder if sometimes my tax is not seed money for crime.

So given the prevailing crime situation, how do we transform those troubled communities into more secure, helpful and dynamic environments? To my mind, it has to do with some form of collaborative, neighbourhood governance; it calls for a dynamic form of local government where the people are motivated to bring about change in themselves, and that which they want in their community. It is not a case of handouts.

I will repeat, it is time we let the police do their jobs. Leave the politics out of policing. Stop ridiculing the police, and I have to bring up SAUTT in that regard. It is not right to denigrate, totally, the performance of what was an interdepartmental task force comprising of police, of the coast guard and our army. It is totally unfair. [*Desk thumping*] I want to say why. Now, all crimes affect us and all crime makes us afraid, but if there was one crime that sent the chills through the business community—and they are still paying for it with insurance today—was kidnapping. They brought that down to, virtually, zero. They were instrumental in preventing bloodbaths. A lot of misinformation has been put out there because of the politics, and that is wrong.

We talk about training. But they have started an academy upon which to build something solid. Yes, there were problems; yes, there were shortcomings, but there is no reason to denigrate. An institution is made up of people. So there is no need to denigrate the hard-working police officers, soldiers and coast guard people who were in there, when all they were doing was protecting us.

Sen. Hinds: Well put, Senator! Well put! [*Desk thumping*]

Sen. H. Drayton: So apart from the decrease that we are hearing in major crime, albeit it is small, we are seeing more police on the road; I am observing a different attitude; there are signs that are very encouraging. We need to encourage more of that; we need to commend them, and we will not get change overnight. With continued commitment it would take only a matter of years and not decades to turn the tide.

I thank you, Mr. President.

Sen. Shamfa Cudjoe: Thank you, Mr. President, for the opportunity to join this debate at this time. Many of the speakers on the Opposition side and on the Independent Bench, I share most of their views.

Mr. President, I have been sitting here and listening to the debate and it is very surprising to me how we continue to—well, especially the Government—politicize this issue of crime. I want to say something that I always say to this Government. National development is a continuous process. So one party may start something; you may not like everything about it, but, as we like to say, do not throw the baby out with the bathwater.

I am sure that there are things that you can build on; there are things you might want to throw away; there may be things that you would want to keep. So the practice of this Government to throw out everything, and scandalize everything, and say everything that happened under the PNM was bad, it is not a good thing; it is not fair; it is not a nice thing to do, and at the end of the day we are wasting time; we are wasting energy and we are wasting public funds, because to break down something or break down an organization and build it right back up, it takes public funds.

I want to jump right into my contribution. Most of the other speakers would have addressed issues of police needing to be properly compensated; raised issues on needing the right facilities, the right equipment and technology and so forth, in carrying out their duties. I wanted to focus particularly on the issue of confidence. I happen to come right after Sen. Drayton, and it seems like she was looking at the same kind of research that I was looking at, but I will continue to give my contribution and try not to repeat some of the things that she said.

I want to say that we can have everything. We can have one police officer to each citizen; we can have all the high technology, all the equipment, everything that you can possibly think about; all the material things; all the facilities, to help to enhance policing, but if the police service and the members of the police service do not have a proper and healthy relationship with the people that they serve, then all these efforts come down to naught.

I think that if we cannot fix this problem, then we are in a terrible state of affairs. I think, today, in this country—and when I do research on the police service in the Caribbean region—we have a serious problem with corruption in the police service. Whether or not that is reality or a perception, it does not augur too well for a service or a police force that is supposed to protect and serve us.

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. CUDJOE]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

Take for example, this is the 31st day of the year and the murder rate, as announced by the AG, is 38. What is surprising to me is that when you read the newspapers, the media houses report that none of these murders have been solved, and that is a serious problem for me.

I believe that most of these murders are being committed in communities where sometimes the victims know their murderer, like the Commissioner of Police said, and most times in our communities there is somebody sitting somewhere who knows the reason for the murder; who knows the murderer and who may even know where the murderer is hiding. No one will pick their teeth to say anything to the police, and that is because of that poor relationship the police has with the members of the community. Now, our environment is clearly not conducive for information sharing between the police and the members of the community, and that in itself is a serious problem.

Now the 21st Century Policing Initiative, the main objective of that police initiative, is to restore a sense of public confidence between the communities and the police service, and every time you pull this document or you read in the newspapers about this 21st Century Policing Initiative, it is the first thing that the document speaks about, and every time Officer Mystar speaks about the 21st Century initiative, he speaks about this whole issue of restoring confidence.

How do you restore public confidence in a society where the line between the good guys and the bad guys is very blurred? I am not saying that all police officers are rogue officers, but we must admit that there are a few bad apples in the bunch, and in Sen. Brig. John Sandy's contribution, his focus was on rooting out these rogue elements from the police service.

Now, over the years, and quite recently also, we have heard many instances of police malpractice, police misbehaviour and corruption in the police service. We have heard in the media, police being brought to the courts and before the judicial system for renting firearms, for bribery, for protection of illegal activities, such as drug trafficking and so forth; for murder, for torture, and this is something that we need to look at with a very suspect eye.

Now I go to a specific place in Tobago to beautify. I dare not say what the service is that I go for, or where, because I am afraid. But I will tell you I go somewhere to get beautified. I can say that much, and that area is a hot spot.

From the time you get on the scene, you know that drugs are selling; it is serious hustling that is going on, on the spot. But, I continued to go there for about four years or so, and the gentlemen do not hide. You sit there at the place and you are seeing people from all different walks of life coming to get their drugs and so forth—
[*Interruption*]

8.30 p.m.

Sen. George: And they beautify?

Sen. S. Cudjoe:—at the “beautification spot”. So, when I first got my vehicle, I did not know how to park properly. So every time I got to where I needed to park at the place, I would ask somebody, whoever is standing there to help me park. I asked one of the gentlemen—he asked me if I needed help parking. He asked me how much my vehicle cost, where, I got money to pay for my vehicle, but I knew his face from being around there, so, I asked, “How is it that you get to do your business here so openly and nobody stops you, nobody shut this thing down?” And he said to me, “Police do not shut down police”. “Police doesn’t shut down, police.” And I have been at that spot several times, there have been police raids, run up all into the “beautification spot”, and you know the police know that there is something illegal going on there. But, you come back next week and week after, and they are operating the same way as if nothing is wrong.

It is the same situation for police officers who purchase cars and give them to young men in the community to “pull bull” or “run taxi”, and those cars would have blue lights, and fluorescent neon colour lights, and dark tint, and so forth. When the police are doing their little spot checks, those cars go by free.

So you have some shady guys in the system who really need to be rooted out, because they cause the system to have a bad image, and it reflects very, very, poorly on the police system.

I know of a situation where police torture people for the fun of it. I have been to parties and seen members of the protective services—police, coast guard, army—start fights, pelting bottles and trying to resolve issues where— something relating to their girlfriends, where somebody would have slept with their girlfriend and they use the police service, and use the protective services to fight those kinds of battles. You dare not go and report those kinds of things in the police station.

In the police service, in the protective services, there is this, it is like a fraternity, it is like a brotherhood. And, you see this “my batch ting”, this person came from “my batch.” Nobody wants to tell on their “batch,” I think your “batch” is the person who you went through the intake process with. And it is something like, if you would have been pledged into sorority or a fraternity, so that person becomes your brother. But that “my batch” business, where people protect and keep secrets and engage in rowdy behaviour and illegal activities and

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. CUDJOE]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

fighting for the “batch”, that cannot work. Then at the end of the day, we wonder why there is such a breakdown in the relationship between the police and the community. When you go to a party and you see a police officer react like that and then there is nobody to report to.

I know of an incident where a gentleman gave a guy a “bad drive” and as he pulled up into the gas station, the gentleman approached him with a knife, and when he went to the police station to report the incident, the police officer that came out to take the matter was the person that rushed him with the knife.

So we need to find a way to treat with these issues. There is no way, you can find police coming into the communities and asking for information and we the members of the community feeling, okay, to disseminate information to the police. I had a personal incident at my home where the police came looking for the person next door. And the police roughed up everybody, gun in our faces, telling my sisters this one looking good, all of this craziness, a little, 12-year-old putting a gun in their face, and later on that weekend the police officer was at a party boasting about it, “Yeah, we had dem busy, you shudda see dem”. So, when you come to my community to ask questions, you are not going to get any information from me. These are the kinds of issues, the kinds of incidents, that people in different communities undergo.

I live in Bethel Village, and where my room is, I can hear the boys on the block hanging out. I can hear when the police come, I can hear the police firing shots, and they have not seen anybody with a gun. These incidents raise the idea of what is really happening in our police service, and what moves are we making to mend that relationship between the community and the police?

So, I know that we have the Police Complaints Authority up and running now. But I read some articles from Gillian Lucky, who, I think is the Director of the Police Complaints Authority, right now, and she was saying that the kind of authority that the police complaints body has is not enough; they can only recommend disciplinary action for the police. You cannot say, suspend this person or fire this person, they can only recommend disciplinary action. So, I think that that is something that we need to look at.

Now, in a November issue of the *Trinidad Guardian* Newspaper, Gillian Lucky would have raised the issue and she questioned the political will of the Government to really treat with these issues. And she asked the question as to whether or not this is just lip service, but I must say that lip service is not enough. At some point in time, we have to stand up and really treat with this.

Quite recently, for last year and for this year, there have been several reports in the newspapers and on the news about police killings. And, the community is beginning to ask questions. Why is this happening so often? And, the police and “batch brothers” always have an excuse as to, “Well the criminal shot at me first and then I fired in return”. Then there is no real evidence; people are looking for the real evidence and mothers are crying out for justice. One of the excuses is, “They aimed at me first and I fired back,” or you will hear in the news report: “Will that person was a criminal anyway.” So, then members of the public would say, “He is better off dead, because he was a criminal.”

So, this is something that we need to look into, as it relates to rooting out these delinquent police officers from within the service and getting to the bottom of what really happened? Is there anybody, is there any protocol, are there any rules, any processes, as they relate to having an investigation, as to whether or not that criminal really had a firearm or if the police officer was just “trigger happy” and ready to shoot?

Now, on Sunday and Monday, I took the opportunity to go around to a couple police officers in Tobago, and some of the reports that I got from some of the SRPs, the Special Reserve Police, some of them said that they were only trained to pull out the gun. They did not receive training in using a baton or in handcuffing people. So when an altercation happen or whenever there is any confusion anywhere and they have to be on the scene, the first action is to pull out your gun. So, I think that is something that needs to be looked into, because police officers would need training in conflict resolution and in anger management—you treat with different issues, differently. If you go on a scene, and the boys are smoking, and you do not see any gun and the boys run, there is no need to pull out your gun and start firing, and I have seen that. We need to find ways of treating with issues of the sort because you would not get answers from the members of the community. So this whole issue of confidence is critical to crime fighting in Trinidad and Tobago. [*Desk thumping*]

Now, Mr. President, Miss Gillian Lucky began to ask questions as to whether or not this thing is about lip service and it begs the question of this whole crime fighting that the Government has been promulgating. Is it just about making the Government look good, or are they really serious about crime? Take for instance, the state of emergency. The state of emergency was instituted by the People’s Partnership Government, and Gillian Lucky reported in that November article of the *Guardian*, that things got a little worse under the state of emergency. There were allegations of police brutality, there were fabrications of charges, planting of

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. CUDJOE]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

evidence on suspects, persons, and property, and concealment of serious crime. All to give the idea to the public that the police were doing a wonderful job and the state of emergency was working. So you find police fabricating charges, planting evidence on people and on their property, and concealing serious crimes, just to give people the idea that the state of the emergency was working.

So, Gillian Lucky called on us to take note of these things. And it begs the question, it makes you wonder, is the police service in bed with the Government? If this is real or if this is just a perception, it does not augur well for this institution that is supposed to protect and serve all of us. I really think that, as Sen. Drayton said, the Government and political parties need to stay out of police business. It begs the question as to whether or not this Government has the political will to do the things it said it would have done, as it relates to crime. There are several people who say, “no” to that question.

I listened to former Senator Mary King, on Monday, and she was speaking about the Government’s lack of political will to treat with crime, especially, crimes against children, that the focus has just been about PR, and it begs the question as to whether or not this is true. One of the few things that Deputy Commissioner of Police Ewatski said, when he came into the police service—this is an interview with the *Guardian*—he was pleasantly surprised by the amount of training and the position of the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service. He said that they were set on a very good foundation. And I remembered seeing an interview on Channel 6 News, where Mr. Jack Ewatski questioned the political will of the Government to really treat with crime. So, I think all of us are asking now, does this Government really have the political will? Are they putting their money where their mouth is as it relates to treating with crime?

Well, the Prime Minister’s political guru and the founder of the UNC told us, “no” that they have no clue what they are doing; where is the crime plan? I feel the need for this Government to prove the critics wrong and to really, show us—not just show us—the crime plan. But, do whatever is necessary to bring crime.

Now, this Government came into power on a wave of hope and expectation, because of the kinds of things that they would have promised. This Government promised to treat with crime and to treat with the economy; they had all the answers. As a matter of fact, the Prime Minister told us, “If we lose, blood would run in our streets”. They won by a landslide and blood is still running in the streets.

8.45 p.m.

Mr. President, I point to the *Newsday* of January 20, 2012. I quote:

“Stemming blood tide

The country, less than two months after the end of the state of emergency, is being bathed in blood. We have already had 26 murders in the land.”[*Interruption*]

Sen. Hinds: I did not see that.

Sen. S. Cudjoe: This was on January 20.

“About 21 of these were committed by guns. All of the victims were male. There were no murders in Tobago for the year so far, but murders were committed across Trinidad, with the majority being in the North and North-west. Eighteen of the victims were under 30 years.”

So, Mr. President, this People’s Partnership Government won by a landslide and blood is running in our streets and this is what you get. This is what happens when you politicize crime. I listened to the contributions by my fellow colleagues, and I wondered: are we treating with the real issues? Are we treating with the young people? Are we treating with the churches? Are we treating with the schools and making sure that crime is being handled in the way it is supposed to be?

The first thing you hear out of the Government is the People’s National Movement this, the People’s National Movement that. Two years after and you are still talking about the People’s National Movement. [*Desk thumping*]

Sen. Hinds: “Dats true, dats right!”

Sen. S. Cudjoe: Mr. President, the people of Trinidad and Tobago dealt with us on May 24, 2010 and that is why we are over here and that is why they are there.

Sen. George: You said that before.

Sen. S. Cudjoe: Let me make my contribution and you will make yours at your time.

Sen. Hinds: Mr. President, the leader of the House is disturbing my colleague.

Sen. S. Cudjoe: Mr. President, they had all the plans for crime, they had all the answers for crime before they came into Government. Now that they are in Government, what now? You are still wasting time talking about the PNM. It is the same People’s National Movement that has been in power in Tobago for the past 10 years, and Tobagonians will tell you, “We doh have a murder rate like

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. CUDJOE]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

Trinidad does”. We do not and that is to tell you, it does not have much to do with crime. The same PNM that you say caused all this crime in Trinidad, what is going on in Tobago—something completely different. I cannot remember a year in Tobago that we had a murder rate over, let us say, 12. I cannot recall one of those years. I think it was in 2009 or 2010, we came to 11.

Sen. George: What is the population in Tobago?

Sen. S. Cudjoe: Fifty thousand people and it still does not work. It does not make sense. Treat with the issues, get into your homes, get into your schools and do what it is you are supposed to do. Last year, close to 360-something murders in Trinidad and four in Tobago; this January; 38 in Trinidad, 0 in Tobago.

Mr. President, it tells you something about your community. It tells you something about your policing. It tells you something about the way people raise their children. It tells you something about the way people operate in their neighbourhoods. It tells you something about Tobago that is significantly different from Trinidad, that does not have anything to do with politics. So when we come here and we politicize this thing and we count how many murders and so forth, you could count murders but the criminal out there with the mind to kill or the mind to do something naughty or nasty is going to do it.

We sit here counting crimes and we do not think about rape, we do not think about these hideous crimes against children. For instance, sometime last week, a gentleman in Tobago cut the wrist of his child. And you know what. It is the same thing Mary King was saying on Monday. This Government do not raise alarm on these things. This is not their concern. If it is not something to make them look good, we do not hear them screaming out and crying about it. You may hear Sen. St. Rose-Greaves or some of the others. But, for the most part, the people who are supposed to be crying out about this, have nothing to say. The hon. Minister Cadiz and the others who used to strike about crime in the days of the People’s National Movement you, do not hear them now. Now, you are in Government, what are you doing? What are you saying?

Sen. George: Continue talking man, go ahead!

Sen. S. Cudjoe: Anyway, funny right? “You in de driver’s seat, I in the back seat” and for some reason, I feel like I am being driven by drunkards. [*Crosstalk and interruption*]

Sen. George: Vice versa!

Sen. Hinds: Bad driving! Bad driving! [*Desk thumping*] I like that line.

Sen. S. Cudjoe: They boasted about the SoE. They said, “We took the stand to institute a state of emergency, something that the PNM did not have the balls to do.” They told us for the business community—[*Crosstalk and interruption*]

Hon. Senator: Who said that?

Sen. Beckles: That word is unparliamentary?

Sen. George: Mr. President, please!

Mr. President: In the context, I will ask you, Senator, to withdraw the remark.

Sen. S. Cudjoe: Thank you. No problem, Mr. President. “We instituted an SoE, something that the People’s National Movement did not have the strength or the temerity to do.” [*Interruption*] Mr. President, they are in the driver’s seat now and as I said, I feel like I am being driven by drunkards; people that had puncheon for breakfast, lunch and dinner. That is how I feel.

So, Mr. President, let me go on. They boasted and said that they instituted a state of emergency. When the thing hit the fan, they said, “No, the police instituted the state of emergency. “ Assistant Commissioner of Police, Mr. Ewatski, had to come to in the press and say, “You know what, we had nothing to do with a state of emergency. We do not have the authority to do that.” [*Desk thumping*]

Sen. George: Mr. President, on a point of order. Standing Order 35(4), “Insulting language”—“We are in the driver’s seat and I am being driven by drunkards.”

Sen. Hinds: Oh, that was a long time ago, man! We passed that about 10 minutes ago. Time is of the essence. Mr. President, do not trouble yourself with that.

Sen. George: But the Senator repeated it.

Sen. Hinds: Nothing is wrong with that.

Mr. President: I will allow that to pass, I do not think that the Senator was referring to a specific individual.

Sen. Hinds: “Dats” right, although it might sound so.

Sen. S. Cudjoe: Thank you, Mr. President, for your fairness. [*Crosstalk and Interruption*]

Sen. Hinds: It sounds like that, but it “wasn’t” that.

Sen. S. Cudjoe: Anyway, I will go on.

Sen. Hinds: I could understand the sensitivity around it.

Sen. George: Me sensitive?

Sen. S. Cudjoe: Mr. President, they called on the business community to “hold tight, we would have economic growth after this”. “Make the sacrifice, take this bullet for your country. Things are going to be all right afterwards. This People’s Partnership Government told us, “Don’t worry about it, the police is getting itself together. They are going to be ready to handle crime after the state of emergency.” These were the things that this Government told us.

Sen. Hinds: Yes!

Sen. S. Cudjoe: And all the intelligence that they had during the state of emergency, where is all of that intelligence now? Pure “dunceness”! [*Desk thumping*]

Mr. President, this Government instituted upon this country a state of emergency that not even “dey” took seriously. The Government itself did not take the state of emergency seriously. How do you expect the people or the police to take the state of emergency seriously? We are under a state of emergency, the Prime Minister “gone” away on a trip, the Commissioner of Police in Brazil, 69 police officers went to the US for a marching competition. “I cyah vex with dem, dey came third.” Police locking up people without evidence. How could I take this Government serious when it comes to treating with crime? Every week they come here wearing this little flag on their chest and talking to us about balisier tie, wearing these little lapels to tell me, “Oh, we love this country so much.” If you love this country so much, you would not be doing half the foolishness you are doing. [*Desk thumping*]

Mr. President, I will tell you something. While this Government is trying to run this country by PR, you cannot solve crime by PR. I remember during the state of emergency, Mr. Wayne Myster and other members of the police coming each day on the TV to give us a report. One of the officers knew it was such a joke, she used to smile and read the report to us.

Mr. President, I will tell you something. This whole crime fighting—not even crime fighting—everything about this Government is about public relations. [*Desk thumping*] At the end of the day, it is to make the Government look good.

It is about fighting an election. It is about trying to get votes. [*Crosstalk*] Now, they have launched a new campaign. When the country is crying out now about crime, you hear Members of this Government start saying, “That is the reason why crime is so high because the People’s National Movement did not support the hanging Bill”. According to the hon. Minister of Sport, he said, “These criminals need a good pop neck”. Pop whose neck? Hang who? How is are you hanging criminals if you cannot catch them? [*Desk thumping*] How the police hanging criminals and putting away criminals if you cannot even catch them. [*Interruption*]

Sen. George: Sen. Hinds was catching “dem” when he was the junior Minister in the Ministry of National Security.

Sen. S. Cudjoe: Mr. President, I cannot hear myself. [*Crosstalk*] And you are supposed to be the Leader of Government Business. I miss Mr. Panday.

Anyway, Mr. President, the thing about crime in this country is that criminals do not have a fear of getting caught. At the end of the day, you have to catch the criminals to put them in jail, you have to catch the criminals to hang them. So I think that there are a few measures, a few steps that this Government can take towards improving the crime-fighting capabilities of the police and so forth. All the time that you have spent in doing PR and in the public eye and taking all these pictures, Minister of— [*Crosstalk*] Jealous of the People’s Partnership? Funny! You need to be in a stand-up tent somewhere.

Sen. Hinds: Do not take him on.

Sen. S. Cudjoe: I heard Sen. Ramnarine speak about this Minister of the People and Social Development—Hon. Dr. Glenn Ramadharsingh. All of the people who are working in that Ministry are complaining, “If we go out to do a project or to give something to somebody, we have to wait for the media to get there. “ I witnessed this same Government deliver a pizza to somebody who lost their father in a mudslide. The people lost everything—lost their parent, lost clothes, lost food, and this Government showed up with a pizza.

Sen. Hinds: It did not have the Prime Minister’s face on the box? [*Laughter*]

Sen. S. Cudjoe: So, at the end of the day, public relations cannot run a country, public relations cannot solve crime. I find the new advertisement in the newspapers where the police is telling us what they are doing informative, I find it educational. But, Mr. President, these advertisements do not mean anything to us if we are not seeing the effects on the ground. If we are not seeing the police

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. CUDJOE]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

working and feeling the police work on the ground and seeing crime subsiding, these advertisements make no sense to us. Mr. President, since when do the police put an advertisement in the newspaper to tell me that they are working for me? I have never seen that before, but under this Government, as Destra said last year,” anything goes, anything goes. “

Sen. Hinds: That would not be Mr. Sandy’s idea.

Sen. S. Cudjoe: Mr. President, as I close, it would be remiss of me if I did not bring these issues to the Parliament. These are some of the points given to me by the many police officers to whom I spoke in Tobago. [*Desk thumping*]

Sen. Hinds: Oh, yes. You consulted with the members of the police service. Consultation!

Sen. S. Cudjoe: Mr. President, whilst the Attorney General boasted about training more police officers in a shorter space of time than the PNM, the people who are undergoing the training are saying that the training is happening too fast, the turnover is too fast, and they are not being trained in certain things that they need to know. They are not being trained properly.

9.00 p.m.

So it is like you are trying to make a date to have them—I think they call it pass-out—and they are not getting to learn everything that they are supposed to learn. So I feel the need to encourage the Minister and whoever is responsible for—[*Interruption*]

Sen. Brig. Sandy: Mr. President, that is not true, the curriculum has been extended.

Sen. S. Cudjoe: That is no problem, the curriculum has been extended on paper, Mr. President, but I am telling—if I lie, I lie after persons who are being trained who spoke to me. What about the officers who told me that they were not trained in handcuff use, using the baton and conflict resolution so that they can solve issues without pulling out their gun?

For instance, the 21st Century Policing Initiative that this People’s Partnership Government said that they rolled out—[*Interruption*]

Sen. Hinds: “Dat man was ah soldier, he knows nothing about de police!”

Sen. S. Cudjoe:—in Tobago and in central. When they started it in Tobago, Mr. President, they had to stop because they did not have all the necessary equipment and so forth to train them. So why we seeing in the newspapers that all

this training in 21st Century policing is happening in Tobago. When they started they had to stop, but that was not reported. I mean it is good to take advice, to take recommendations, at least to listen.

Sen. Hinds: Yes.

Sen. S. Cudjoe: You say you are a caring Government, you listen and then you lead. “Gimme ah break!”

Mr. President, as it relates to response time, some of these officers complained about the station being understaffed sometimes and depending on the ranking of the officers who are in the station at the time, they cannot go out. For instance, SRPs are not supposed to go out alone. They were trying to explain something to me as it relates to a sergeant and a corporal. If one of them does not show up—I did not get that one too clearly, so I will leave that alone.

Mr. President, I will tell you something about the drivers. Whilst we are saying that we are providing all these vehicles to the police service, not enough persons are trained in driving. Even though you are trained to drive your own car and you have a driver’s permit and so forth, there is a certain kind of defensive driving that you learn in policing to drive that police vehicle. Sometimes when persons call and they do not have a driver on hand, maybe the driver would have been sick that day or so, but it makes it difficult for them to go out into the community, or go out on their crime fighting. So sometimes the easiest response is when you call the police you hear them say “We have no vehicles.” Then somebody would come in the newspapers the following day and say it is not true, we have vehicles, but at the end of the day, Mr. President, the real issue is not enough persons being trained in defensive driving, to drive the police car and to use equipment—

Sen. Hinds: “PNM produced 3,000 vehicles, so dey hah vehicles, buh no drivers.”

Sen. S. Cudjoe: Mr. President, the officers were also concerned about relieving police officers of administrative duties, because when you call the police station, the same persons are responsible for fighting crime and so forth, they are responsible for answering the phone. So I am hoping that we could setup a call centre, something like 911 or so, like they have in the US. A call centre where persons are trained to do that specific kind of work to take a report properly and thoroughly, so that the persons who are trained in crime fighting can really go out there and get the job done.

Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
[SEN. CUDJOE]

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

Mr. President, some of these problems are not only attributed under the People's Partnership Government, some of these things existed under the PNM. When you get into government you have to find ways to improve what you met there. You are not going get everything right. We did not get everything right. You are not going to get everything right. The persons who come after you are not going to get everything right. The national development is a continuous process, technology is going improve, persons are going to need more training, you are going need to update your equipment and so forth. So I am not trying to make a show, I am just offering a little advice—[*Interruption*]

Sen. Hinds: Well appreciated. [*Desk thumping*]

Sen. S. Cudjoe:—and delivering the points I was asked to deliver. Now, Mr. President, another problem we have is facilities, for instance, I think they call it specimens and exhibits. When police officers have to go to court and let us say a marijuana or a specific—[*Interruption*]

Sen. Hinds: Forensic exhibit.

Sen. S. Cudjoe:—forensic exhibit, yes, forensic exhibit is in involved, now, that officer has to fly to Trinidad and “go get it”, bring it back to Tobago, and if the case is postponed, has to fly it back to Trinidad to put it back in the storage facility. When the case is called again you have to travel back and forth to get that. So as I had recommended in the DNA debate, Mr. President, I am hoping that at some point in time we can set up that kind of facility in Tobago, because it takes time, it would probably be a day or a half day for that officer to travel to Trinidad, get the exhibit and so forth.

One more thing. I think this is being addressed in 21stCentury Policing Initiative, many officers are complaining that that uniform is just too hot, it is uncomfortable, it is not practical for them to do running up and down and doing whatever it is they do out there in the sun sometimes. So there are small changes that do not require any major set of money or so forth, but if we can listen to the views of the persons who work for us, I think that we can get a better job done.

Sen. Hinds: Brigadier only—[*Inaudible*]

Sen. S. Cudjoe: For me, Mr. President, bigger than all these little things, as I said in the beginning, it is about restoring confidence and I really hope that this 21stCentury Policing Initiative achieves that. If we achieve nothing else, we need to restore that confidence, Mr. President, so that police would be able to get some of these crimes solved.

I find it interesting, Mr. President, because this Government reported savings on the Witness Protection Programme, and that is a problem. When persons offer up information to the police sometimes they need a certain kind of protection. So we need to invest as much as we can in national security, in the Witness Protection Programme, in the Victim Protection Programme if we really want to see things done and if we really want to achieve the things that we want to achieve.

You can tell the public all the wonderful things—I listened to the Prime Minister as she delivered on January 24, and she reported all the wonderful things that she claimed is happening in crime, that the People’s Partnership Government had brought down this, had brought down that, and I recognized the only person in the back clapping her on was Minister Moonilal. And that is to tell you, Mr. President, all the other members of the Government did not even believe the things she was saying, some of them were looking at her like, are you serious?

Hon. Senators: Ah! Ah! Ah!

Sen. S. Cudjoe: So, Mr. President, I would really like to see—[*Interruption and laughter*—these things really happen, one can see it on the ground. If you are saying you are fighting crime, we want to feel it. [*Interruption*] Leave them alone, Mr. President, they want to shut me up, but they cannot.

Sen. Hinds: “Dats how dey react to the truth.” [*Desk thumping and interruption*]

Sen. S. Cudjoe: “Dey cannot handle it, Mr. President. You know what, if yuh doh know how to run de country get out!” Anyway as stated by the Director of the Police Complaints Authority, if the Police Complaints Authority is not able to really make an impact as it relates to providing disciplinary measures and really making sure that these officers are disciplined, we need to find a way to probably setup an independent authority, an independent body to treat with these rogue officers, because a couple bad apples in the bunch can spoil the whole thing.

Mr. President with those few words I hope this Government that promised to listen and lead would have listened, and even if “yuh shame to say yuh gonna take my advice, go behind my back and do it. You might end up with good results.

With that said, Mr. President, thank you. [*Desk thumping*]

Adjournment

Tuesday, January 31, 2012

ADJOURNMENT

The Minister of Public Utilities (Sen. The Hon. Emmanuel George):Mr. President, I beg to move that this Senate do now adjourn to Tuesday, February 07, at 11.00 a.m., when we will continue the debate on the DNA legislation.

I beg to move.

Mr. President: Before I put the question, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Sen. Sherrie Ali [*Desk thumping*] on her maiden contribution. It was admirably short. Thank you.

Question put and agreed to.

Senate adjourned accordingly.

Adjourned at 9.09 p.m.

WRITTEN ANSWER TO ORAL QUESTION
Trinidad & Tobago Football Federation
(Financial Support of)

24. Sen. Fitzgerald Hinds asked the hon. Minister of Sport:

- A. Could the Minister indicate whether financial support has been directed to the Trinidad and Tobago Football Federation and its predecessor organization(s) by his Ministry; and any other entity under the purview of his Ministry, for each of the past five (5) years?
- B. Could the Minister indicate the total cash contribution given to the Trinidad and Tobago Football Federation, in the run-up to and towards the efforts of our national football team for qualification in the last World Cup campaign?

The Minister of Sport (Hon. Anil Roberts): Mr. President, with regard to Part (A) of the question, financial support provided to the TTFB by the Minister and the entity under its purview, the Sports Company of Trinidad and Tobago Limited, for 2007-2012, is detailed below:

Year	Ministry of Sport (\$)	SportTT (\$)	Total Funds
2007	12,342,000	7,883,244.89	20,225,244.89
2008	540,300	1,486,990	2,027,290
2009		1,140,854	1,140,854
2010		900,500	900,500
2011	8,000,000	670,160	8,670,160
2012	3,000,000		3,000,000
TOTAL	23,882,300	12,081,748.89	35,964,048.89

Mr. President, with regard to Part (B) of the question, please be advised that no cash contributions were given to the TTFB toward the effort of the National Team for qualification in the last World Cup campaign.

Mr. President, I thank you.