

Oath of Allegiance

Friday, April 24, 1992

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 24, 1992

The House met at 1.30 p.m.

PRAYERS

[MADAM SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. A.N.R. Robinson took and subscribed the Oath of Allegiance as required by law.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Madam Speaker: Hon. Members, I have excused from today's sitting the hon. Member for St. Ann's East.

PETITION

Universal African Improvement Association

Mr. Hedwige Breaux (*La Brea*): Madam Speaker, I beg leave of this honourable House to present a humble petition on behalf of the members of the Universal African Improvement Association, who are desirous of constituting the Association into a corporate body by private bill.

I now request that the Clerk be allowed to read the petition.

Petition read.

Question put and agreed to, That the promoters be allowed to proceed.

PAPERS LAID

1. The Immigration (Amendment) Regulations, 1992. [*The Minister of National Security (Hon. Russell Huggins)*]
2. Annual Report of the Central Bank of Trinidad and Tobago for the year ended December 31, 1991. [*The Minister of Local Government and Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Hon. Kenneth Valley)*]
3. Annual Economic Survey of the Central Bank of Trinidad and Tobago for the year ended December 31, 1991. [*Hon. K. Valley*]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

**Rental of Vehicles
(WASA)**

16. Mr. Trevor Sudama (*Oropouche*) asked the Minister of Public Utilities:

Could the Minister state:

- (a) How many vehicles are now rented by WASA and from which firm/s they are rented?
- (b) The annual cost of such rental and whether such rental outlay includes the cost of maintenance of these vehicles?
- (c) The annual cost of maintenance of the WASA vehicles displaced by those which are now rented?

The Minister of Public Utilities (Hon. Morris Marshall): Madam Speaker, there are 83 vehicles rented by the Water and Sewerage Authority. In this regard 71 are rented from Auto Rentals Limited and 12 vehicles are rented from Southern Sales and Services Company Limited.

The annual cost of such rental, which includes maintenance, is \$3,099,480. The annual historical cost to WASA for maintaining the 24 vehicles that were displaced is \$336,000. These vehicles, however, are not now in service so that there are no actual maintenance costs being incurred.

Mr. Sudama: Could the Minister tell this House which is the parent company of Auto Rentals Limited?

Mr. Marshall: Madam Speaker, I really do not know.

Mr. Sudama: In view of the fact that the annual cost of maintenance of the displaced WASA vehicles was in the vicinity of \$336,000, could the Minister explain the rationale of his Ministry in renting vehicles, in fact, paying an annual rental outlay in addition to the maintenance costs and what that figure would have been? Because your answer to (b) included maintenance cost. I would like to find out from you what was the rental, exclusive of maintenance cost; and secondly what was the rationale of the Ministry in having these vehicles rented.

Mr. Marshall: Madam Speaker, it is difficult for me to give a response to the first supplemental question, that is to say, what would have been the maintenance cost separate and apart from the rental cost. You see it is a package and the cost

of maintenance is in fact built in to the cost of rental. That is the first point. In terms of the question of if you had purchased, the information that I have is that it would have cost about \$10,335,713.33, if you are talking about a one-year period. Of course, there will be additional financial commitments, in terms of maintenance, in terms of interest, in terms of down-time cost, and so on, if one or two of the vehicles are laid up. The information is that on an annual basis you have had an additional \$4,207,713.33 per year.

1.40 p.m.

More than that, I would like also to draw to the attention of the hon. Member and, indeed, to this House, that this matter of the question of vehicle rental as opposed to purchase is a situation that is now being addressed very actively by the board. It is a matter that we inherited, quite frankly. There are concerns. I cannot say at this particular point in time which route to go, whether we should purchase or whether we should rent. It is a matter that we are pursuing. The matter will be actively pursued; it will be thoroughly investigated and based on the data and information coming through, if it is in the best interest of the utility and, indeed, in the best interest of the country that we purchase, that is the route we are going to go. But it is a matter which we have inherited and there is a whole report on it and we cannot easily disengage from it at this particular point in time. The matter is being viewed very seriously and we are going to take a decision on that in the not too distant future.

Mr. Sudama: Am I to assume from the Minister that in terms of purchase versus rental, the Ministry of Public Utilities came to the conclusion, whenever this decision was made, that it was in the interest of the Government to rent rather than to purchase?

Mr. Marshall: No, I am not saying that. This is a matter which was initiated about two years ago. Actually, there was a committee that was established—I like to be very frank and straightforward and I am not prepared to play games—and apparently the committee took a position that it was in the interest of the utility to purchase, but for whatever reasons, a decision other than that took place, based on what we inherited.

I do not like to talk too much about the past. The reality is that this is what has happened and we are looking at it now. It is no sense dealing with what transpired before. It would influence what we are doing to avoid making the errors of the past, but we are not going to be engaged in too much of what

Oral Answers To Questions
[HON. M. MARSHALL]

Friday, April 24, 1992

transpired before. That is the reality; it is a matter which we inherited; it took place about two years ago; we are looking at it very actively. As I said before, we are going to take a precise decision on this particular matter as soon as we come up with some conclusion in terms of what is the best direction in which we should go.

Mr. Sudama: Madam Speaker, the past makes the present and the fact that we are in this situation today is as a result of decisions which were taken. But I want to ask a question. You stated that your committee of the Ministry of Public Utilities recommended purchase, but due to other reasons, other interventions, the decision was made to rent. Could you say whether that intervention was as a result of a decision made by the Minister of Public Utilities at the time?

Mr. Marshall: I would not wish to make that statement. It is really very difficult for me to say. I cannot say it was a directive of the then Minister. I would be dishonest if I say that. I really cannot say.

Mr. Sudama: You must have records.

Mr. Marshall: I cannot, at this time, say that. But obviously there was a Minister who was responsible and a certain kind of decision was taken which incurred certain kinds of expenses and the responsibility ought to rest somewhere. But if you are asking me to say whether there was a definitive directive from the then Minister, it will be very difficult for me to say at this point in time.

Mr. Sudama: I am asking whether there was intervention by the then Minister to influence the decision. That is what I am asking.

Mr. Marshall: Madam Speaker, I have really tried to respond as best as I possibly can on this particular matter.

WASA
(Equitable Billing)

21. Mr. Sahid Hosein (*Siparia*) asked the Minister of Public Utilities:

Can the Minister indicate whether WASA is doing anything to ensure that there is an equitable system of billing for its services given the fact that some areas receive a seven-day supply of water and others a one-day supply with persons in both areas being charged the same rates?

The Minister of Public Utilities (Hon. Morris Marshall): Madam Speaker, WASA has advised that it recognizes the fact that given the different levels of

service in various areas, the strict adherence to billing based on existing rates, could result in inequities. It is the intention of WASA to introduce, as quickly as possible, a universal metering system, the details of which are being finalized. This system will ensure that billings are consistent with service provided.

I want to say as well, that this matter of inequitable billing arrangements is also being addressed at the level of the Public Utilities Commission, because there is, indeed, a rate application before the Commission at this time.

Mr. Hosein: Madam Speaker, given the fact that we have been hearing about this metering arrangement for years, can the hon. Minister indicate, if he possibly can, how soon is, “as quickly as possible”?

Mr. Marshall: A very important question, Madam Speaker. Unfortunately, I cannot give you a precise time at this point. It is my intention, not too far away, to come to this House and provide you with, not only the issue of metering, but a comprehensive approach to dealing with the problems facing us at the Water and Sewerage Authority. I understand the concerns coming through and they are very valid concerns. I have made this point repeatedly. The problems at WASA are not going to go away overnight. They are very chronic and serious problems and right now we are formulating an action plan which will deal with the problems, metering and otherwise, on a long-term basis. We are also coming up with a short-term approach and, very shortly, I will be able to come to this Parliament and say something precisely about that. But it is really very difficult for me at this time to give you a precise time, but we realize it is a very serious matter. The only way you can deal with the question of the inequitable approach in treating with billings is to meter, so that people are actually going to pay for what they are, in fact, using. But I cannot, at this time, give you that kind of information.

WRITTEN ANSWER TO QUESTION

Justices of the Peace

The following question was asked by Mr. Subhas Panday (Naparima):

- 23.** Would the Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs state the names and addresses of persons who were made Justices of the Peace during the period 1976 to 1992?

Vide end of sitting for written answer.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Community Upgrade Programme

25. *The following question stood on the Order Paper in the name of Mr. Trevor Sudama (Oropouche).*

Could the Minister state:

- (a) Whether a provision was made in the 1991 Budget for a programme entitled, "The Community Upgrade Programme of the Prime Minister's Office"?
- (b) How many projects were undertaken under this programme according to constituencies and how were these projects identified?
- (c) What was the total expenditure on these projects and whether such expenditures were in conformity with existing financial and exchequer regulations?

The Minister of Local Government (Hon. Kenneth Valley): Madam Speaker, I do request an extension of one week for this question. Very simply, this question is to be answered by the Prime Minister's office, but of course, the notice got there late, given that it was directed to the Minister of Community Development, Culture and Women's Affairs.

Mr. Sudama: I just have one query. Because I was not here last week, am I to understand the answer was ready last week and is not ready this week?

Madam Speaker: I put no such interpretation on the hon. Member's reply.

Question, by leave, deferred.

Daniel Pinto v The State

26. Mr. Basdeo Panday (Couva North) asked the hon. Attorney General:

Would the Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs inform this honourable House whether his Government intends to comply with the decision of the Human Rights Committee of the United Nations (Communication No. 232 of 1987) pursuant to the decision of the said Committee in the matter of *Daniel Pinto v The State of Trinidad and Tobago* which decision was made pursuant to the provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of the United Nations?

The Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs (Hon. Keith Sobion): Madam Speaker, Trinidad and Tobago, having obtained full membership of the international community, is required to accept the existing international legal order. One of the most effective ways of honouring such membership is to adhere explicitly to those instruments which establish that order, to comply with their obligations and to take part in their operations and the work of their supervisory organs. Thus, in the interest of comity, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago would seek to comply with the views of the Human Rights Committee in the manner provided by the municipal law of Trinidad and Tobago.

The United Nations Human Rights Committee has given its views to the effect that prisoner Daniel Pinto was a victim of a violation of his human rights and that he is entitled to a remedy entailing his release from prison. The Human Rights Committee is neither a court nor a body with a quasi-judicial mandate and its decisions are therefore described as views, and not decisions. However, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago is not unmindful of the deliberations of this committee with respect to this particular matter.

In accordance with our municipal law, the power to release Daniel Pinto lies with the President of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, in accordance with sections 87 to 89 of the Constitution of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, since Pinto has exhausted all legal remedies now available to him. Consequently, the Attorney General has advised that the views of the Human Rights Committee be referred to the Advisory Committee on the power of pardon, established under section 88 of the Constitution, whose advice will then be submitted through the relevant Minister for consideration by the President. The President is the only legal authority who may validly exercise the power of pardon conferred by the Constitution.

The Attorney General has further advised that the death sentence be deferred, pending the determination and advice of the Advisory Committee.

1.50 p.m.

**Princes Town Police Station
(Construction of)**

27. Mr. Mohammed Haniff (*Princes Town*) asked the Minister of National Security:

Would the Minister state:

- (a) Whether the Government intends to construct a new police station in Princes Town?

Oral Answers To Questions
[MR. HANIFF]

Friday, April 24, 1992

- (b) If the answer is in the affirmative, would the Minister state when will work commence on this project, and what sums, if any, have been allocated for this project?

The Minister of National Security (Hon. Russell Huggins): Madam Speaker, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago is in the process of implementing, on a phased basis, a special programme to deal with, among others, the accommodation needs of the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service. It is proposed that this construction programme would be phased over a period of five years with construction of the Princes Town Police Station being one of the proposals to be implemented in the first phase, that is, 1992/1993.

The budget cost of this Princes Town project is being developed in consultation with the appropriate agencies. Commencement of construction will be arranged as soon as the preliminary planning for this proposal has been completed. Thank You.

**ADJOURNMENT MOTION
(LEAVE)**

Mr. John Humphrey (St. Augustine): Madam Speaker, in conformity with Standing Order 12, I delivered a letter to you requesting your leave to move a matter of urgent public importance. I shall read the letter:

"Dear Madam Speaker,

I shall be seeking your leave at today's sitting of the House to raise a matter of definite urgent public importance to wit the breaking of houses unlawfully in Bamboo No 3. to make room for a sewer system in conformity with an agreement between the Government of Trinidad and Tobago and the Inter-American Development Bank reached by the former regime "

Madam Speaker, the matter is definite because the project is being undertaken now. The land is being dug by an excavator to make room for the sewer pipes. It is urgent because in the next day or two, houses that are in the way of the trench will be demolished. It is of public importance because the Government is about to breach the Constitution and the law by breaking down the houses of these unsuspecting citizens.

I raise it because I have personal knowledge of a judgment that was delivered on a constitutional matter by Justice Deyalsingh that indicates that even though citizens may be squatters on state lands, the houses which they occupy on those

lands are their property and they are entitled to the protection of the law under the provision of the Constitution that ensures the enjoyment of property of all citizens not to be deprived thereof, except by due process of law. In this case, there has been no due process and these unsuspecting citizens are living in fear that the contractor will, with all his heavy equipment, demolish their houses and they will have no place to live. I was advised yesterday that one particular resident in the area has been there in excess of 30 years.

Madam Speaker, I want to suggest, if you give me the opportunity to do so at the appropriate time, that the Government desist from continuing with this project and I would like the opportunity to try to persuade the Government to renegotiate that agreement with the IADB in the interest of the people of this country.

Madam Speaker: The hon. Member is alleging that there is indeed a breach of due process I will grant leave for him to pursue the matter.

Hon. Members, the matter under consideration is that leave be granted for this matter to be raised.

Leave is now granted to the hon. Member to raise this as a matter of urgent public importance and the motion now stands adjourned until 6.00 p.m.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The Minister of Local Government and Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Hon. Kenneth Valley): Madam Speaker, I wish to seek leave of the House to take "Statements by Ministers", on the Order Paper at a later stage in today's proceedings.

Question put and agreed to.

2.00 p.m.

ELECTIONS AND BOUNDARIES COMMISSION

[THIRD DAY]

Order read for resuming adjourned debate on motion [February 28, 1992]:

Whereas several complaints and/or irregularities surfaced in the last General Elections which tend to indicate that the Elections and Boundaries Commission was not functioning adequately;

Be it resolved that this Honourable House recommend to the Government that it institute an immediate enquiry by an independent body into the operations of the Elections and Boundaries Commission;

And be it further resolved that the said body shall be comprised of persons to be appointed by the President after consultation with the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition;

And be it further resolved that the enquiry be held in public and its report submitted to Parliament within a period of not later than six months from the date of its appointment.

Question again proposed.

Mr. Ramesh Lawrence Maharaj (*Couva South*): Madam Speaker, when this motion was adjourned, you would recall that we were discussing the issue as to whether there should be the appointment of a commission of enquiry into the operations of the Elections and Boundaries Commission, having regard to the widespread complaints of irregularities which occurred during the last election. You would recall that in moving this motion, it was made quite clear that it arose as a result of the complaint of irregularities which occurred throughout Trinidad and Tobago. It was not based on the complaints of irregularities which occurred in constituencies which were won by the United National Congress.

The major irregularities which were described were deficiency in the registration exercise by the commission, in that persons who were entitled to vote were not on the list of electors; persons were being denied the right to vote. There was also the irregularity that the function of some of the returning officers, presiding officers, poll clerks and the procedure for this election were questionable. There were complaints that candidates' poll clerks were not permitted to scrutinize the election machinery.

I am doing this in order to show the background and to get the response from the other side to see what they have responded with. It was also mentioned that during the period before this debate started and after the election, that the Elections and Boundaries Commission was requested to provide any report which it conducted over the years in respect of any enquiry with regard to irregularities which occurred during elections.

You would recall that in moving the motion, I established before this House that complaints of irregularities—and the irregularities which I mentioned—surfaced in respect of the electoral administration in this country, over the last 30

years; that there were newspaper cuttings and quotations from the Elections and Boundaries Commission Reports. It clearly showed that not only did these reports exist, but even the newspaper editorials during the period called for investigation to have the matter redressed.

I also showed that the electoral history in this country showed that the political parties including the governing party and the leader made complaints about the machinery and requested change to be done so that people would be able to exercise that right to vote.

I quoted from the hon. Member for Diego Martin East—and he recognized that unless this machinery was corrected—from an article dated December 21, 1991 in the *Trinidad Guardian*; and this was written by him—he was not a Minister at the time—and I refer to it:

"For if a large number of voters are not allowed to exercise their franchise in the next election we may have a riot in this country and we have had enough violence....."

I am doing this in order to show that the other side has recognized the importance of people having the right to vote and being able to exercise it. Not only have they recognized that, in this debate, but also that irregularities exist.

I quoted from an article by the Member for Diego Martin West. Whilst he was in opposition, he said that it was important for the election machinery to work. In effect, he was hinting that if the Elections and Boundaries Commission did not function properly and adequately that the democratic process in our country would be jeopardized.

What do we have? In spite of all those recognitions and admissions and the fact that the motion raised an issue of great constitutional importance which affect the foundation of the electoral system in our country and a motion which cries out for machinery to redress the problem, what response did we have from the other side?

We have a response which in effect stated that we do not want to have any slur on the integrity or to offend in any way the members of the Elections and Boundaries Commission because they are an independent commission. What did the other side quote from the Constitution in order to support this?

I want to deal with that because I want to show that the other side is looking for excuses not to deal with the problem in the country. The problem which I am

Elections and Boundaries Commission

Friday, April 24, 1992

[MR. MAHARAJ]

dealing with now is a problem of electoral reform. They relied heavily on section 71 of the Constitution of Trinidad and Tobago. May I read section 71 (12):

"In the exercise of its functions under this section the Commission shall not be subject to the direction or control of any other person or authority."

That section is talking about the Elections and Boundaries Commission.

What the other side is saying is that if you appoint a commission of enquiry to investigate the complaints of irregularities, you would be interfering; you would in effect be directing or controlling the exercise of the Elections and Boundaries Commission. Is that reasonable?

In my respectful submission that cannot be correct. As a matter of fact, this commission of enquiry, if the other side agrees with it, would not be directing or controlling the commission in the exercise of its function.

What are the functions of the Elections and Boundaries Commission? The functions are the registration of voters and the conduct of elections. The commission of enquiry would not be either directing or controlling the Elections and Boundaries Commission in the exercise of their function to register or to conduct the election. What the commission of enquiry would be doing will be investigating the manner in which the facts that exist, on which the commission has to exercise their function in determining whether there are enough resources and why it is that the functions cannot be exercised. The commission of enquiry would then have to make recommendations as to whether the law should be changed or resources have to be given. When one looks at the motion, one sees that it is to investigate, not to direct or control but to investigate.

What I want to find out is if that submission is correct, the Police Service Commission is an independent commission. The Police Service Commission under the Police Service Act has the power to investigate a police officer and allegations; so that if the Government appoints a commission of enquiry to investigate allegations made by a police officer, is that commission of enquiry usurping the functions of the Police Service Commission? No! Or is it directing or controlling the exercise of the Police Service Commission? No! But, when it is convenient for the Government to investigate they can say, yes they investigated. When it is not convenient, they do not want to investigate.

2.10 p.m.

It is recognized that a public enquiry is an instrument employed by Government with the ultimate aim of redressing a public grievance and injustice. Governments have a moral duty to employ these enquiries when the public welfare demands it. A public enquiry forms part of the fabric of administrative functions and duties of a government and that function must be exercised to serve and account to the people, and to redress injustices.

If it is correct—as the other side has agreed that it is correct—that these complaints exist, it is quite apparent that the Elections and Boundaries Commission, for one reason or another, has not been able to deal with them. It is undisputed that people who are entitled to vote do not get to exercise that right due to the effect of the machinery. Is it not a serious duty placed upon the Government for the welfare, and in the interest of the people, in the interest of the security and public welfare of the people of the country, to ensure that something positive is done so that people can get their due? Why is there such a reluctance to have the operations of the elections machinery under public scrutiny, so that the public can see what is happening and to have some input? Why are obstacles being created to prevent people from having the right to enjoy that right to vote? I do not understand the reason.

I have not only listened to the hon. Member for Diego Martin West, but I took the trouble to read his address to this House three or four times and in his address, he said that nobody on that side challenged the evidence as presented by the mover of the motion. He said that the problem had to do with competence on the day of the elections. He also said that they agreed that there were problems with the electoral system; that there was need for improvement; he also said that they were not disputing the fact that there had been problems on elections day. Notwithstanding that, the Hon. Attorney General answered and questioned the motive in filing the motion. We did not take any objection to that. He referred to comments I made in my contribution, which comments he said gave the impression that we were challenging the results of the elections. Any reading—and with the greatest respect to the Hon. Attorney General—of the motion would see that this motion is not challenging the results of the general elections. If the results of the elections in any constituency had to be challenged, one knows that the court is the only institution to do that. This motion is not to challenge the

results of the elections; this motion is to challenge what occurred on a national scale in relation to the irregularities and complaints in order to find out what has happened and to determine what machinery should be employed in order to improve the system. This is what this motion is about.

I think I committed one of the gravest political sins in this House according to the other side, when I mentioned in my contribution that the elections results showed that the United National Congress was deprived being the Government by about 7,000 votes. That seemed to have angered the other side to such an extent that it has affected their responses in this matter. It could never be a political sin to speak the truth and when one looks at the report of the Elections and Boundaries Commission for 1991, one sees at page 283—I am doing so to demonstrate that it is a political fact in Trinidad and Tobago that the PNM Government was able to govern this country because they got 7,081 votes more in five constituencies. I am not saying that to say that the results were wrong. What I am saying is that it is important for the elections machinery to be above suspicion: it is important for it to be like Caesar's wife.

From that result, it would show that in Ortoire/Mayaro the PNM—7,528, the UNC—6,013, the NAR—2,563, and the PNM won by 1515 votes. In Pointe-a-Pierre, PNM won by 192 votes; in Tunapuna, the PNM won by 2,699 votes; in St. Joseph, the PNM won by 1,312; in Barataria, the PNM won by 1,363—a total of 7,081 votes in those five constituencies. So that it is not a political sin to mention the truth. The fact of the matter is that if something is wrong, it is wrong, whichever side it benefits.

Madam Speaker, the Hon. Attorney General said that these are mere administrative irregularities. He finds it very difficult to accept that whatever name one calls it, the fact of the matter is that irregularities occur. What is the result? What happens as a result of the irregularities is that people who have a right are denied that right and when people are denied the right to vote that is not an injustice against that person alone; that is an injustice against everyone in the society. Everyone must feel that injustice, and when we have a system which produces that result, it contaminates and pollutes the electoral machinery in a country. An election cannot be said to be free and fair if you have a machinery which is polluted and contaminated by administrative deficiencies.

May I say that I congratulate the Member for Tobago East in that he has displayed that he is truly committed to the parliamentary traditions in this country in that he has occupied his seat and has decided to perform a role in this

*Elections and Boundaries Commission**Friday, April 24, 1992*

[MR. MAHARAJ]

Parliament. We, as one of the Opposition parties in this House, conducted an enquiry. We came here, as is our duty under the Standing Orders, to put pressure on the Government to appoint an enquiry. The other side has not told us—neither the Attorney General nor anyone else. I do not know whether they had to get the permission of the co-Prime Minister of the country, Dr. Saith, but no one has told us—

2.20 p.m.

Mr. Bereaux: Madam Speaker, on a point of order. I think the hon. Member for Couva South knows that he should not make a remark like that.

Mr. Maharaj: I was thinking aloud, I am very sorry.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. Member retract that statement?

Mr. Maharaj: The hon. Member probably would agree with me, but if he is offended by that, I am sorry.

Madam Speaker, neither the Attorney General, nor any of the Government Ministers who have spoken, has stated in this House in such a serious motion, in an issue which affects the rights of the poor man, the ordinary man that the Government has decided on its own to conduct an enquiry the nature of that enquiry. What is the evidence? What are the findings of that enquiry? Give us the reasons for the findings. They have not been able to produce any enquiry into any of the complaints.

Madam Speaker, if our parliamentary system is based on a response from the Government, how can a reasonable person say that no response is a response? Then we had the response from the hon. Member for La Brea, and what did he say? He said that this is an independent commission and if you appoint a commission of enquiry to investigate these irregularities, there will be parliamentary coercion on the members of the Elections and Boundaries Commission.

I find it very difficult to accept that on any interpretation it could be considered that if a commission of enquiry is asked to investigate irregularities in order to assist a commission in functioning that it can be said that it is coercing them in the exercise of their power to direct them or control them in registration on voters or in the conduct of election. Nobody is going to tell them how to register voters.

Mr. Breaux: On a point of order, Madam Speaker. The Member for Couva South is misquoting me. I did not say there would be parliamentary coercion. What I said was that the manner in which the Elections and Boundaries Commission was appointed was to prevent it from succumbing to parliamentary coercion. I referred at that time to the fact that the sums of money, the salaries, the money paid to the commissioners was charged on the Consolidated Fund.

Mr. Maharaj: Madam Speaker, even if that is so, I have read it and I do not want to waste some of my valuable time, but even if what he is saying—the fact that there are moneys—nobody is denying that they are members of an independent commission, nobody is denying that, nobody could tell them how to do their duties. But anyone would know a commission of enquiry is to ascertain facts. A commission of enquiry has no power to direct anybody what to do. It is after the report, if the Government wants to accept the report and change the law, they will change the law if it needs changing. But these are all smokescreens and I do not want to indulge in that. What I want to do is I want to show this House that, in effect, there has been no answer to this motion.

Do you know what the hon. Member for La Brea said? One sees that they have reached a certain point in the journey, but they do not have the courage to take the plunge. Hear what he said:

"Commissions of enquiry, they are put together for the purpose of dealing with matters of immense public importance. I want to support the Members on the other side, who indicate that irregularities and complaints with respect to elections are of immense public importance."

Hear what he said again, and I am reading it:

"I recognize and agree with the hon. Members of the Opposition that matters having to do with elections of representatives of the people are of paramount importance and must be seen to be without blemish, as they are the very foundation upon which our democratic society rests. In circumstances when reports are made concerning election irregularities, every effort must be made to ensure that the complaints are dealt with in accordance with the law."

But what does he recommend? He moves an amendment that we should give the Commission more resources and he says that if you give the Commission more money, more resources, these problems would be solved. Well, this Commission, whether it is these members or others, for the past 30 years, have been getting money. They got money and the problems have been happening. It is because

Elections and Boundaries Commission
[MR. BÉREAU]

Friday, April 24, 1992

money and resources have not been able to solve the problem, that shows the importance of the motion. That shows why the motion should be regarded as being a weapon which can be used to solve the problem, to attack the problem.

Madam Speaker, if the other side thinks that by voting against this motion they are, in effect, spiting the Opposition, taking a point against the Opposition, they are making a serious mistake, because when they vote against this motion, they are voting against the people of Trinidad and Tobago. This is a motion which transcends political party affiliation. This motion involves the human race. So when this motion is voted against, as they intend to vote, it is a vote against the human race. They are voting against people, they are voting against people's rights. They are, in effect, voting against themselves.

Madam Speaker, one of the things that this Government must know from now is that there are many avenues open for an Opposition party, like this Opposition party to, in effect, demonstrate not only to this community, but to the international community, that this Government is not serious about the enjoyment of the rights of people, not serious about free and fair elections. The contributions that the Members made in this Parliament would probably get worldwide coverage at international institutions.

You see, Madam Speaker, whilst this Government is taking steps to, in effect, prevent people, and I say taking steps to hinder and obstruct people from having the right to vote, from exercising that right—

Dr. Rowley: Madam Speaker, on a point of order. I think the Member is getting carried away with his own self-entertainment. This Government is guilty of no such action and I would ask him to withdraw that statement.

Mr. Maharaj: Madam Speaker, I am submitting that having regard to the inaction, having regard to the response by the Government this is in effect, constituting an obstruction and hindering of the right to vote.

Dr. Rowley: Madam Speaker, the Government is accused of hindering the people.

Mr. Mohammed: On what point is he rising now, Madam Speaker? He has not said that he is rising on a point of order and he has not stated the point of order.

Dr. Rowley: Madam Speaker, if he did not notice, the Member gave way and you are not on the floor yet.

Madam Speaker, the Member for Couva South is making certain accusations against the Government which are imputing motives which are improper and I am asking the Member, if he cannot demonstrate that it is accurate, to withdraw that accusation. It is an accusation I am challenging. *[Interruption]* You keep quiet until your turn comes.

Mr. Maharaj: My contribution is to the effect that a response by the other side, rightly or wrongly, constitutes a refusal to deal with the problem and that refusal can constitute action on their part in denying people their right to vote and obstructing and hindering people in their right to vote.

Dr. Rowley: That is warped opinion.

Mr. Maharaj: Well, that is your view.

Madam Speaker: That is what I was just about to tell the hon. Member. This is the view of the hon. Member. It is his opinion, it is not a proven fact and so the Member may continue.

Dr. Rowley: Therefore, it is of no merit. Carry on.

Mr. Maharaj: I wonder if that time would be taken from me? You want them to prevent us from talking, or what?

Madam Speaker: No, I think the hon. Member said that the Member for Couva South was insinuating that there was indeed hindrance on the part of the Government with respect to the election machinery.

Dr. Rowley: He was making an accusation.

Madam Speaker: But from what has transpired, I think this is the view of the hon. Member for Couva South and his opinion he is expressing. Maybe he might make it a little clearer in his contribution.

Mr. Maharaj: Madam Speaker, I am saying that having regard to the response by the other side that they have demonstrated that they are not truly committed to the enjoyment of human and fundamental rights.

Dr. Rowley: That sounds like logic to you?

Mr. Valley: Madam Speaker, again, the Member seems to be stating a fact. We are contending it is not a fact. If that is his opinion, all we are asking him to state is that it is his opinion.

Elections and Boundaries Commission
[MR. BÉREAU]

Friday, April 24, 1992

Mr. Maharaj: Madam Speaker, they want to tell me how to speak English. I am submitting that the response which the Government has attempted to give, is a response which is not supported on any construction of the Constitution of Trinidad and Tobago. It is a response which demonstrates that the Government is not truly committed to solving the problems of Trinidad and Tobago.

One of the problems which exist in this society, which the other side has recognized is a denial of justice to people in their being denied the right and the entitlement to vote because the Government said they accepted the evidence that the complaints were there, irregularities occurred and people have been denied the right to vote.

Dr. Rowley: We just do not accept your solution.

Mr. Maharaj: That is your right. Madam Speaker, so the point I was making is that when the Government adopts such a partisan approach in a matter which affects public interests, it demonstrates that it is not really seriously committed to its manifesto. The manifesto was for it to uphold the rule of law, commitment to enjoy human and fundamental rights. That was the social contract which the Government decided to go to the people with. But here it is, the Government now gets an opportunity to deal with the problem, and what do they do? They, in effect, said, they are not dealing with it.

As a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, is it not correct that by the response which the Government has given in this motion that they are prepared to forget the brutal injustices which are being occasioned to people, that they are, in effect, prepared to abdicate to the Elections and Boundaries Commission their responsibility of governing this country? Is it not that this seems to be the trend of the Government. Abdication of responsibility? Here it is that the Government has an opportunity staring it clear in the face that they have decided that the only way to solve this problem is to amend this motion to put more resources to the Elections and Boundaries Commission.

Madam Speaker, if this House and the people of this country had any doubts whatsoever that the other side is bankrupt of ideas, bankrupt of motivation, bankrupt of incentive, bankrupt of inspiration, the answer that they have given to this motion demonstrates that.

The Attorney General and Minister for Legal Affairs (Hon. Keith Sobion): Madam Speaker, I had not intended to contribute any further in this debate, but I am motivated by the concluding remarks of the Member for Couva South. In

particular, the Member for Couva South sought to tell this House that whilst we on this side have recognized that there were deficiencies in the system for the conduct of the elections, not only in 1991, but in previous years, that we were somehow engaged in an attempt to avoid finding a solution to the problems. But again, the Member for Couva South, as he did in his opening, did not deal specifically with the irregularities of which he complains.

In his opening, he read extensively from newspapers going back from 1962 to 1991. But he did not at any time pinpoint the specific irregularities of which he complains, save and except to say that persons found that their names did not appear on the list.

Mr. Maharaj: Madam Speaker, on a point to order. What the hon. Attorney General is saying is not correct at all. As a matter of fact, I have a transcript and if he looks at the third page, he will see for about three pages, and I will read some of it, deficiency in the registration exercise, the names of numerous persons with ID cards, late mailing of polling cards, inability—it is about 12.

Hon. K. Sobion: Madam Speaker, I did say, “save and except”, and I was going on to the save and excepts. The excepts were that persons whose names did not appear on the registrations, that persons—save and except a number of matters which we on this side have identified as being pure administrative irregularities and that is what they are.

Mr. Sudama: Which would have affected the outcome of the election in several of the constituencies.

Hon. K. Sobion: I know that is your concern. The fact is that we on this side recognize the right of the population to exercise their franchise, and we will do anything to defend that right and we have suggested in our amendment a solution which in our view can properly take care of the administrative irregularities to which the Member for Couva South has referred.

The amendment proposed is to the effect that the Elections and Boundaries Commission be provided with the necessary resources to address those administrative deficiencies as may be found to exist, and to permit the Commission to discharge its constitutional function in a more efficient manner. It is a recognition on this side that there are administrative difficulties. It is the recognition on this side and we have suggested solutions. We have suggested and a wider public education programme can be undertaken in respect of voters' requirements, *et cetera*. All of the things that my friend from Couva South has

Elections and Boundaries Commission
[HON. K. SOBION]

Friday, April 24, 1992

referred to are problems which can be solved in exactly that way. You do not take, Madam Speaker, a sledgehammer to kill a fly. You do not attempt to interfere with the operations of an independent commission by suggesting that a commission of enquiry—and I want the hon. Member for Couva South to read his motion properly. It relates to the operations of the Elections and Boundaries Commission. That is what he wants an investigation into: The operations of an independent commission for matters of pure administration. Whether you have a voters' list—and I can refer to some of the complaints that those on the other side raised with respect to the Elections and Boundaries Commission. When I contributed earlier, I indicated that that was the proper course that they should adopt. They, in fact, did it. They went to the Elections and Boundaries Commission and they complained that there was more than one revised list, the last of which was printed two days before the elections. Again, that is a question of resources. If the Elections and Boundaries Commission had the manpower, if they had the financial resources—

Mr. Sudama: Could the Member give way to a question? Could he inform this House why that second revised list which was prepared two days before the elections was made available to some parties and not to other parties in the elections?

Hon. K. Sobion: Madam Speaker, as I understand the Standing Orders, the Member for Oropouche can rise on a point of clarification. He is asking me a question over which I have no control.

The fact of the matter is, these are the problems which they identified, that there was more than one revised list, one came out late; that persons without identification cards whose names were either on the list of electors or in the unit register were not given the same treatment, a question of training of personnel within the electoral polling division, location of polling agents at the polling stations does not allow them to properly scrutinize the election machinery. What does he want, a commission of enquiry to identify where you put a desk in Diego Martin Junior Secondary School, so that polling divisions could have a good view? These are the problems that they have raised, these are the problems for which they wish a commission of enquiry.

“The People's National Movement candidates permitted to remain inside the polling station in excess of up to 10 minutes”. That is a matter of training, again. I am not saying that these things happened. I am not for one moment saying that

these things happened, but even if they did happen, those are matters of pure administration. "Information officers talk freely to voters..."

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. K. Sobion: Once you fulle their feathers a little they cannot keep quiet "Information officers talk freely to voters giving information and advice". You want a commission of enquiry into that? Madam Speaker, the simple point is that this motion as I said before, was motivated purely with a view for the other side to attempt to demonstrate to the wider public that they stood a chance somehow of forming this present Government. They feel straight into the poor loser syndrome and my friend from Couva South said it again today. He went through figures to deomnstrate that by 7,000 votes—

Mr. Humphrey: On a point of order, the hon. Member is imputing improper motives contrary to Standing Orders.

Hon. K. Sobion: I wonder if the Member for St. Augustine would identify the improper motive. I said that the motion was put forward, in my view, solely for the purpose of demonstrating, as the Member for Couva South said, that they could have won the elections.

Mr. Maharaj: I never said that. As a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, if I said it—you can check the record, the political sin which I committed was when I said that the UNC party was denied Government by about 7,000 votes. You see how they are offended about that. That is wrong.

Dr. Rowley: That is precisely what you are implying.

Hon. K. Sobion: Madam Speaker, let me assure the Member for Couva South that no one on this side is offended. The fact of the matter is that if one were to take an objective view of the arguments presented by the mover of the motion and those who spoke on the other side, one can come to no other conclusion than the fact that whilst there my have been administrative irregularities, what is a proper step to take to address them?

I am submitting, Madam Speaker, that the proper step is contained in the amendment proposed by the Member for La Brea, which suggests in its recommendation that the necessary resources be provided to the Elections and Boundaries Commission to ensure that in matters of training, in matters of preparation for an election, that they would be ready and able to ensure that all

members of the population of Trinidad and Tobago are able to exercise their franchise.

To underscore that point, may I repeat that since 1961, when there were six or seven election petitions, at no election since that time has there ever been a challenge of that nature. No other party, between 1961—a matter of 31 years—and today has there been a challenge to the operation of the Elections and Boundaries Commission, except for the administrative problems which the Member for Couva South has identified.

Mr. Maharaj: Would the hon. Member given way to a question. Is it not correct that the basis for filing an election petition is a different basis for what requires a commission of enquiry or an enquiry?

Dr. Rowley: Frivolous and vexatious.

Hon. K. Sobion: The Member for Diego Martin West has answered the question. The call for a commission of enquiry in these circumstances is frivolous and vexatious and that is the end of the matter.

We have suggested a proper method of addressing this problem as appears by the amended motion. We have noted that the Elections and Boundaries Commission, with the limited resources that they have had over the years, strove to ensure that there have been free and fair elections in Trinidad and Tobago for over a period of 31 years. I thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Hon. Members, we are now going to deal with the proposed amendment to the motion which is as follows: That the words, “their existed certain administrative deficiencies in the operation of”, be inserted between the word “that”, and the word “the” in line 2 of paragraph 1; and that the words “was not functioning” in paragraph 1, be deleted completely; and that paragraphs 2 and 3 be deleted. The resolution should accordingly read:

“Be it resolved that this honourable House recommend to the Government that it takes steps to provide the Elections and Boundaries Commission with the necessary resources to address such administrative deficiencies as may be found to exist and to permit the Commission to discharge its constitutional function in a more efficient manner.”

Question put and agreed to.

Resolved:

That this honourable House recommend to Government that it take steps to provide the Elections and Boundaries Commission with the necessary resources to address such administrative deficiencies as being found to exist and to commit the commission to discharge its constitutional function in a more efficient manner.

**SPECIAL JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE
(1992 BUDGET)**

Mr. Basdeo Panday (*Couva North*): Madam Speaker, the motion that stands in my name reads as follows:

“Be it resolved that this honourable House appoint a Special Joint Select Committee to monitor and report to the House on the performance of the Government in relation to the implementation of the budget proposals for 1992.”

Madam Speaker, having regard to what took place in this House recently, I would have thought that I need only sit down at this stage without debating this motion at all and that this House would agree. But I know the other side would think it is a very good idea, but I must do my duty, regardless of the consequences. That has been my philosophy as a politician for the past 26 years. I do my duty regardless of the consequences; many have felt the brunt of that philosophy.

2.50 p.m.

Madam Speaker, the rationale behind this motion really begins with the rationale behind the introduction of Adult Franchise, in which the philosophy is that the electorate, that is the people, must be given the power to govern themselves. That is the basis of the philosophy. But in a country such as Trinidad and Tobago, 794,000 persons—that is the size of the electoral list—cannot get together to govern themselves, so they agree to elect representatives to do so on their behalf, hence the Constitution and the provisions for elections, provisions for Parliament and for the Government, and so forth. The social intention is that a smaller body, that is, 36 representatives, will run the country on behalf of the electorate. These 36 persons are, therefore, theoretically the government. These 36 representatives have been elected to this House and they themselves have elected a committee to carry on the day-to-day affairs of governance. That committee is called the Executive or the Government. The importance of this concept is that the committee is responsible and answerable to the body that elected it. That is to say,

the government is responsible to the House. That is the basis upon which this system is founded, the philosophical underpinnings of the system.

Mr. Sudama: Not the PNM.

Mr. B. Panday: I am happy to know that my colleagues on the other side have no problem with that.

The issue that has, however, confronted democratically elected, that is to say, Parliaments elected under the Westminster system, including the Government at Westminster itself, is: How does the House effectively control the government? The truth is, it is the government that controls the House, and that has not been the original democratic intention of the Constitution. How has that come about? That has come about because of the intrusion of what is called "party politics" into the system, and that has made the need for a motion such as this all the more urgent. The majority party, in effect, elects the government and the party whip ensures almost blind support for the government. The House, therefore, is reduced, effectively, to a rubber stamp. So that what in fact happens in practice is in total contradiction to what was the original intention of the Westminster system.

This motion seeks to introduce a mechanism that will provide for a supervisory role of the House over its own creation, that is to say, the Government. It calls for a special Joint Select Committee to monitor the Government's implementation of its own budget proposals for 1992.

We have seen recently in this House how useless it is to spend days and, indeed, long and tedious hours into nights, debating the Government's budget proposals that allocate moneys for various services to the people. What is the point of spending all that time debating the budget if after it has been approved by this House there is no mechanism for ensuring that the Government sticks to its proposals and that it does not deviate from them and implement a completely different budget without parliamentary approval? I refer to the budget which took place in this House recently, not to re-debate the matter but merely to refer to statements made in the House in which Members of this House agreed that it was an abuse of power to transfer over \$200 million—

Mr. Valley: Abuse of the system.

Mr. B. Panday: All right, no problem, I will accept that. It was an abuse of power under the system.

Mr. Valley: No.

Mr. B. Panday: Does he not agree that it was an abuse of power?

Mr. Valley: That is the system.

Mr. B. Panday: But the system provides for the abuse.

Mr. Valley: It does not.

Hon. Member: A manipulation of the system.

Mr. B. Panday: On a question to the Government, I was told that we came to this House in 1991 and the original allocation for the LID Programme was \$70 million, and this was revised upwards to \$140.5 million, with the Government finding that money by removing moneys allocated by this House from Health, Widows and Orphans Fund, the public transport system, the Port Authority, and so forth. That debate indicated the drawback of the system. This motion seeks to prevent the present Government from repeating what the past Government was able to do. Even in the other place where this matter was debated, views were expressed that the system is terrible. This House can approve a budget and the Government, after leaving here, can go and implement a completely different budget, tell the House nothing about it and then the following year come and say, "approve this, or you are dead." You have to approve it. As other Members say, "you have to close the book." I was trying to show them how to close the book without approving it, but they would not agree with me. You have no choice but to approve it. Should we permit a system like that to continue? That is the simple issue that faces us in this motion. It asks for a Joint Select Committee to prevent a rape of the budget in 1992 as it was raped in 1991. That is all it seeks.

I am happy that in filing this motion, we did not put a preamble to it, and thank God we did not. As if the unseen hand was there, the preamble was put by this House itself last week and week before, and that preamble is: "look what can happen if you do not have a committee to monitor the implementation of the budget".

I do not intend to argue long on this motion at all. In fact, I want to give the Government an opportunity to reject it today. I am hoping that they will reject it today, so that it will be in time for my next public meeting. I always say that the debates do not finish in this House, they finish outside, and that is the most important place.

Madam Speaker, you would notice that the Opposition has taken the very unusual step since this Parliament has met, of not submitting names for the

appointment to the Standing Committees as is required by the rules. We have not done that out of pique; we have not done that out of spite; we have not done that out of malice, we have done that to demonstrate the futility of the present system.

Dr. Rowley: Out of negligence.

3.00 p.m.

Mr. B. Panday: No, no, no, we are not negligent here at all.

When we say we have the answer to the unemployment problem, we do not immediately go and hold a symposium to ask other people how to do it. We do not do that. We do not make those kinds of mistakes at all. We do not tell that kind of terminological inexactitude to the people. The greatest deceit I have ever seen in my life—people jumping up and boasting, “we have the answer to unemployment”, and in less than four months they hold a symposium to ask everybody what to do about unemployment. I have never seen anything like that in my life. Anyway, that is beside the point. We have taken the unusual step of not appointing anyone to the standing committees, because we wanted to demonstrate the futility of that exercise.

Madam, I think the most important thing to point out about the Standing Orders is the note that appears on the cover: "Standing Orders of the House of Representatives made by the Governor under the provisions of section 8 of the Trinidad and Tobago (Constitution) Order in Council, 1961." These Standing Orders pre-date Independence and therefore they are totally outdated. And what do they call for? This was a Constitution that was intended to have a Governor-General to be ruled from Britain. These were not Standing Orders that were intended for an independent people with republican status. Not at all. If you look at page 79 of the Standing Orders you will see how impotent the Parliament was intended to be. Let me start at page 75:

"There shall be the following Sessional Select Committees—

- (a) the Public Accounts Committee;
- (b) the Standing Orders Committee;
- (c) the House Committee;
- (d) the Committee of Privileges;
- (e) the Regulations Committee."

As a matter of fact, if we start with the first one, the Public Accounts Committee and its cousin or brother, the Public Accounts (Enterprises) Committee, this House has admitted that those Committees are without teeth. As a matter of fact, one former Member of this Parliament went and sat down on the steps of the Hall of Justice for 40 days protesting—*[Interruption]* Probably sitting down somewhere protesting, certainly not on the Hall of Justice, I tell you that! My point is that that was a protest action against the toothlessness of the Public Accounts (Enterprises) Committee, in that the Public Accounts (Enterprises) Committee was examining the accounts of PLIPDECO and they saw some irregularities there and when they attempted to demand documents and papers from those persons who were in control of PLIPDECO—it might have been Julien, I hope it is not Julien—*[Interruption]* Is that right? Oh my God, look who it was, the co-Minister of Finance. But when they attempted to investigate irregularities, this PNM Government supported a motion to file a High Court action for an injunction. This Government authorized the filing of an injunction to prevent the Committee from investigating the accounts of PLIPDECO—

Dr. Rowley: You are misrepresenting the whole thing. That is misrepresentation of the facts.

Mr. B. Panday: The PNM Government—when that Prime Minister was a Member of the Government and the Member for San Fernando East wearing the same tie, just not sitting down in the same position, but wearing the same tie, and therefore responsible for that action—Member of the Cabinet.

Mr. Sudama: Did you oppose that in Cabinet?

Mr. B. Panday: He did not oppose it. My instructions are that he approved it.

Mr. Manning: Who instructed you?

Hon. Member: You cannot know that, that is confidential.

Mr. B. Panday: I claim client and counsel privilege, Madam Speaker.

So we know that even the most important and powerful Committee under these Standing Orders really have no power at all and that you cannot investigate anything. As a matter of fact, when the Public Accounts Committee go to examine anything, they are examining the books 10 years after. They have a backlog of 10 years. So we say, what is the point of that? What is the point of this Opposition taking part in a Public Accounts Committee or Public Accounts (Enterprises)

Special Joint Select Committee (1992 Budget)
[MR. B. PANDAY]

Friday, April 24, 1992

Committee to examine the accounts of the Government five/six years ago; and when it has no power to order the attendance of witnesses and documents, and so forth? As a matter of fact, the most important committee in the Standing Orders is the House Committee. Standing Order 74 states:

"(1) The House Committee shall have the duty of considering and advising the Speaker on all matters connected with the comfort and convenience of Members of the House, and from time to time reporting to the House its Minutes of proceedings.

(2) The Minister in charge of arranging the business of the House shall be a Member, and the Chairman, of the House Committee.

(3) The House Committee shall consist of six Members..."

You know what that is? Where we will get the tea. That is not the point—the comfort of the Members and so forth. The comfort is here—whether we get new chairs? What sort of comfort are we talking about. But the point is, I do not know that the House Committee has met more than once or twice in the 17 years that I have been in this Parliament.

Then there is the Committee on Privileges. I must congratulate the last Speaker. Every time there appeared in the press some article against him he used it. It was the only Committee and he used it to stifle and muzzle the press when he was the subject of its criticism. I know of no other cases in which that Committee ever met.

There is the Regulations Committee. I am not aware that the Regulations Committee ever met for a single time in the 17 years that I have been in this Parliament.

So Madam, when you hear people, particularly our brilliant journalists commenting that “they are only in Parliament”, how many times have we read in the newspapers that our journalists are commenting and other people, our calypsonians, saying “they are only ‘kicksing’ in Parliament”? If perchance that is true, then I submit that is due to the fact that the Standing Orders do not permit of anything else. Madam, do you know that this Parliament that considers itself to be modern does not have a question time? There is no question time in this Parliament. So my friend, the Member for Tobago—for San Fernando East [*Interruption*] It is on my mind, Madam Speaker. I am so happy to see him here,

it is on my mind. I am so overjoyed, Madam, to see that once more we are on the same side.

The Member for San Fernando East has an uncanny and unpleasant habit of responding to every attempt to modernize the system by claiming that he is a Westminster man; he is committed to the Westminster system.

Mr. Sudama: What does that mean?

Mr. B. Panday: What he really means is that that is an excuse for not having any kind of reform at all. Because this is a problem that has bothered not only us, but also the mother of our Parliament—the British Parliament. The British Parliament, in fact, had extensive reforms in 1979. But in the British Parliament there is something called "question time" where every time there is a sitting of Parliament for a given time, the Ministers must answer questions. Members on the Opposition Benches, ask them questions about matters which are current and relevant. Not in this House! Then he says he is a Westminster man, but he does not want to change that; he does not want to introduce a system where he is supposed to answer questions on his legs.

3.10 p.m.

If you want to ask a question in this House, it takes 21 days' notice. You must give 21 days' notice if you want to ask them a question about brutalizing somebody down the road. They are brutalizing somebody; they are discriminating against somebody and you have got to file a question and it takes 21 days. Then they defer it, of course. That is the system. I think it is Standing Order 17, which says:

- "(1) A question shall not be asked without notice, unless it is of an urgent character or relates to the business of the day, and unless the Member has obtained the leave of the Speaker to ask it.
- (2) Notice of a question may be handed by a Member to the Clerk when the House is sitting, or may be sent to or left at the office of the Clerk at any time during the hours prescribed for the purpose. Every such notice must be signed by the Member giving it."

But the part I wanted:

- "(3) A Member who desires an oral answer to a question shall mark his notice with an asterisk and such a question shall be put down for a day to

be named by the Member being a day not earlier than twenty-one clear days after notice of the Question was given."

So if you want to ask a question, you have to give 21 days' notice, by which time, not only have they forgotten the answer, but you have forgotten the question. It is no longer relevant and nobody cares about the answer because too much water flowed below the bridge during that period.

Then a motion, I believe, also takes a similar period to qualify. But if it is a motion from the Opposition, I believe in the five years of the last session, we did not succeed in completing one motion. Am I right? We completed one.

Madam Speaker: I think the hon. Member is speaking under Standing Order 77. The resolution is that a Special Joint Select Committee be appointed to monitor and report to the House on the performance of the Government in relation to implementation of the budget proposals for 1992. I wonder if the hon. Member can confine his contribution to show this House why he is insisting that such a committee be appointed and what would be the result if such a committee is appointed.

Mr. B. Panday: Certainly, Madam. The point I was making is that these Standing Orders are woefully inadequate in order to supervise the Government, in order to make the Government accountable, as it ought to be, to the Parliament. They are outdated in the sense that you might have succeeded—for example, this motion may not have been necessary if there was something like question time; if the Ministers had to answer questions much more readily than in 21 days; if this House debated motions, for example.

Our Standing Orders say that if the Government comes here and its business finishes from 1.30 to 2.00 p.m., the House adjourns. Although the Opposition has Private Members' business in the House, it cannot debate it, because it is not the last Thursday or the fourth Thursday in the month. It is woefully inadequate.

I am saying that I am moving this motion to provide this House with a mechanism to make the Government accountable. That is the purpose of referring to the other Standing Orders. I am saying, if the Standing Orders as a whole were adequate, this motion might not have been necessary.

Madam Speaker: I think the hon. Member will have to make out a case for the Joint Select Committee, for his specific purpose being to monitor the report of the House. It is not the sessional committees.

Mr. B. Panday: When I filed this motion originally, it was filed under Standing Order 79, really, not 77. What we were seeking at that time was a Joint Select Committee. The rules as to joint select committee says:

- "(1) The House may for the purposes of any Select Committee appoint not more than six Members to sit with Members of the Senate as a Joint Select Committee.
- (2) The quorum of a Joint Select Committee shall be such as the Committee may decide.
- (3) A Joint Select Committee shall elect its own Chairman.
- (4) A Joint Select Committee may be appointed at the request of either House with the approval of the other House."

Madam Speaker, I see the point you are making, and it may be that the Senate would not agree. The original objective was that because this House is so small, we thought of having Members of the Senate included. But now that you have pointed that out to me, I would consider amending my motion to take out the word, "Joint", and come under Standing Order 77. Because you are quite right. The Senate may not approve and I am going to make sure that this House approves or rejects this motion and that it is not defeated by a ruse, that is to say, this House agrees, but the Senate disagrees. So I shall amend my motion to omit the word, "Joint", and to come now under Standing Order 77.

Madam Speaker: The question under consideration is to omit the word "Joint" therefrom. So the amended motion now reads:

"Be it resolved that this honourable House appoint a Special Select Committee to monitor and report to the House on the performance of the Government in relation to the implementation of the budget proposals for 1992."

Seconded by Mr. John Humphrey.

3.30 p.m.

Mr. B. Panday: So we know where we are now. We are under 77 and we are asking the House to appoint a select committee—you see why this House always "kicksing"! If they only have "kickers" in the House, what do you expect?

Madam Speaker, at one point I was saying that this House has an image, a very bad image of being a place where you only talk. As a matter of fact, the original word comes from a French word *parlement*, the house of talk. It is the

house that was intended only for talk but modern parliaments have gone way beyond being merely a house of talk, and way beyond a legislative chamber. It is now a body that calls upon the Government, which is a committee of the House, to be accountable to a larger body, that is the House. That is the concept of modern parliament. So that if this motion succeeds, I am sure that we shall change the image of this House, where no longer will people be able to say that we are only "kicksing" in the Parliament here, because if any Government tries to

move money into DEWD for the purpose of winning election or otherwise, or try to move away money from Health, or try to rob widows and orphans and so forth, we shall be able to monitor that from day to day. This special select committee will sit from day to day monitoring the activities of the Government in so far as it relates to the implementation of the budget. That, Madam, is our objective.

If sometimes it appears that we on this side explode in frustration that may very well be due to the archaic nature of the system and, it is not only we who are frustrated by the system. Sometimes, even the clerks, the Speaker, everyone is frustrated by this archaic system and it is time we do something about it instead of merely complaining about it.

We not only call upon the Government, as I say, to agree to the appointment of this committee, but I take the opportunity to suggest that this is a temporary measure—the appointment of this committee for 1992 be viewed as a temporary measure. It is for this reason that a special select committee is proposed. It is not a sessional committee. The sessional committees are for the entire session. This is a committee which is stated quite clearly in the motion, to monitor and report to the House on the performance of the Government in relation to the implementation of the budget proposals for 1992.

The reason I framed the motion in that way is because I am also conscious of the fact that there is need for review of the entire Standing Orders. Everybody agrees to that. When the Government was in the Opposition they agreed to it. But the moment they get on the other side, for some strange reason they disagree. I remember we had set up a committee to review the Standing Orders. As a member of that committee, I submitted an extensive memorandum on this whole question of amendments.

I remember studying Standing Orders of the Canadian, Australian, and British Parliaments and, most of the Parliaments of the African and Asian countries that

belong to the Commonwealth and produced a tremendous document which was put before the House and because the Government of the day was unwilling to seek passage of new Standing Orders, it fell apart. I am taking this opportunity to say that this motion is of a temporary nature. Only for 1992, I would hope, and I am inviting the Government to move a motion because I believe if we in the Opposition move a motion that is going to take some months—that we move swiftly to appoint a Standing Orders Committee as required by the rules and that we move swiftly to make recommendations for the amendment of the Standing Orders and bring them to the House. My friend does not understand—

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member is suggesting that the Standing Orders Committee be swiftly appointed and that committee be mandated—that is what we have been advocating since I took the Chair.

Mr. Valley: Madam Speaker, we have done our part. We have suggested our Members; we are waiting—

Madam Speaker: I think the committees will be announced on the next occasion. Members of the Opposition have also submitted their names.

Mr. B. Panday: Madam Speaker, the point I was making is, unless I have a commitment from the Government that we shall move swiftly to make proposals for the amendment of these Standing Orders, what is the point of appointing our Members to that Standing Orders committee? Just for the show?

Madam Speaker: Hon. Member, the chairperson of the Standing Orders Committee, shall be the Speaker. I have been at pains to say let us set up this committee and thus the very complaint the hon. Member is making at the moment will not be necessary. I think they are all adamant on that situation, that the situation needs looking into and amending. I think we will proceed.

Mr. Valley: Madam Speaker, already it is the Member who is causing the problem. Perhaps, given an insight he may wish to withdraw his motion and submit his names for the Standing Orders Committee.

Mr. B. Panday: That is exactly the point I wanted to make. You see I am saying I shall prove your *bona fides* on this motion. We have not named our Members for the Standing Orders Committee because we fear that you do not want to amend the Standing Orders. I shall know today on this motion, if the Government is not prepared to set up a committee to monitor the budget then they are not prepared to amend the Standing Orders, and we shall not appoint anybody to that Standing Orders Committee or any other committee in this House. We are

not going to participate in exercises of futility. We told them when they held their unemployment symposium that we are not going to be party to frauds, we are not going to tell this country that there is going to be employment and so forth. because they are in Government. We are not going to do that. We know they cannot do anything about unemployment and we are not going to legitimize their exercise—that is legitimacy. I invite them to come to ours on Saturday and see how it is done.

Mr. Valley: Is the Opposition going to solve the problem?

Mr. B. Panday: Come on Saturday and you will see what a symposium is like. This is not a case where we are going to ask people to give me 50 projects, I will cut it down to 30 and then to 15 and in the end employ 4,000 persons per month when the unemployment figure is 150,000. You are not even scratching the surface. I am not going to be a part of that and that is beside the point.

Madam Speaker, the reason we waited until today to announce our intention with respect to the committees of the House and in particular the Standing Orders Committee is that we wanted a demonstration of the *bona fides* of the Government. We wanted to see what the decision of the Government is going to be on this motion and if the Government votes against this motion to set up a committee to monitor the activities of the Government in relation to the budget, then it shall be clear in our minds that the Government has no intention of any kind of parliamentary reform. Therefore, it will be an exercise in futility to suggest any members for the Standing Orders Committee or indeed any other committee. It is for that reason that I do not intend to carry this debate for long. I do not intend to belabour the point, as I said last week. When we debated the Variation of Appropriation Bill it was quite clear that had such a committee as the one I proposed been in existence, what took place then could not have taken place without the knowledge of the people or the consent of the Government.

Madam Speaker, the motion that I propose is not contrary to the parliamentary system and particularly to the Westminster system because, as I indicated earlier, the British House of Commons appointed a committee in 1976 which reported in 1978 and by 1979 they had made revolutionary changes. I am going to deal with the point that I know is going to come so I just want to read from that report, I just want to read from that report because on several occasions I have heard the Prime Minister, the hon. Member for San Fernando East, say that we must not have revolutionary change, we must have evolutionary change. His idea of evolutionary

change is no change because I want to know how the rules of this House have evolved from 1961 to 1991—30 years. What evolution has taken place?

3.30 p.m.

I do not think my friend understands the word evolution, so I am going to refer him to a text. This is really a book entitled *The Changing Constitution* by Jeffrey Jowell and Dawn Oliver. The article in that book to which I specifically refer is article 6 called "Select Committees and Back-Bench Power" by Gavin Drewry. That article at page 136 says:

"In June 1976, the House of Commons set up a sixteen-member Select Committee on Procedure 'to consider the practice and procedure of the House in relation to public business and to make recommendations for the more effective performance of its functions'. The Committee held fifty-eight sittings, at fifteen of which it took oral evidence, most of it from Members of Parliament and Clerks of the House. This rather introspective exercise gave rise to a substantial report, published in August 1978. The Committee's approach is summed up in a couple of early paragraphs:

The essence of the problem...is that the balance of advantage between Parliament and Government in the day to day working of the Constitution is now weighted in favour of the Government to a degree which arouses widespread anxiety and is inimical to the proper working of our parliamentary democracy.

We believe that a new balance must be struck, not by changes of a fundamental or revolutionary character in the formal powers of the institutions concerned, but by changes of an evolutionary kind, following naturally from present practices. We have approached our task not in the hope of making the job of Government more comfortable, the weapons of Opposition more formidable, or the life of the back-bencher more bearable, but with the aim of enabling the House as a whole to exercise effective control and stewardship over Ministers and the expanding bureaucracy of the modern state for which they are answerable, and to make the decisions of Parliament and Government more responsive to the wishes of the Electorate.' "

That was part of the terms of reference. Although they said that their approach was not going to be revolutionary but evolutionary, you should see some of the changes which they made. Some of the changes which they made would make the Member for San Fernando East hit the roof.

Special Joint Select Committee (1992 Budget)
[MR. B. PANDAY]

Friday, April 24, 1992

He is undoubtedly the most reactionary conservative that I have met in my life. The moment he won the election he went around saying, “take it easy; take it easy; there will be no change; nothing is going to change; everything is going to be all right; there is about 25 per cent unemployment; that is not going to change; do not worry; everything is going to be fine.” That is the cat that swallowed the canary. No change! No change! He has no concept of what is revolutionary or even evolutionary.

I just wanted to quote that paragraph, if perchance he intends to get up in this House and say that the changes which we propose are revolutionary.

Madam Speaker: The speaking time of the hon. Member has expired.

Motion made, That the hon. Member's speaking time be extended by 30 minutes. [*Mr. R. Palackdharrysingh*]

Mr. B. Panday: I, therefore, rise only to say that my motion reads:

Be it resolved that this honourable House appoint a Special Select Committee to monitor and report to the House on the performance of the Government in relation to implementation of the Budget proposals for 1992.

I so move.

The Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs (Hon. Keith Sobion): Madam Speaker, I want to make one preliminary observation and that is that the motion put forward by the Member for Couva North did not by way of introduction—in the normal way, as he himself observed—contain any recitals or preamble.

In my view, recitals or preamble are not really just a matter of form or courtesy to those who have to deal with the motion, but they demonstrate the thought processes that went into the ultimate resolution moved by the Member so moving the motion. I am neither suggesting that the hon. Member for Couva North did not have any thought put into his motion, nor that he intended to be discourteous, but I feel that with his length of legislative practice he considered it to be more a matter of form and would therefore demonstrate his arguments from the floor of the House, but in doing so, I became somewhat confused as to what exactly were the thought processes which determined the bringing of this motion.

The Member for Couva North vacillated between whether there should be select committees or not. He indicated at one stage that this motion was a test of some sort in order to determine whether he should perform his duty under the

Standing Orders and appoint or nominate Members to select committees. Be that as it may, I am not concerned with whether there was proper form in the presentation of this motion, but I would rather wish to turn to the substance of the motion itself.

Having scrutinized the motion and having analyzed the arguments raised by the Member for Couva North, it seems to me that one would have to deal with this motion on two levels. In the first instance it seems as though the motion proposes that this committee should have some sort of control over the Government, "the big G" as the hon. Member puts it, the executive and at another point, one gets the impression that this committee is to act as some kind of review body over the actions of the Government. Resolutions of this kind are not new.

They have been raised—as my friend has pointed out—in the mother of our Parliament, the UK. Parliament, but when they are raised they are clear and explicit as to their intent. I will therefore have to deal with it in both aspects as I see it, whether it is an intention that this committee controls the executive or whether it is meant as a review committee.

Mr. Humphrey: Would the Member give way? I want to assist the Member. In reading the motion, it is quite clear that the committee is to report to Parliament. The committee will have no powers other than to monitor the provisions of the budget and to report to Parliament. Parliament retains the constitutional authority. The committee has no power other than just monitor and report.

3.40 p.m.

Hon. K. Sobion: I thank the hon. Member for St. Augustine. You see, as I would demonstrate later, it would seem to me to be safer to deal with this motion in both its aspects, because the Member who moved the motion talks about sitting day to day and the motion itself, if I may read it, talks about:

"in relation to implementation of the budget proposals for 1992."

So one is not quite clear—it may be clear to the Member for St. Augustine—I am certainly not clear and I am not taking the chance, therefore I propose to deal with it at both levels. If it is intended to be a committee which has some degree of control over Government's activity, then we will deal with it at that level; if it is intended merely as a review body, we will deal with it at that level.

Special Joint Select Committee (1992 Budget)
[HON. K. SOBION]

Friday, April 24, 1992

Insofar as the first interpretation is concerned, the problem I would have with the motion as it is framed is, that it pays little cognizance to the fact that our democracy operates with a basic principle and that is, the separation of powers principle. If the second interpretation is what is intended, then certainly the mover of the motion has failed to pay regard to the existing constitutional and statutory provisions which exist for reviewing the actions of the Executive.

Mr. Mohammed: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do believe that the Hon. Attorney General in his submission is misleading the House, because the status of the select committee and what happens to the report of the select committee is clearly defined in the Standing Orders of this House. I will draw Madam Speaker's attention to Standing Order No. 82(5):

"The report of a Select Committee shall be presented to the House by the Chairman or other Member deputed by the Committee, including any minority report and shall be ordered to be laid on the Table, and be printed, without question put."

So, the Hon. Attorney General is proceeding on a dissertation, giving interpretations on what is intended, when what happens to the report of a select committee is clearly enunciated in Standing Order No. 82. I wish to draw this to the attention of the Hon. Speaker and to the Hon. Attorney General.

Hon. K. Sobion: One has to be careful because one has to look at the wording of the motion made and one has to look at some of the statements made by the mover of the motion. Quite apart from the statement that this committee was to be a day-to-day committee monitoring the affairs of the Government, there was the statement made that the Government is a committee of this House *et cetera*. So, the interpretation that I put to the motion is based not only on the way the motion is worded but on the statements made by the mover of the motion.

One has to look at the question of whether this motion is intended to create a committee which would have some degree of control over the operation of the Executive arm of the Government and, if that is what is intended, then it offends a fundamental tenet of our democracy, that is the separation of powers theory which creates a clear distinction between the Executive, the Legislature and the Judiciary. The functions of those three bodies are different and distinct, and interference one with the other is something that is severely frowned upon.

I can demonstrate that by reference to an attempt in the UK Parliament to establish a committee of a type which is generically similar to that which is being

proposed, and the comments which were made in relation to that attempt. I refer to page 206 of the edition of *Constitutional and Administrative Law* by Wade and Bradley, where in 1959 an attempt was made to form a select committee—

Mr. Sudama: Is there a more recent edition?

Hon. K. Sobion: The incident is 1959. It is the 10th Edition.

"Thus in 1959 the Select Committee on Procedure in the UK Parliament rejected a proposal for a permanent committee on colonial affairs on the ground that this was 'a radical constitutional innovation': 'there is little doubt that the activities of such a committee would be aimed at controlling rather than criticising the policy and actions of the department concerned. It would be usurping a function which the House itself has never attempted to exercise'."

Quite simply, the proposal was rejected on the basis that it constituted an interference with the right of the Executive to conduct its affairs and went beyond the accepted bounds of a review committee. I make the point now and I will make it later, that we on this side have no problem with any attempt to enhance the review procedures. We have no difficulty with having mechanisms in place, because checks and balances are part of the whole concept of the separation of powers and must exist between the different arms of Government. What we object to and what we will protest strongly, is any attempt by the mover of the motion and those on his side to suggest the establishment of a committee which would have power of controlling and/or influencing the work of the Executive.

If that is the intent of the motion, it would seem to me that this House is not the proper forum for tinkering with basic and fundamental tenets of our Constitution. It would seem to me that what is required if one intends to deal with fundamental principles affecting the Constitution, is a forum which affords wider participation by the public generally. My friends may protest but some on the other side are well aware of the kinds of instruments that can be established. Constitution commissions have been initiated by some on the other side and that is the kind of forum which one ought to use if one intends to interfere with the basic principles of the Constitution.

If, however, what is intended is proposition 2—a review or a committee which will oversee and report on the activities of the Government, then one will have to consider what existing machinery is in place and whether that machinery is

Special Joint Select Committee (1992 Budget)
[HON. K. SOBION]

Friday, April 24, 1992

adequate, whether it needs to be enhanced and whether the motion which is before the House is mere surplusage. As I said, we on this side have no problems with checks and balances between the Executive, Legislative and Judicial arms of Government; it is part of the principle behind the separation of powers theory; it is central to our system but, in moving this motion the hon. Member for Couva North made only passing reference to the existing machinery.

What is the existing machinery? Insofar as Government expenditure is concerned, the Constitution states how public funds are to be expended and I refer Madam Speaker to sections 112, 113 and 115 of the Constitution. Expenditure from the Consolidated Fund can only be made when it is authorized by an Appropriation Act, section 112 of the Constitution.

3.50 p.m.

Section 113 provides for supplemental appropriation bills to be passed. I would read from section 113 (3):

"...a supplementary estimate showing the sums required or spent shall be laid before the House of Representatives and the heads of any such expenditure shall be included in a Supplementary Appropriation Bill."

Now, what my friends on the other side are failing to see is that the machinery is there, the safeguards are there and it is a question for the Parliament as a whole, and particularly the Opposition, to monitor. They must fulfil their responsibilities as an Opposition in Parliament. It is for them to get. The machinery is there. It is not that the machinery is not there, but if they fall asleep and talk about all kinds of irrelevancies, they will never do what they are required to do under the Constitution.

The fact of the matter is that the Constitution sets up the machinery for Government expenditure. It sets up the checks and balances, it sets up the machinery whereby the Opposition can monitor Government activity. But they want to add something which deals with the very measures that are set up not only in the Constitution, but also in the Exchequer and Audit Act. The provisions are there. It is for the Opposition to be alert to what is happening. There are other measures, as well: Question to Ministers, Motions—

Mr. Maharaj: If the Member would give way on just a small point of clarification. Is the hon. Member saying that the Opposition last year was not alert?

Mr. Manning: Just the leader.

Mr. B. Panday: Which leader, in the first half or the second half?

Madam Speaker: The Member may continue.

Mr. Sobion: Madam Speaker, when the Member for Couva North presented this motion and failed to make reference to the safeguards which already exist in the Constitution and in the Exchequer and Audit Act, again, I have to look at what is the motivation for all of this. When he suggests that he is not nominating his Members to the committees established under the Standing Orders, depending on what happens with this motion, I get the feeling that this House is being somehow held to ransom, and that if the Member for Couva North does not get his way, he will act like the petulant one all over.

Madam Speaker, the safeguards are here. I can refer not only to the statutory provisions as contained in the Constitution and the Exchequer and Audit Act, but there are committees, as well: The Public Accounts Committee, the Public Accounts (Enterprises) Committee, the Finance Committee. These are the committees, which are set up under our democratic system to deal with Government expenditure. It requires the alertness of those who are supposed to be the watchdogs of the Government. The hon. Member for Couva North talks about our Standing Orders being deficient, and suggesting that they should be changed for change sake because they have been there for 31 years.

But if one were to refer to the position under the UK Parliament, the Public Accounts Committee has been existing since 1861 and is still a functioning organization in the British Parliament, a committee which exists under our own regulations. These are the tried and tested safeguards that we have built-in, not a spurious committee which suddenly changed from a joint select in the middle of the debate to a select committee. I do not know what else it will change to by next week, but when one is suggesting change of this nature, one must be precise.

I did comment on the absence of the “whereas” in the motion, the fact that there was no preamble, which usually signal the direction of the mover. We are faced with a motion which in midstream can shift either way and the Member for Couva North wants to ask this House to accept that as a fundamental change to the way in which we operate our democracy. That is the question. If we fail to do it, he is going to sabotage the process of Government by not appointing Members to the select committees which exist: Members who have the effect of amending the very Standing Orders of which he complains. So he holds us to ransom and

Special Joint Select Committee (1992 Budget)
[HON. K. SOBION]

Friday, April 24, 1992

says that he will not nominate members. I am certain that we can get around that and that we can proceed without his nomination.

Madam Speaker, this motion, essentially, as I said, can be looked at both ways. If it intends to affect our basic constitutional principles, it cannot be entertained by this House. If it intended to be some sort of review or control body, the mechanisms are already there, they are already in place, and it is for my friends on the other side to ensure that through their diligence they do their work.

The Member for Couva North made reference to statements out of the Senate, and I want to refer to one of the statements that were made in the Senate by an hon. Senator, that the system is probably corrupt. The system is not corrupt at all. The system can be operated in such a way to end with corrupt results, but the system is not corrupt. The system is there, it is in place, and if we have diligent Members on the other side of this House, then I am certain that it would not be a problem as appeared on a previous occasion.

Madam Speaker, we on this side emphasize that whilst we are mindful of the need for control, as between all organs of the Government, we are satisfied that it is merely a question of how the existing mechanisms are operated that will ensure that the mechanisms work and that this motion is a non-starter. I thank you Madam Speaker.

COMPREHENSIVE DRUG INTERDICTION STRATEGY

Minister of National Security (Sen. The Hon. Russell Huggins): Madam Speaker, hon. Members, since assuming office, the Government has been working assiduously with a view to addressing the crime and drug situation in Trinidad and Tobago. Having completed our assessment of the situation, we are now in a position to make a comprehensive statement on the course of action we have agreed to pursue. There was a time when we accepted that no man is an island. Today we go further. We speak about the emergence of the global village with all the implications of such a development. It falls to all of us to recognize our place in this global village.

The Caribbean is a transshipment corridor for cocaine and marijuana destined for the United States and other markets. The cocaine transshipment volume through Venezuela and the Caribbean is estimated at 10 to 13 tonnes per month, and there is conclusive evidence that a not insignificant portion of this finds its way through Trinidad and Tobago.

There are some 432 kilometres of coastline surrounding Trinidad and Tobago which are controlled principally by the Coast Guard, with limited resources. There are four major general cargo ports in Trinidad and Tobago, and at present 10 other ports handling special cargo and accommodating pleasure craft. Some of these vessels originate in transit or in producer countries. Numerous small craft are attached by an inter-island trade with CARICOM countries and Venezuela. In addition, there are numerous points along the coast which facilitate illegal access to this country. As a gateway to the United States and Europe, Trinidad and Tobago offers several advantages.

Indications of significant increase of a number of illegal firearms in general circulation in the country complemented by intelligence to the effect that the illegal importation of firearms is on the rise, are all symptoms of the drug trade. Information coming out of arrests of Trinidad and Tobago citizens in foreign countries and investigations of drug trafficking operations overseas point to well-organized trafficking networks operating in Trinidad and Tobago. The compelling indications of drug related activities are supported more by intelligence than by arrest and court convictions. Notwithstanding all of the above-mentioned indicators, there has been an almost complete absence of seizures of drugs entering the country either by sea or by air. This is a reflection of weakness at the investigative level and a paucity of timely, actionable intelligence.

All of the criminal activity that mushrooms from drug trafficking is in pursuit of money and the acquisition of wealth. The surreptitious introduction of illegally obtained huge cash profits into the legal financial system is essential if these benefits are to be enjoyed with impunity.

Money laundering and the financial aspects of the traffic in drugs now occupy a major part of the global strategy against drug trafficking. It is generally recognized that any counter-narcotics strategy at national or international level that fails to appropriately address the problem of money laundering and the financial aspects of drug trafficking, is likely to reach no further than the lower levels of this highly lucrative illegal transnational industry.

Prior to the passing in November 1991 of the Dangerous Drugs Act, No. 38 of 1991, there was no legislation in Trinidad and Tobago which specifically addressed the problem of money laundering. Appropriate enhancement of the administrative and legal frameworks to combat money laundering needs to be given priority.

Comprehensive Drug Interdiction Strategy
[HON. R. HUGGINS]

Friday, April 24, 1992

The multifaceted and extremely complex nature of the drug trafficking problem demands that any strategy be integrated, involving all pertinent agencies, closely monitored and well co-ordinated at the implementation level.

The principal law enforcement agencies: Police, Customs, Coast Guard, and Regiment have all been attempting to tackle the problem. They have enjoyed only limited success in their efforts largely because their activities have been essentially disjointed and unco-ordinated. The technical training and financial assistance for their counter-narcotics efforts which they have been receiving from our neighbours, the United States, Canada as well as the United Kingdom and France, have not had the effects that we anticipated largely because of the overall unco-ordinated approach. In short, the effort against drugs has not benefited from all our collective strengths, which should have been enhanced by the training and expertise which is available from such worthwhile assistance.

Madam Speaker, Government considers that a well co-ordinated strategy is likely to result in significantly greater impact that is more measurable and more cost effective. It will foster a partnership among the Government agencies involved in drug interdiction. Elimination of inter-agency rivalry, and eradication of drug money laundering; it will eliminate duplication of effort and waste of resources; it will also ensure that the complete picture as it relates to the multifaceted matter is always available to the Government.

All indications are that there is need for immediate strengthening of the national approach to addressing what is perhaps the major current threat to national security, that is, the illicit drug traffic.

In the context of the urgent need for immediate action as I have indicated, and with a view to effecting a structured, co-ordinated approach to drug interdiction based on a clearly defined strategy, Cabinet has given its approval to the implementation of the following measures:

- i. The establishment within the Ministry of National Security of an administrative, investigative and operational co-ordinating agency.
- ii. The co-ordinating agency will focus on drug interdiction in two areas as follows:
 - (a) The first will be in the area of policy formulation, strategy development, co-ordination, and implementation. Follow-up action will be taken either by the co-ordinating agency itself, where

appropriate, or by channelling to relevant agencies for execution. One of the major objectives of the co-ordinating agency will be to ensure that while a drugs interdiction strategy is being effected, the interdiction momentum is accelerated and enhanced by way of a co-ordinated and structured approach to the implementation of measures and initiatives that are deemed necessary at any given point in time.

- (b) The other area of focus will be information gathering. As a central co-ordinating unit for the development, collection, processing and analysis of all relevant information from all the agencies involved, the aim will be to increase the volume and quality of information that will drive the actions of the operational units dealing with drug interdiction and associated activities. The major units involved in these investigations, particularly the Police Narcotics Bureau, will be immediately reviewed and extensively reorganized and refocused to complement this improved intelligence capability.

The terms of reference of the co-ordinating agency will be as follows:

- (a) To develop an integrated drug interdiction strategy, focusing on, but not restricted to, the key areas of international co-operation, the legal framework, intelligence, investigations, foreign technical assistance and information exchange, crime prevention, airport and seaport and coastal security.
- (b) To co-ordinate the efforts of relevant Government departments, protective services, the defence force and other government and non-government agencies as necessary, in the implementation of the strategy.
- (c) To immediately review current ongoing measures and programmes, and initiate and oversee implementation with a view to ensuring that the interdiction effort is not suspended, but rather progressively enhanced while the final strategy is emplaced. The function will include developing, through the relevant agencies, directions for the improvement of their individual capabilities.

[HON. R. HUGGINS]

- (d) To direct an integrated information centre with the aim of fully developing counter-narcotics intelligence capability emphasizing the production of timely, actionable intelligence to support operational activities. The centre will be the central point for the dynamic management of information from all sources on the matter of counter-narcotics. Key elements of the centre will include:
 - (i) The existing operations jointly undertaken with co-operating foreign government.
 - (ii) Integration of the existing Interpol link into the centre.
 - (iii) Development of the pooling and exchange of information among law enforcement agencies, utilizing appropriate computer systems and other inter-agency exchange mechanisms.
 - (iv) Development of information exchange relationships with foreign Government agencies.
- (e) To develop a programme against economic crime, focussing on the following areas:
 - (i) Assessing the scale of economic crime, including drug related money laundering and drug-related corruption. The co-ordinating agency will interface with the relevant agencies as appropriate for the collection of information and the provision of advice, emphasizing a systems approach to loss prevention and the reduction of vulnerability to economic crime. The co-ordinating agency will establish a unit for follow-up investigations into reports of suspicious financial transactions emanating from banks and other financial institutions in accordance with section 47 of the Dangerous Drugs Act, 1991.
 - (ii) Providing directions and assistance to relevant law enforcement agencies in the investigation of major economic crime and drug trafficking investigations.
- (f) To co-ordinate technical assistance, the co-ordinating agency will be the central co-ordinating authority for the negotiation and the implementation of technical assistance to the Counter Narcotics

Interdiction Programme from donor countries and multilateral agencies.

- iv. The co-ordinating agency will be headed by a director.
- v. The director of the co-ordinating agency will:
 - (a) Be responsible directly to the Minister of National Security;
 - (b) Be an individual who, by virtue of established reputation and record in the technical areas described, will command the respect of the relevant Government agencies, as well as that of the wider public;
 - (c) Hold a position commensurate with the authority and responsibility that will devolve on the co-ordinating agency.
- vi. Other conditions attaching to the position of Director of the co-ordinating agency will duly recognize the risk to personnel safety which the head of this agency will automatically assume.
- vii. The co-ordinating agency will have access to all protective and military services in pursuit of its responsibilities.
- viii. The Director will be authorized to invite relevant Government Ministries and departments to be represented on sub-committees as required from time to time.
- ix. In addition to the functions to be discharged by the Director, the co-ordinating agency will be initially equipped with the following resource elements:
 - Administrative,
 - Legal,
 - Technical/Law Enforcement,
 - Research,
 - Support Services.
- x. The co-ordinating agency will have its own budgetary allocation and perform its own accounting to enable effective planning and control of its operations.
- xi. Co-operating countries and international organizations will be invited to establish, in Trinidad and Tobago, on terms and conditions to be agreed

upon, offices of their respective drug enforcement agencies, to liaise and work in closest possible collaboration with appropriately designated officials and agencies in counter-narcotics interdiction activities.

- xii. Requests will be entertained as a matter of policy from other governments and international organizations to station in Trinidad and Tobago liaison officers of relevant agencies engaged in counter-narcotics activities where it is considered that such a presence will be mutually beneficial to the counter-narcotics efforts of Trinidad and Tobago and the requesting country.

Madam Speaker, I should like to intimate to hon. Members that since the taking of these decisions by Cabinet, I have consulted with the hon. Attorney General and the hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs concerning the need for urgent ratification of the 1988 Vienna Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances. It is intended to expedite examination of the provisions of the Dangerous Drugs Act, 1991 and other pertinent legislation with a view to determining whether the Act substantially complies with the requirements of the Convention. This is with a view towards urgent ratification of the Treaty.

Further, a detailed study is now being undertaken with a view to amending the Dangerous Drugs Act, to give it more venom, particularly in the areas of money laundering and asset seizure. Discussions on the formulation of asset transfer policies are to begin shortly with other governments.

Hon. Members would appreciate, Madam Speaker, that no drug interdiction strategy for Trinidad and Tobago, however comprehensively perceived, could be effective without being serviced by a reliable Police Service. I wish therefore to assure this House that Cabinet has moved with dispatch to put in place two key measures for reform of the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service.

The Government is of the view that continuing changes in both internal (organizational) environment of the Police Service as well as the external environment which it services, reflects the need for fundamental, structural and management changes which will enable the organization to provide a satisfactory service to the public.

Externally the environment is marked by:

- Extensive demographic changes resulting in an increased urbanization of the population.

- A heightened awareness and sensitivity to constitutional rights.
- Increased levels of education and sophistication in the commission of crime with perhaps the most significant development being the emergence of the global criminal trade in illegal drugs.
- Increases in the overall pace of change influenced by rapid advances in communication technology.

4.20 p.m.

In the circumstances, Cabinet has agreed to the immediate commencement of a programme of reform for the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service embracing the following objectives as stated in the O'Dowd Report of 1990. I quote:-

"If the Police Service is to become more efficient and effective, it needs to urgently pursue fundamental managerial and cultural change. In summary, it must:-

- (i) have a common identity and be clear about its role and purpose and underpin the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service slogan 'Protect and Serve';
- (ii) improve leadership as well as fundamentally review its management systems, procedures and structure;
- (iii) become less defensive and isolated from the community it serves;
- (iv) improve lines of communication both internally and externally;
- (v) improve its image in terms of buildings, uniforms, technology and equipment;
- (vi) make a far better use of existing resources;
- (vii) recognize the need for improved disciplinary procedures within the Service."

Cabinet has agreed further that an Executive Committee should be appointed under the chairmanship of a Management Consultant, with responsibility for the implementation of the programme of reform, immediately initiating action in areas of high priority, and reporting to Cabinet through the Minister of National Security.

Comprehensive Drug Interdiction Strategy
[HON. R. HUGGINS]

Friday, April 24, 1992

Cabinet has agreed that the terms of reference of the new Executive Committee for reform of the Police Service shall be as follows:

- (a) responsibility for the implementation—

and I want to stress here, Madam Speaker,

- (a) responsibility for the implementation of a programme of reform within the Police Service using as a basis the recommendations of the O'Dowd Report and other relevant recommendations;
- (b) to establish a strategy and methodology for implementation of the reform programme including the establishment of working groups within the Police Service to address key areas of the programme;
- (c) to utilize the management institutions, specialist agencies, the University of the West Indies and other relevant entities and individuals in the furtherance of its stated objective.

Members of the Executive Committee are:

Mr. Gordon M. Howell	-	Chairman Personnel Management Consultant
Mr. Ainsley Tim Pow	-	Permanent Secretary with responsibility for Public Administration, Office of the Prime Minister.
Mr. Lance Selman	-	Special Adviser (Protective Services) Ministry of National Security.
Mr. Richardson Henry	-	Deputy Commissioner of Police
Mr. Stephenson Sarjeant	-	Management Consultant

In addition, Madam Speaker, steps are now being taken to include in the implementation team, one of the Scotland Yard detectives who was a member of the O'Dowd team.

One other measure agreed to by Cabinet with respect to the Police Service is the decision to introduce legislation for the establishment of an independent impartial body to address complaints by the public against police officers. The necessity for this kind of legislation has arisen as a result of the numerous serious complaints that are made by members of the public concerning the conduct of

police officers in the exercise of their duties and the lack of appropriate machinery to address these complaints.

The main features of the proposed legislation are:

- (a) the establishment of a body to:
 - (i) supervise the investigation of complaints made by members of the public against police action;
 - (ii) undertake direct investigation and make recommendations with respect to complaints in particular cases.
- (b) the establishment of a unit of the Police Service or a "Complaints Division" with the primary responsibility for addressing complaints.

The Government recognizes the urgent need for this legislation in the interest of the public at large. Government is of the view that the measure is justified on the grounds that the public should be made comfortable with a situation wherein complaints against the police are not being investigated exclusively by the Police Service itself.

These measures represent, Madam Speaker, the determination of the Government to fulfil the solemn resolve to give priority to the maintenance of law and order, fully conscious of its obligations to uphold the precepts of the rule of law on which our society is founded. Accordingly, therefore, this Government will not depart from its stated undertaking to commit all necessary available resources of money and manpower at its disposal to bring about the condition of security to which all our citizens are entitled.

Madam Speaker, I thank you.

Mr. Basdeo Panday (*Couva North*): Would the hon. Minister agree to have that statement he has just made debated in this House? If the answer is yes, is he prepared to take steps to bring it before this House for full debate?

Hon. R. Huggins: Madam Speaker, I have not considered the request made by the honourable Member for Couva North. After consultation with my colleagues, I would be quite happy to reply to that question.

Mr. Humphrey: Madam Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister.

Hon. Member: Question!

Comprehensive Drug Interdiction Strategy
[HON. R. HUGGINS]

Friday, April 24, 1992

Mr. Humphrey: Elucidation!

Mr. Panday: Clarification, he is entitled to that.

Mr. Humphrey: The hon. Minister has named the committee with the responsibility for re-organizing the Police Service in terms of its management and administration. He announced a far more important committee in dealing with the drug interdiction procedure and it was described as a co-ordinating committee, but we have heard nothing more than a mere announcement that there will be a co-ordinating committee. Would the honourable Minister indicate to this House whether such a committee has been appointed; if it has, who are the members of that committee; if it has not been appointed, when will it be appointed, and when will this honourable House be notified of its appointment?

Hon. R. Huggins: Madam Speaker, the body to be appointed is a co-ordinating agency. I would like to say that because of certain security measures which first have to be put in place, given the nature of the matter which this agency is to address, I do not believe it is appropriate at this point in time to respond specifically to the questions raised by the hon. Member for St. Augustine.

Mr. Maharaj: Would the Minister state whether any machinery will be put in place so that the public can scrutinize the appointment of these Members to determine whether the appointment of these members would be in the public interest?

Mr. Valley: Madam Speaker, on a point of order. Questions are not allowed under "Ministerial Statements".

Mr. Huggins: Madam Speaker, this body is simply an agency which will be formed within the Ministry of National Security. I do not know that it is the policy whenever people are being appointed within a Ministry to have them scrutinized by members of the public.

Madam Speaker: Hon. Members, the sitting of this House is suspended until 5.00 p.m. for the tea break.

4.30 p.m.: *Sitting suspended.*

5.05 p.m.: *Sitting resumed.*

SPECIAL JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE (1992 BUDGET)

Mr. John Humphrey (*St. Augustine*): Madam Speaker, I rise to support the amended motion of the Member for Couva North and to express dismay at the contribution of the hon. Attorney General, the Member for Ortoire/Mayaro. Madam Speaker, I think that Lord Acton's *Analysis of Power* is appropriate.

Mr. Valley: Lord who?

Mr. Humphrey: Lord Acton—That power tends to corrupt and absolute power tends to corrupt absolutely. Madam Speaker, what we have in the Trinidad and Tobago version of the Westminster system where we have a written Constitution, unlike Westminster, is a virtual Prime Ministerial dictatorship and it comes out of the abuse of the constitutional process because you cannot find it enshrined in the Constitution. But because the Executive dominates the Parliament in fact, if not in law, the interpretation that is given to our Constitution is that the Prime Minister is paramount.

We heard the hon. Attorney General describe the Westminster constitutional model as a separation of powers; and I do not know where he got his training in understanding the Westminster constitution and the Trinidad and Tobago counterpart, but it is quite the opposite. In fact, the United States constitution is a separation of powers, but in the Trinidad and Tobago Constitution, as in Westminster, there is no separation. None whatever. There is a fusion of powers and it is clearly stated in the very Constitution. "Executive Powers" can be found under Chap. 5, section 74:

- "(1) The executive authority of Trinidad and Tobago shall be vested in the President and, subject to this Constitution, may be exercised by him either directly or through officers subordinate to him.
- (2) Without prejudice to the generality of subsection (1), the supreme command of the armed forces of Trinidad and Tobago shall be vested in the President and the exercise of this power shall be regulated by law.
- (3) Nothing in this section shall prevent Parliament from conferring functions on persons or authorities other than the President."

Now that is a fusion. There certainly is no separation between President and Parliament.

Section 75(1) states:

Special Joint Select Committee (1992 Budget)

Friday, April 24, 1992

[MR. HUMPHREY]

“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.”

That is not a separation, that is a clear fusion. There can be no separation of executive authority from Parliament under this Constitution. In the American system, yes. The President can veto legislation. In the American system he can— not here. So there is a separation of powers in the US constitution but not in the Trinidad and Tobago Constitution and, Madam Speaker, it is dangerous for Trinidad and Tobago, or any government, to interpret our Constitution as being similar to that of the United States. It is seriously dangerous for the Government, for the Executive, to believe that it is separate and exists separately from the Parliament.

Now, if you suggest that the Judiciary must be independent, yes. That is a basic tenet of Westminster. Again, in the United States the Judiciary is appointed by the Executive. Not so in Westminster. So I am really alarmed at the interpretation given, both to the motion that is before us and to the Constitution generally by the hon. Attorney General. I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that he seriously consider—*[Interruption]*

Mr. Sudama: Removing the AG.

Mr. Humphrey: No, I am not suggesting that he should seriously consider a re-examination of the basic precepts under which our system is established. Otherwise he is going to fall into the same trap as his predecessor and establish himself as a virtual dictator. This is what has happened. If we are to take the Constitution seriously, Madam Speaker, and take our role as Members of Parliament seriously, we cannot just look at one part of the Constitution and not at another part.

This motion deals with accountability in the most important area of parliamentary life which is the area of allocating the resources of the country and directing those resources—the area of finance. Because the annual budget is an exercise whereby Members of Parliament determine the fortunes of Trinidad and Tobago for that year, by allocating and directing the use of finances—and it is not just state finances. Because the Government has the power, through the Parliament, to raise taxes and can, therefore, call on the citizens to make financial contributions to the state for the purpose of managing the affairs for that financial year. So it impacts on the private citizen. No other agency, no other institution in

the society enjoys that kind of power. The budget, therefore, determines whether Trinidad and Tobago enjoys a decent life for a year, or whether our people are put under pressure.

5.15 p.m.

How are we supposed to manage the annual budget? How are resources supposed to be allocated and directed? The Constitution tells us. The Constitution does not say: "The Executive has been elected; it has won an election; it therefore is the government and now it is going to command the resources of the country in its own interest." It does not say that. It tells the elected government how those resources must be managed and directed.

I want to turn to the part of the Constitution that, as a Member of this Parliament, I have always considered to be paramount, and that is the Preamble. The Preamble, written in the name of the people of Trinidad and Tobago is, in effect, the statement of social objectives of Trinidad and Tobago. That is what it is. Everything that we do, as Members of this House or as officers of the Constitution; anything that we do where our power is derived from the provisions of the Constitution, must be done in a certain way, to achieve a certain objective. Madam Speaker, the objective is clearly stated, dealing with the economy, and finances deal with the economy.

At clause (b) of the so-called preamble is something that the hon. Attorney General missed in the motion. It says that the people of Trinidad and Tobago

"respect the principles of social justice and therefore believe that the operation of the economic system should result in the material resources of the community being so distributed as to subserve the common good, that there should be adequate means of livelihood for all..."

Madam Speaker, that is the mandate. When we sit here and examine the national accounts and look at heads of expenditure and we vote, the mandate is to ensure that all of the people of this country have at least the basic requirements of survival. If not a decent living standard, with security, at least the basic requirements of survival. In our species, the basic requirements which we derive through earning an income and expending the income in the market place, food, clothing, shelter. If we could take a tour of this country and satisfy ourselves that all of our citizens enjoy those basic requirements of survival, then we could say we are doing our job. But all of us know that we cannot do that. There are many citizens who are deprived of the very basic elements that are required to survive.

Special Joint Select Committee (1992 Budget)
[MR. HUMPHREY]

Friday, April 24, 1992

The budget exercise is supposed to achieve that, and I am amazed that the spokesman for the Government side has indicated the Government's opposition to the motion so ably proposed by the Member for Couva North. It would seem to me that the Government would welcome Members of this House, because you are talking about Members from the PNM party, the UNC party and the NAR party. Those are the Members of this House today. So there are three parties in this House, and each one of the parties, by virtue of being here, has demonstrated that it has the support of the people. In fact, that is the whole principle of the representative arrangement that we have adopted, the Westminster system. We therefore have to assume that collectively, among the 36 of us, we represent, by and large, the whole society. We have to assume that, because no other party won a seat in this House. Mind you, we know that is not so. We know that there are minority political organizations that do not have sufficient national support to claim a seat and, therefore, certain people in the society are not permitted a place in this House. They cannot have representation in this House. That is a fault of the constitutional process.

If we accept the premise that among the three parties, we represent the vast majority of the population, Madam Speaker, I cannot see why the Government would object to having Members of those respective organizations sit, representing the whole House, in a committee, to monitor the nation's finances on the basis of the budget: what was voted, how it is being spent, what projects were identified and are those projects being undertaken. Then in monitoring, to report to the whole House and, hopefully, the House would debate that report. I would think that the Government would welcome that.

I am amazed that the lone spokesman for the Government so far, has opposed it. Naturally, when we debate the budget, that is the opportunity that we use to argue for reforms. God knows that this country needs some reforms. It needs reforms in the budgetary process, because as a Minister for part of a year, I recall how the budget was formulated. I can tell you that the budget is formulated by the public servants taking the accounts from one year and just carrying them forward to the next year.

Mr. Manning: That is how you all did it.

Mr. Humphrey: That is how it is done. That is how it has always been done for the 30 years of PNM administration. The party manifesto, on whichever party forms the Government, has its mandate, is totally and absolutely ignored. We all debated the budget for this year—

Mr. Manning: Madam Speaker, I think I must defend the public servants. It is not our experience at all that our manifesto is being ignored by the public service. That is not our experience at all.

Mr. Humphrey: I did not say the public service ignored it. I am saying they are ignoring it. The Government is ignoring it. You see, that is another fault. They perceive this separation of powers and believe that the Executive enjoys some sort of sanctity. It is not even responsive to its own party, and this we know for a fact. You see, I was once a member of that party. Yes, I will say it, "once a PNM, always a PNM".

When I went in there, I went in, realizing the need for constitutional reform, that the British colonial masters had imposed on us as a society, a condition that was crippling us, disabling us as a society. We were not able to move forward because of the conditions imposed by the British colonial masters and their local agents, both in the politics and in the business community. The PNM regime was a local agent of the British raj. There is no question about it. Because they refused to do anything about the race that was injected into the society, deliberately by the British. You see, they did not need to bring their marines to control us. We fought so much against each other, that their marines could be left in comfort in England, and they did not have to be sent, except on occasion.

5.25 p.m.

The 1937 riots in the oilfields, they sent the marines because oil was important to them. But this Government has accepted lock, stock and barrel what was established as the basis of the political system of the colonial masters, divide the population deliberately upon race and keep it divided. I am an external observer. The two major racial groups in the society, African, Indian—they are not Africans, Indians anymore; they are Trinidadians.

Madam Speaker: The only difficulty I find with the hon. Member's contribution is that I think it is getting a bit irrelevant. I think we are really debating whether or not a select committee should be appointed to monitor and report on the performance of Government in relation to the implementation of the budget and I do not think these external statements about race ought to come in at this point. Could we consider the motion at hand, please?

Mr. Humphrey: A special select committee is a committee of all parties of the House.

Special Joint Select Committee (1992 Budget)
[MR. HUMPHREY]

Friday, April 24, 1992

Madam Speaker: I do not think the hon. Member is really trying to defend his statements on race at this point in relation to the motion. Could we just please carry on.

Mr. Humphrey: I accept your ruling. I have no problem with the ruling but you see I know it is a fact of political life. Objective observers look on and they comment and say that is a fact of political life and it is a fact of political life that disables us as a society.

Well you see, power tends to corrupt, absolute power corrupts absolutely, but I do not think Lord Acton did an analysis of power, because if a government comes into office, we describe it as being in power but if that government cannot solve the basic problems of the society what power does it really have? It has no power and this Government, as previous governments including the NAR which we have just suffered for five years, has never really had power. The fact that they would reject the proposal of this special select committee is an indication that they know they have no power. They are worried about what might happen here—that we might be critical of what they are doing and that criticism might go out to the wider public and more pressures will mount on them. So they want to have a semblance of power; for what purpose? Just to have it and this is what we have been witness to over the last three/four decades in our historical life.

Madam Speaker, this motion will in fact, give life to what was intended by the Constitution, for the Cabinet to be collectively responsible to the Parliament. This is the sort of thing that will give life to that.

Madam Speaker, the areas of reform that are required to make this Parliament responsive to the people of this country start from the most basic and go right through the gambit of everything that is done in the society, but the vested interest groups of the society will not accept any reform. In fact, the present Prime Minister is afraid to use the word reform. He is afraid of the word revolution for what it connotes in the minds of the people but you see, change sometimes comes in a difficult way. In fact, the world has changed overtime through violent means. That is how change has come. There has not been a revolution in the history of man that has not been violent. I am not advocating violence in our changing process. Mine has been the greatest voice against violence all my political life. But you see I am a realist.

Madam Speaker, if we do not get an executive responding to the spirit and the letter of the Constitution and enabling this Parliament to play the role it should be

playing, a meaningful role, then unfortunately pressures will mount in the society more and more, and there will be another explosion. Explosions do not come out of a vacuum. They come out of the real circumstance under which people live and that circumstance is imposed by the system. It is our duty to improve the system where we find it is weak and as the Member for Couva North pointed out, and we all went through it, the Member for Diego Martin Central said it was unprecedented. "Never before have we debated a Supplementary Appropriation Bill." That is what he said—that these things are normally accepted as a matter of course, which is true, but this one was debated because we want to put an end to that sort of thing, that sort of abuse of power, where you use the state's resources selfishly in order to try to retain office.

Mr. Maharaj: Mrs. Indira Gandhi was convicted and jailed for that.

Mr. Humphrey: I do not want to be tempted to talk about the experiences of other countries, certainly in the context of violence.

Madam Speaker, I want to try to persuade the hon. Prime Minister to use his tremendous power, because he has the power. There is no question about it. Anyone who has the authority to hire and fire his Ministers has the power. It is true he does not have a very large majority so he cannot abuse it to any very great extent as it was abused on the last occasion but, I want to try and prevail on him to use that power in the interest of the people of Trinidad and Tobago, and not in the sole interest of himself and his party; great is the PNM and it will prevail—change the motto—great are the people of Trinidad and Tobago and we will prevail—all of us as a society and not just the PNM. In that regard, to show his commitment to the process of genuine unity by accepting this motion and I want to refer him—I have not started changing the picture yet—to page 21 of his manifesto. Remember what I promised? If I was satisfied that he abused his power I would not change him to Adolf Hitler, I would change him to the likeness of the Member for Tobago East.

Madam Speaker, look at what the manifesto of the PNM said. Now, we judge this on the basis of this motion, on the spirit of what seems to have been intended:

"Major initiatives will include:

the establishment of an appropriate mechanism, at the level of Parliament if feasible, within the model of a parliamentary democracy, to provide for

consultation on national energy policies between Government and Opposition."

Now I have to interpret that to mean that the Prime Minister is prepared to work more closely with his colleagues opposite in formulating policies, in executing programmes but through Parliament.

Madam Speaker, the surest way of fulfilling this manifesto pledge is when you have the opportunity to amend those Standing Orders, and I realize as Speaker you intend to do so. I want to give you credit for that. In fact, in the spirit of Westminster and in accordance with the Standing Orders, even though they were outdated, the committees of Parliamentarians are recognized as valid, as useful. In fact, the hon. Member could not have moved the motion for establishing a special select committee had there not been provision for it in the Standing Orders. It is perfectly within the hon. Prime Minister's vision of parliamentary democracy to include this and it is in accordance with the spirit of the manifesto of his own party. *[Interruption]* Do not force me to change this.

Madam Speaker, I seek to persuade our friends opposite to support this. It can only do good for Trinidad and Tobago.

5.35 p.m.

Mr. Trevor Sudama (*Oropouche*): Madam Speaker, I know the Member for Diego Martin West is expecting blows. When I get up he expects blows, but tonight I will spare him, because he is such a glutton for blows. It gives me no pleasure to beat him annually, in parliamentary terms.

I have risen this afternoon to talk about a subject on which I believe I have had some measure of competence. In fact, it is the most important issue to be discussed in this Parliament, because it has to deal with the nature of a budget. What is a budget? What does it represent? What does it reflect? It is the most important statement that the government makes on an annual basis to the people of this country, because included in that budget is the policy statement of the government setting the framework for the improvement of the economy of this country; for the reallocation of resources; providing the country with a statement on its philosophy and distributive process. It is a most fundamental statement that could be made annually and it decides how much each group, individual and community get on an annual basis.

Therefore, this has to do with the whole budgetary process. If I may seek to educate Members on the other side, as to the procedures, because the budget statement is merely the end result, at a certain point in time, of the procedure of a process, which, when certain decisions are finalized by the Executive, comes to this House for ratification. It is critical to understand how that procedure operates from the time of its inception, to the time that the Cabinet makes its annual decisions.

The Member for St. Augustine has questioned part of the issue. Basically, the budget is divided into three elements, that is the recurrent element which deals with expenditures and allocations for ongoing projects which they have decided upon over the years. Then there is another element called the developmental element where you spend money to develop new programmes which are supposed "to develop the economy" to provide the infrastructure for development.

Now, what happens to one section of that budget presentation? From my own experience, having been there for a very short period of time—I see my colleague for Tobago East is not here. I would have elaborated a little more. I think I would reserve that elaboration for the next day—various departments of government are requested by the Ministry of Finance to send proposals to them on the basis of ongoing programmes.

Never, from my knowledge, while I was there in 1987 and previously, has the Ministry of Finance ever indicated to these departments, "tell me which programmes you are continuing, which are obsolete, which are irrelevant with respect to the services they are providing. Never has that statement been made. It is this carrying forward—

Mr. Manning: Madam Speaker, I am very grateful to the hon. Member for giving way. It is a fundamental error in the argument that is being advanced by the hon. Member.

When the individual ministries make a submission either to the Minister of Finance in the case of the recurrent budget, or to the Ministry of Planning and Development in respect of the capital budget, that submission is expected to be informed by the political wisdom of the Minister responsible. That is the difference between the PNM's approach and the approach of others.

Mr. Sudama: I have not come to that point as yet. I am just giving them the preamble of how the system works. We have not come to political wisdom or the

Special Joint Select Committee (1992 Budget)
[MR. SUDAMA]

Friday, April 24, 1992

lack of it as yet. Those are separate issues. That is PNM's political wisdom. I will deal with that in due course.

The Minister of Finance tells the various ministries, "look here, give me your proposals." What happens at the various departmental levels is that the civil servants then look at what they asked for last year, and add more for inflation or whatever and put on another five per cent on the budget provision. Are you on a point of order? You are disturbing my trend of thought.

Mr. Valley: I want to put you on the right trend of thought. Madam Speaker, I just want the hon. Member simply to inform the House whether the process which he is describing obtains for the capital project or the development programme.

Mr. Sudama: Where were you for the last five to ten minutes when I was speaking? Are you aware of the process in the Ministry of Finance dealing with the preparation of the budget? He is a Minister in the Ministry of Finance and he was also a civil servant under the PNM's regime. Now, I am wondering, is this why the PNM came up with such hatched budget proposals in the past? Maybe the Member for Diego Martin Central had a significant input. He does not even understand what I am speaking about.

I am telling you exactly what the civil servants do with respect to the recurrent programme. They look at the last provision for the previous budget; they may look at what the current expenditures are and so on; then they add a little percentage and send it forward for recurrent. Then that comes to the Ministry of Finance.

As I said, at that particular point the department has never been asked to indicate whether in fact the ongoing programmes which they are currently pursuing are relevant, irrelevant or need to be amended. All they do is come up with numbers based on what has been requested in previous years.

5.45 p.m.

Mr. Valley: Obviously, the Member does not understand what he is talking about, or he is intent on misleading the House. If he is talking about the recurrent programme, he is talking about personnel expenditure, expenditure on goods and services and other minor equipment. There is no programme that is financed under the recurrent programme as such, so there is no programme one can say is absolute. If one has 100 employees, the question is whether one would have fewer employees the next year, or whether one would consider the 100 to be sufficient.

Mr. Sudama: That is the problem you face. He never asks the question whether these 100 employees are doing anything meaningful. That is the question he has to address. Surely, when you employ people you employ them for something, and the questions of whether the services they are providing are in fact provided in the most effective manner or whether they are relevant at all in the situation in which we find ourselves, are never addressed. His mind is attuned in a certain way. What you did last year you will do this year, but with a little more money. I am saying that is a fundamental flaw in the way the budget is prepared.

We come to the other aspect of the budget. Even in the recurrent programme, there is inbuilt an allocative process where money is being spent, directed to which target group? In what areas? That is already inbuilt in the budget and he merely carries on with that. Then you come to the second aspect of it where he says that the Prime Minister says that that incorporates the political wisdom of the Minister and the PNM Government where you attempt to initiate new programmes to address issues of infrastructure, involvement in the economy in one way or the other, dealing with specific problems which they face and which they call developmental.

Now, whose views prevail in the determination of those values and those programmes and those allocations? They are the views primarily of the senior public servants, informed or amended by the views of the political directorate, but the political directorate has, over the years, been attuned to look at the problem only in a certain way, that is, not to look at what is necessary for the development of the economy to create more equal opportunity in the society through the manner in which they spend money; to create the framework for production, for greater productivity, on-going and permanent employment opportunities and so forth. Over the years, what has happened is that their philosophy for developmental expenditure has been flawed and has been politically motivated.

What is happening under the Westminster system is that it is a winner take all syndrome and whoever wins the Government decides how these resources are to be allocated to the virtual exclusion of everybody else. We are here in this Parliament but we have absolutely no input in the formulation of that critical document which comes to this House called the budget. If we had a different budgetary process, we would not have that great urgency as expressed in this motion which I fully ascribe to, of monitoring exactly what has been provided for and what has actually been expended. I am saying that if the prior work was done

Special Joint Select Committee (1992 Budget)

Friday, April 24, 1992

[MR. SUDAMA]

in a more rational way, taking the whole country into account—the needs of the society and the economy—then the need for this post-budget analysis, while important, would not have become as urgent as it is now.

Madam Speaker, I want to give this House a little anecdote of the thinking of the PNM. I recall in 1983, we were invited by the then PNM Government to Republic Day celebrations, held at Farrell House Hotel. After the main function, the then Prime Minister, Mr. Chambers, invited the Leader of the Opposition and myself for a drink and to talk.

He said to me: "Are you coming again to attack me and to attack the Government Friday,?"

I said, "Mr. Prime Minister, I have no other option. The system provides that I have to displace you in order to have a say in the decision-making process in this country. This is what the system provides. I will get up in Parliament and I will speak for five years and they will not even acknowledge my presence, let alone what I say".

He said, "Boy, I do not know how you all do it. Friday, after Friday, I am subjected to attack. My Government is subjected to attack".

I said, "Mr. Prime Minister, if you do not want attack, let me give you two proposals. The first is, let us form a national government in Trinidad and Tobago".

"No way, no way", he said. "Let us, from the Members elected to the House, choose the best talent available and form a government of national unity, at least for the time being". We were in a special situation. In those years the economy had started to slide and we were getting into economic crisis. It was on the horizon. Everyone could have seen it. Oil prices were falling, *et cetera*.
[Interruption]

Are you willing to make an intervention at this point? If you are, I expect you to say something. These are very important and fundamental matters. I expect you to say something in this debate even if it is to confirm your reactionary position with respect to this proposal. Hear me out. I said:

"Let us form a government of national unity, in which case we will discuss in this Parliament. It will not be a confrontational relationship between fundamental issues Government and Opposition, at least for a certain time period until the economy is stabilized."

He said, and it was a convivial occasion, "Yes, I will think about it. "

I said, "As an alternative—*[Interruption]* I do not think the Member for Diego Martin West is capable of conviviality.

Dr. Rowley: Madam Speaker, for my own edification, I would like to ask a question in the light of what he just said. Did the Member say that he was at a function and they all were drinking before this happened?

5.55 p.m.

Mr. Sudama: Let me proceed from what he was saying. Although it was a formal discussion, it has very significant bearing for the way in which the PNM conceives of Government, conceives of the legislative process, conceives of parliamentary democracy. So I said, "Look, Mr. Prime Minister, if you do not want to consider national unity, let me give you an alternative proposal. You see that budget, it is a very important document, because it is a distributive, allocative process. But when I am in Opposition, I have absolutely no input into that allocative process, absolutely no input".

Dr. Rowley: But you were in government when the same thing happened.

Mr. Sudama: I will deal with you and your input. I mean the Member for Arouca South came crying to me, he said, "You know, I am here and they only give me \$14 million for Health." I said, "But did you argue your case in Cabinet?" He said, "No, boy, I could not talk. Only \$14 million for development, what am I going to do with this?" And he tells me now that I had power in 1987. You see, he had power. A Member of Cabinet and crying that the allocation was only \$14 million.

Madam Speaker, I said, "Look here, Mr. Prime Minister, let me give you a suggestion: Let the Members of Parliament—we all represent constituencies, we all have needs, we all have areas of the economy which need to be addressed in the national interest and also in the regional interest and when you add up whatever happens in the regions, of course, that is the national interest". I said, "Let us address that. Prior to the budget presentation in this House, let us also be part of that process of budget formulation, where we provide our input".

I can tell you best what are the priorities in my constituency. No civil servant can come and tell me in Oropouche what my priorities are and what the priorities of the people in Oropouche are, but that is in fact what they do under the present

Special Joint Select Committee (1992 Budget)
[MR. SUDAMA]

Friday, April 24, 1992

system: They determine your priorities, whether a bridge is to be built, whether drainage has to be done on an ongoing basis or other basis, these civil servants decide. The Ministers do not care, simply because Oropouche, as far as they are concerned, does not exist; they do not care.

Madam Speaker, I said let us get involved prior—are you going to ask a serious, intelligible question? If not, I will not give way.

Mr. Imbert: On a point of order, Madam Speaker. I wish to inform this House that I toured the constituency of Oropouche with the Member for Oropouche, viewing drainage and irrigation works and allowed him to make valuable input.

Mr. Sudama: What he did not say is he purported to tour the constituency of Oropouche and he came there and after one and a half hours of touring—maybe the sun was too hot—he said, "You know, I have an emergency to go to in Port of Spain." He cut short his visit and he ran back to Port of Spain. This is the kind of talk that they engage in.

Dr. Rowley: He spent an hour and a half with you? He good.

Mr. Sudama: I said, "What have you seen so far, can we get any decision as to what you are going to do?" He said, "Well, we will think about it. I did not know these places existed in Trinidad." The Member for Diego Martin East! You see the attitude. He asks me and I show him a lovely area of the Oropouche Lagoon devastated by an infusion of salt water, where there was thriving agriculture before, economies devastated. He asked me, "Is this part of Trinidad?" This very knowledgeable Minister of Works. You want to ask this question today? It is six o'clock, you see, I want to find out if you want to ask because I have to respond to you.

Madam Speaker: The hon. Member will have to give way at this time for a matter of urgent public importance which was raised by the Member for St. Augustine.

**DESTRUCTION OF HOUSES
(BAMBOO SETTLEMENT No. 3)**

Mr. John Humphrey (*St. Augustine*): Madam Speaker, I think I have risen at a very opportune moment. I thank members of this House for giving me this opportunity. Yesterday, the Member for Oropouche, the Member for Chaguanas, the hon. Minister of Housing and the representative for St. Joseph in which this

area falls and myself, met a very large delegation of residents at Bamboo Settlement No. 3.

Madam Speaker, what we discovered was that a project is being implemented that could be the source of some very serious problems emerging in that area. It is a project that was inherited by this Government from the last Government based on alien conditionalities imposed by the financing agent that has entered into an agreement with the Government.

The Inter-American Development Bank negotiated a loan for regularizing and upgrading certain squatter areas in this country and imposed certain conditionalities on that loan. One of the conditionalities is to apply standards that are not even common to developed societies. The standards that are being imposed on that little area are not even common to all areas of developed societies. The particular aspect of the project that I have identified in my motion is the laying of a sewer main. They are putting for that village, a central sewage disposal plant that is not required in a low density area such as Bamboo Settlement No. 3. There is not a single lot smaller than 100 by 50 feet, 5,000 square feet, not one. So there is no need for high density sewage disposal facilities. The Commodore Garden Newbold Septic Tank can work and will be much more economical, much less disruptive.

Madam Speaker, the reason I sought to raise this as a definite matter of urgent public importance is that the contractor is on site and he has a very large excavator, excavating a trench for laying the sewer main and there are several houses on the alignment of that trench and the villagers complain that those houses, are going to be demolished by the contractor. If the contractor demolishes those houses, he will be in breach of the Constitution and the law of Trinidad and Tobago. It will be an illegal act, and there will be serious recriminations.

I want to try to persuade the Government to stop that aspect of the project in its tracks. Go no further with it. What is needed there is not a central sewage disposal system. What is needed there is a little scientific drainage. The problem with that area, Madam Speaker, is that it is below the high level of the Caroni River. When the Caroni River reaches its highest level, that total area is below that. If the bank is breached, the area is flooded. But if, in heavy rainfall, the level of the river is high, the water that accumulates in the village stays in the village, and you have to wait until the water level of the river declines to drain the area.

What I want to suggest that the Government consider, first of all, is telling the IADB that they are not accepting the conditionalities and that they are not going to

Destruction of Houses (Bamboo Settlement No. 3)

Friday, April 24, 1992

[MR. HUMPHREY]

honour the conditions of this contract that was entered into by the previous regime but would like to sit and renegotiate the use of these resources. I am not saying to treat them discourteously, but call the representative—there is a local representative—to a meeting and indicate that if this project continues in the way it is going, it will have severe social repercussions.

Apply the resources, enabling the flood waters that are contained by the village at high water mark of the river to be pumped out of the village. Establish a system of drainage that will collect the water at a point near to the river and pump it out. In fact, the infrastructure enables it, because there is a main drain adjacent to the highway and there are crosses, under the road that will take all the water collected in the village to that main drain and therefore you can build a sump at the end of the main drain and pump the water into the river when necessary. Now, that would be a useful piece of infrastructure. That would ensure that there is no flooding. That will enable the unit septic tank to work for each household.

There is a high watermark so you dig the conventional soakaway, but you can dig a gravel drain and attach that gravel drain to the drainage system and the gravel drain, if properly designed, can enhance the environment because the moisture contained in that drain can keep the grass and foliage green. It will save a tremendous amount of money.

I was advised that each resident is being forced to pay \$18,000 overtime for the sewage aspect of development. Madam Speaker, this is absolutely ridiculous. You do not have centralized sewage disposal systems in a majority of the homes in North America, for example, which is the most developed of all the societies. You have them in the cities, where there is a high density of residential settlement. You need them there and our experience in this country is that these plants break down and you get severe reactions from the ecology. A good case in point is Buccoo Reef, which is being destroyed by a plant that is not operating, in the Buccoo housing estate. I want to try to persuade the Government to seriously reconsider.

Madam Speaker, the Government has the power to do this. The Member for Couva North and the Member for Couva South, who are both capable lawyers in their professional lives, are going to a meeting tonight. The villagers have already been advised that what is required is an injunction to stop the project. Now, we can preclude that if we get an assurance from the Government that they will not press on with this project. The village is not going to support the project.

I think the Member for St. Joseph is fully aware of that and from the chat I had with him yesterday, Madam Speaker, I believe he would welcome putting a break on the project until some time is spent to reconsider.

I can see problems, because when you enter into a contract you are bound by conditions, and if you breach the conditions there are penalties. But I believe that both the contractor and the Inter-American Development Bank will be prepared, because of the new circumstances—this is a new Government, after all—in a good spirit of co-operation to sit and renegotiate so as to redirect the resources in a way that the members of the community can accept, support and assist in.

Madam Speaker, I have had the experience in the past of confronting the Government virtually alone on this issue of breaking down people's homes. As a serious and responsible Member of this Parliament and citizen of Trinidad and Tobago, I sought the responsible route in that confrontational exercise and I took a matter to the High Court and a ruling was given by Justice Deyalsingh on the matter that has been established in the common law. The people who are described as squatters on state lands have constitutional rights, first, to the protection of the law and, second, to the enjoyment of their property not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law. That ruling clearly identified the houses, as humble as they might have been, as private property.

Madam Speaker, it is true the squatter has no legal right to occupy state lands written in the laws of the country. But according to the spirit of the Constitution, there is a constitutional right. Because at the end of this period of slavery, when slaves were emancipated, the Crown tolerated their settling on Crown lands and acquiesced in their use of Crown property, that has now become entrenched in the common law of Trinidad and Tobago. That is the matter, Madam Speaker, that gives those residents in Bamboo Settlement No. 3 the legal power to withstand this.

I am not a lawyer practising before the bar, I am at a much higher level than that, Madam Speaker, because they have to practise in accordance with the laws we make here, and I am a party to making those laws.

The other issue I think the Government should take note of, the Government, in its manifesto, has promised the squatting community to regularize, in accordance with an Act that was passed in 1986, to wit Act 20 of 1986. Madam Speaker, it has to be amended because it is impractical. But if that is what the Government is trying to implement, it is not succeeding in Bamboo Settlement No. 3.

Destruction of Houses (Bamboo Settlement No. 3)
[MR. HUMPHREY]

Friday, April 24, 1992

In Bamboo Settlement No. 3, the solution to the problem of regularizing the squatters is not in accordance with the terms and provisions of that Act. I know that the Government is seriously contemplating an amendment to the Act, and I suggest that it is a good Act. However, the statutory lease is not granted until the squatter fulfils certain conditions. Those conditions will never be fulfilled: one, that surveyors survey the allotment and that the squatter must meet the cost of that. We do not have sufficient land surveyors in this country to survey the 50,000 squatter allotments in this country. For the next 10,000 years it will never be done. Secondly, that the deed of conveyance must be prepared by the squatter himself. He must go to a lawyer and have that prepared. It is just not going to happen. Remove those provisions and grant a statutory lease to all the squatters of this country. All you would need to do is let them establish their own boundaries, they can do this by the planting of "ryo" which for hundreds of years was satisfactory. That is all you need to do until you can gradually upgrade the data, but it is going to take an inordinately long time to upgrade that data on the basis of proper land surveyors and proper deeds and so forth. You will never get through that exercise.

Madam Speaker, I thought that I would make this intervention with the hope that we would go no further with that and not push the country into a crisis that is unnecessary. I personally do not want to get involved in another confrontation of this type. I meant to help the Government solve the problems of this country, quite frankly, but I will not stand by and see this sort of thing happen.

The same way I was activated in 1983 to single-handedly confront the Government and virtually change my whole philosophy of life in that process because I could not sit by idly and see the rights of human beings being trampled the way they were being trampled and today I feel the same way.

If we are forced to confront the Government on this, I will be right there, taking the position of chief confronter, but I am pleading with the Government to avoid that.

The Minister of Housing and Settlements (Dr. The Hon. Vincent Lasse):
Madam Speaker, I rise to address the question raised by the hon. Member for St. Augustine. First off, Madam Speaker, I would like to make it very clear that the Government of Trinidad and Tobago has a clear policy on the question of squatter regularization. The Government intends to regularize squatters on state lands, pursuant to Act 20 of 1986. That is to say at 25 cents per square foot and \$1 lease rent per year. But bearing in mind that in 1986, there were approximately 7,000 squatter households on state lands and a similar number on private lands, it has

Destruction of Houses (Bamboo Settlement No. 3)

Friday, April 24, 1992

become necessary for us to look into Act 20 of 86 and amending it where necessary so that persons who are squatting on state lands would be able to acquire the due title.

Thus, Madam Speaker, on January 14, 1992, I appointed a committee to explore the possibilities and modalities for recommending squatter regularization within the policy framework of Act 20 of 1986. I also wish to state at this point in time that a task force has also been set up to elaborate a new housing policy. As soon as a new housing policy is formulated to the satisfaction of the Government, the findings would be made available to this House.

Before I turn to Bamboo Settlement proper, I wish to state that the events leading up to the question that was raised stem from the fact that there had been certain dissatisfaction voiced by certain residents or squatters at Bamboo Settlement No. 3. On Wednesday, April 22, 1992, the Member for Oropouche came to my office with a delegation from Bamboo Settlement No. 3 to discuss in what way we can move towards regularizing squatters. At that point in time, the arguments which were being advanced by the squatters were basically, one, the fact that they were in favour of cesspits instead of a sewer treatment plant.

Mr. B. Panday: Are you saying cesspits or septic tanks? Because there is a difference.

Hon. V. Lasse: I am reporting what transpired in my office on Wednesday.

Mr. Bereaux: Cesspit, latrine.

Hon. V. Lasse: Madam Speaker, although I had arranged with the Member for Caroni Central to visit squatters in his area on Thursday around two o'clock, I decided that I would try to accommodate the Member for Oropouche and visit Bamboo Settlement No. 3. Therefore, at around 1.30 p.m. on Thursday, I arrived at the scene where I met the Member for St. Augustine, the Member for Oropouche and, the Member for St. Joseph, the parliamentary representative of the people.

The question about demolishing homes was never a question on the agenda because, in truth and in fact, what was happening at that point in time, on the scene where we had electronic media, was a case whereby a roadway was being constructed. But it was brought to my attention that the roadway was being constructed on a parcel of land, I believe, in the vicinity of two to three acres being claimed by one of the settlers. Therefore, the question of demolishing, as I

Destruction of Houses (Bamboo Settlement No. 3)
[HON. V. LASSE]

Friday, April 24, 1992

say, was never brought to my attention, or there was never any indication that the contractors were embarking upon such a course of action.

Madam Speaker, I agree with the Member for St. Augustine when he mentioned that certain agreements had been entered into prior to this Government taking office, because on June 20, 1990, the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago signed a loan agreement with the Inter-American Development Bank in the amount of \$66.1 million, to accelerate implementation of the National Settlements Programme over a five-year period and, among other things, that included the development of approximately 5,000 serviced residential building lots.

6.25 p.m.

Madam Speaker, this has a direct relation to Bamboo Settlement No. 3. In January, contracts were awarded to deal with two areas in which Bamboo Settlement No. 3 and Maturita Triangle had been so identified. I had the opportunity of visiting Maturita Triangle, and the work is continuing smoothly without interruption.

A firm policy on the IDB segment has not been clearly identified at this point in time. As I have mentioned, a task force has been set up to deal with a new housing policy and a committee has been set up to deal specifically with the question of squatter regularization pursuant to Act. No. 20 of 1986. Therefore, Madam Speaker, I want to assure Members on the other side that the policy of this Government is to build and not to destroy. We intend to regularize squatters pursuant to Act No. 20 of 1986. As the Minister of Housing, I intend to monitor the situation very closely, and with specific reference to Bamboo Settlement No. 3. I would continue, as I am doing at this point in time to entertain questions from the persons who are now residing in the areas, and I am embarking upon a visit to each area where we have squatters on state lands. I assure the Members on the other side that this Government would not stand to see one single house demolished.

Madam Speaker, I thank you very much.

Mr. Panday: Madam Speaker, we are going to Bamboo Settlement tonight. My friend and I have been invited. Can I tell them that their houses will not be demolished?

Hon. V. Lasse: I believe I have made myself very, very clear.

Mr. Panday: I can tell them that, can I?

Mr. Sudama: Mr. Minister, in the light of your visit there, and you saw the location of the sewer site and the houses which are between the sewer site and the river, I would like to know whether those houses would have to be broken down. Is that a requirement of the physical plan which is currently being implemented? What would happen to those persons whose houses will be broken down? If you are not proceeding with the sewer plant, fine. If you are proceeding with the physical plan with respect to roads and sewer, it will involve demolition. What is the policy of your Government?

Hon. V. Lasse: Madam Speaker, I would like to refer once more to Act No. 20 of 1986. Under that Act, provision has been made whereby if a situation arises where squatters are actually living back to back with each other and because of the contour of the land one has to be removed, relocation has been provided for.

Mr. Humphrey: The hon. Minister was not taken to that part of the development. In fact, he will recall that a number of persons blocked his vision of what was going on in the excavation of the sewer line. Perhaps that is why he is not cognizant of the fact that the sewer line is directly in the path of three or four houses.

Mr. Panday: They will not be broken down, he says.

Hon. V. Lasse: I thank the hon. Member for St. Augustine for seeing for me, but I did see for myself. I believe the question that he did pose would be the same. Wherever the squatters are within an area that is being occupied, the question of relocation would take place.

ADJOURNMENT

The Minister of Local Government and Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Hon. Kenneth Valley): Madam Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to Friday, May 1, 1991 at 10.00 a.m. The debate on the Finance Bill which was introduced in the House today starts on next Friday, morning at 10.00 a.m., and we expect that it would continue on Monday, May 4, 1992.

Question put and agreed to.

House adjourned accordingly.

Adjourned at 6.32 p.m.

WRITTEN ANSWER TO QUESTION

Justices of the Peace

23. Mr. Subhas Panday (*Naparima*) asked the Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs:

Would the Minister state the names and addresses of persons who were made Justices of the Peace during the period 1976 to 1992?

The Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs (Hon. Keith Sobion): Madam Speaker, part of the records relating to the appointment of Justices of the Peace, which were kept in the Red House, was destroyed during the events of July 27, 1990. The information which was contained in the destroyed records had to be obtained from other sources, e.g. other Ministries and Departments, the *Trinidad and Tobago Gazette*.

Attached is a list showing the names and addresses (where available) of persons who were appointed Justices of the Peace during the period 1976 to 1992:

COUNTY VICTORIA

NAME	ADDRESS	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Carlyle Mohan	21 Ruth Avenue San Fernando	27/04/77
Goorshaine Hassanali	Rehabilitation Centre 7—21 New Street San Fernando	01/11/77
Hakim Mohammed	254 Naparima/Mayaro Rd. St. Julien Village Princes Town	03/06/81
Rennie Charles	Bassa Trace, Moruga	11/09/81
Cecil Bonas	Deceased 16C, Roy Joseph Street San Fernando	23/10/81
Alfred B. Huggins	Deceased Indian Walk, Princes Town	11/09/81
Seepersad Arjoonsingh	Dumfries Road Rambert Village	

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

	Bamboo P.O. San Fernando	07/12/84
Nazir F. Mohammed	Buen Intento Road Princes Town	20/08/87
Kelshall Charles	213 Indian Walk Moruga Road	25/11/87
David Paul Chadee	220 Naparima Mayaro Rd. Tableland	25/11/87
Godfrey Lee Sing	Grand Chemin Moruga	25/11/87
NAME	ADDRESS	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Rakeeb Hosein	13 Fonrose Street San Fernando	19/1/89

COUNTY ST. PATRICK

NAME	ADDRESS	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Durent Trotman	Cap-de-Ville, Point Fortin	01/05/78
Ramsubir Ramsubhag	No available address	13/08/79
Aubrey Persad	Deceased	06/02/80
Carlton Anthony	138 Crest Camp Fyzabad	11/04/86
Dexter Soodeen	137 Guapo Road Opp. Fyzabad Police Station, Fyzabad	11/08/87
Noah H. Neptune	Bungalow 122 Crest Camp Fyzabad	09/12/87

COUNTIES NARIVA/MAYARO

Mohansingh	Brothers Road	06/05/76
Cyril R. Forde	Mafeking Village,	

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

	Mayaro	14/10/81
Winston Gould	Guayaguayare Road Radix Village Mayaro	15/05/85
Robert Kalloo	Pierreville Mayaro	29/01/88
Zamir H. Rahim	5 Grant Street Rio Claro	29/01/88
Armin Mohammed	23 Mile Mark Naparima Mayaro Road Rio Claro	30/11/88

COUNTY CARONI

NAME	ADDRESS	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Krishna John	Brickfield Village Waterloo Road Carpichaima	09/12/87
Raymond Augustus	Brasso Village Brasso	09/12/87
Mookram Ramesh Bhagwandeem	55 Nolan Street Felicity Chaguanas	23/02/89

COUNTIES ST. ANDREW/ST. DAVID

NAME	ADDRESS	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Cecil Bernard	Daniel Scott Trace Talparo	20/11/87
David C. Nath	c/o Capil's & Co., Rd. E.M.R. Sangre Grande	20/11/87
Ramdath Mathura	Herrera Trace Cumuto Via Sangre Grande	26/03/88

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

Cecil Quamina	No. 3 Green Acres Foster Road Sangre Grande	26/03/88
David M. Tony	Mary Street Sangre Grande	26/03/88

TOBAGO

NAME	ADDRESS	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Oscar O'Neal Deane	22 Second Street Sun Valley Lower Santa Cruz	08/08/87
NAME	ADDRESS	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Frederick Powder	Delaforde, Tobago	20/08/87
Douglas Archer	St. Cecelia Concordia Tobago	18/12/87
George Beard	c/o P.O. Box 260	18/12/87

COUNTY ST. GEORGE

Irvin Ram Charan	No available address	15/10/76
Dennis Ramjohn	No available address	13/07/77
Albert Thomas	No available address	15/09/80
Williams G. Richards	1 Gordon Street Port of Spain	04/11/81
Myrtle Carter	14 Ruby Drive Diamond Vale Diego Martin	05/08/87

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

Mortley F. DePeaza	10 Joanne Avenue Hillsborro Development Maraval	07/09/87
Ainsley E. Dwarika	Correll Street Tunapuna	20/11/87
Cyril A. Lalla	No. 9 Charles Street Arima (Deceased)	25/11/87
Guillermo Antonio Prospect	5th Drive, Mt. d'Or Rd. Champs Fleurs (cancelled 4.12.89)	20/11/87
NAME	ADDRESS	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Ramsundar Persad	41 Rapsey Street, Curepe	20/11/87
Clive Tyson	247 Maloney Gardens D'Abadie c/o P.O. Box 749 Port of Spain	20/11/87
Cecil Bernard	Daniel Scott Trace Talparo	26/02/88
Cornilius Samuel	No. 2 Sixth Street West Cassleton Dinsley Gardens Tacarigua	29/11/88
Raymond Thompson	Mapp Lands c/o George Street P.O. George Street Port of Spain	16/02/89

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

NAME	ADDRESS	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Mulchan Sieuchan	Caroni	08/06/77

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

Edgar Wilson	No available address	10/03/80
Richard Rambaransingh	San Fernando	17/06/83

**Appointments of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
Magistracy
1976**

NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Yvonne Guiseppi	Magistracy—St. George West	8/1/76
David Gouveia	Magistracy—St. George West	8/1/76
Basdeo Mulchan	Magistracy—Caroni, Couva	8/1/76
NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Rudolph Ramgoolam	Magistracy—St. Patrick, La Brea	29/1/76
Keate Ganessingh	Magistracy—St. Patrick	29/1/76
Carlton Libert	Magistracy—Eastern Counties	29/1/76
Sookdeo Maharaj	Magistracy—St. George, Arima	29/1/76
Eugene Prince	Magistracy—St. George East	06/5/76
Fitzroy Louis Ford	Magistracy—St. George East, Arima	13/5/76
John Griffith	Magistracy—St. George East, Arima	15/10/76
Irwin Ramcharan	Magistracy—St. George East, Tunapuna	15/10/76
Theophilus Nicholas	Magistracy—County Caroni	15/10/76
Fitzroy Ford	Magistracy—Trinidad and Tobago	29/10/76
Ramberran Ramkhalawan	Magistracy—Trinidad and Tobago	29/10/76
Kenwyn John Hill	Magistracy—St. George West	10/11/76

**Appointments of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
Magistracy
1977**

NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Theophilus Nicholas	Magistracy—Caroni	10/2/77
Fyzool Persad	Magistracy—St. Patrick	10/2/77
Jeremiah Suphal	Magistracy—Victoria	16/2/77
Anatol Leance	Magistracy—Tobago	9/2/77
Mulchan Seuchan	Magistracy—Caroni	12/4/77

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

Basdeo Mulchan	Magistracy—St. Patrick, Siparia	13/7/77
Verna Babulal	Magistracy—Couva	13/7/77
Dennis Ramjohn	Magistracy—St. George West	13/7/77
Sukdeo Maharaj	Magistracy—Eastern Counties	13/10/77
Carlton Libert	Magistracy—St. George East, Arima	13/10/77
Kelvin Harrilal	Magistracy—Victoria, Princes Town	13/10/77
Dave Darbassie	Magistracy—Tobago	25/10/77
Verna Babulal	Magistracy—St. Patrick	1/11/77
Andrew Boodhai	Magistracy—Trinidad and Tobago	1/11/77
Clement Clunis	Magistracy—Trinidad and Tobago	24/11/77
NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Messina Mohammed	Magistracy—Caroni	24/11/77
Basdeo Mulchan	Magistracy—Trinidad and Tobago	16/12/77

Appointments of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
Magistracy
1978

NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Fatima Gopee	Magistracy—St. George East	16/1/78
Dennis Ramjohn	Magistracy—St. George West	09/3/78
Carlton Libert	Magistracy—Arima (St. George East)	05/4/78
Rajkumar Dukharan	Magistracy—Eastern Counties	05/4/78
Farouk Ail	Magistracy—St. George West	05/4/78
Parsan Sookdeo	Magistracy—Caroni	20/6/78
Sam Saroop	Magistracy—South Eastern County	20/6/78
Fatima Gopee	Magistracy—St. George East	12/7/78
Jurent Trotman	Magistracy—St. Patrick	31/7/78
Andrew Boodai	Magistracy—Victoria	29/9/78
Sookdeo R. Maharaj	Magistracy—Northern Eastern Counties	17/10/78

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

Ramdeo Sookdeo	Magistracy—Supreme Court	17/10/78
----------------	--------------------------	----------

Appointments of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
Magistracy
1979

NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Ralph Sadhu	Magistracy—St. George East	03/1/79
Ralph Ramdass	Magistracy—St. Patrick	17/1/79
Verna Babulal	Magistracy—Caroni	17/1/79
NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Kelvin Harilal	Magistracy—South Eastern County	17/1/79
Armichand Sookram	Magistracy—Victoria	06/2/79
Omar Jokhan	Magistracy—Tobago	21/2/79
Victor Charles	Magistracy—North Eastern	06/3/79
Trevor Hamilton	Magistracy—Trinidad and Tobago	22/3/79
Henry Seepersad	Magistracy—Victoria	29/3/79
Lorna La Borde	Magistracy—Trinidad and Tobago	05/4/79
Ralph Sadhu	Magistracy—St. George East	16/5/79
Ramcharan Balleram	Magistracy—Tobago	19/7/79
Ramcharan Balleram	Magistracy—Caroni	19/7/79
Bonadeen Brathwaite	Magistracy—St. Patrick	15/11/79
Ayesha D'Abreau	Magistracy—St. George West	01/12/79
Ramnanan Ramroop	Magistracy—Caroni	04/12/79

Appointments of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
Magistracy
1980

NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Aubrey Persad	Magistracy—St. Patrick	06/2/80
Claudette Caddle	Magistracy—St. George West	13/2/80
Sam Sookram	Magistracy—Victoria	20/5/80

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

Armichand Sookram	Magistracy—Victoria	11/6/80
Armichand Sookram	Magistracy—St. Patrick	14/7/80
Albert Thomas	Magistracy—St. George	15/9/80

Appointments of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)**Magistracy****1981**

NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Cecil Phillips	Magistracy—Tobago	27/2/81
NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Armichand Sookram	Magistracy—St. George East	08/7/81
Kelvin Harrilal	Magistracy—Victoria	02/10/81
Lystra Baynes	Magistracy—Tobago	02/10/81
Vadawatee Rampersad	Magistracy—South/Eastern	01/10/81
Ramraj Sookhansingh	Magistracy—St. Patrick West	01/10/81

Appointments of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)**Magistracy****1982**

NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Ramchand Gopaul	Magistracy—Siparia	16/04/82
Ramraj Sookhansingh	Magistracy—Siparia	16/04/82
Ramchand Ganga	Magistracy—San Fernando	03/05/82
Ralph Sadhu	Magistracy—Tunapuna	13/05/82
Haymchand Jattan	Magistracy—Sangre Grande	03/06/82
Persad Mohammed	Magistracy—La Brea	16/06/82
Deo Beharry	Magistracy—Arima	01/07/82
Farouk Mohammed	Magistracy—Sangre Grande	01/07/82
Calton Libert	Magistracy—Mayaro	01/07/82
Amichand Sookram	Magistracy—St. George East	01/07/82
Sookdeo Parsan	Magistracy—Point Fortin	05/08/82
Reitoo Ramlal	Magistracy—Couva	05/08/82

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

Henry Seepersad	Magistracy—Princes Town	05/08/82
Eugene Prince	Magistracy—Tunapuna	08/10/82
Kelvin Harrilal	Magistracy—Siparia	08/10/82

Appointments of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)**Magistracy****1983**

NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Ramraj Sookhansingh	Magistracy—Victoria	24/01/83
Salickram Raghoo	Magistracy—Caroni	07/04/83
NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Eugene Curtis Prince	Magistracy—St. George West	07/04/83
Fatima Gopee	Magistracy—St. George East	07/04/83
Armichand Sookram	Magistracy—Caroni	07/04/83
Kelvin Harrilal	Magistracy—Victoria	07/04/83
Sam Saroop	Magistracy—North-Eastern	07/04/83
Richard Rambaransingh	Magistracy—Trinidad and Tobago	25/05/83
Armichand Sookram	Magistracy—St. Patrick	28/07/83
Henry Seepersad	Magistracy—Victoria	10/08/83
Ramnanan Ramroop	Magistracy—St. George West	23/09/83
Farisha Dubarry	Magistracy—St. Patrick	23/09/83
Ramoutie Maraj	Magistracy—St. George West	23/09/83
Bissoonday Roodal	Magistracy—Mayaro	01/12/83

Appointments of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)**Magistracy****1984**

NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Ramona Premchand	Magistracy—Siparai	02/03/84
Anne Marie Roberts	Magistracy—Princes Town	02/03/84

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

Ford Fitzroy	Magistracy—Trinidad and Tobago	02/03/84
June Ahye	Judiciary—Supreme Court	10/04/84
Sam Saroop	Magistracy—Tunapuna	20/04/84
Sam Saroop	Magistracy—Siparia	02/05/84
Anne Marie Roberts	Magistracy—Tunapuna	02/05/84
Fyzool Mohammed	Magistracy—Princes Town	02/05/84
Messina Mohammed	Magistracy—Tunapuna	11/07/84
Victor Charles	Magistracy—St. George West	11/07/84
Narine Sahadeo	Magistracy—Victoria	11/07/84
NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Rosida Basdeo	Magistracy—San Fernando	23/08/84
Marva Ashby-Williams	Magistracy—St. George West	29/08/84
Eugene C. Prince	Magistracy—St. George West	27/09/84
Ramjit Ramoutar	Magistracy—Sangre Grande	07/11/84
Fitzroy Ford	Magistracy—Trinidad and Tobago	01/12/84
Henry Seepersad	Magistracy—Mayaro	06/12/84

Appointments of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)**Magistracy
1985**

NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Sam Saroop	Magistracy—Point Fortin	24/01/85
Kelvin Harrilal	Magistracy—Siparia	24/01/85
Parsan Sookdeo	Magistracy—Princes Town	13/06/85
Farouk Mohammed	Magistracy—Arima	25/07/85
Fyzool Persad	Magistracy—Supreme Court	12/12/85

Appointments of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)**Magistracy
1986**

NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
------	------------	------------------------

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

Anne-Marie Roberts	Magistracy—Couva	06/11/86
Ramraj Sookharsingh	Magistracy—Chaguanas	06/11/86
Eugene Prince	Magistracy—Tunapuna	06/11/86
Farouk Ali	Magistracy—St. George West	06/11/86

Appointments of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)**Magistracy
1987**

NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Messina Mohammed	Magistracy—St. George East	04/03/87
NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Ramchand Gopaul	Magistracy—St. Patrick	4/03/87
Ali Hosein	Magistracy—St. Patrick	“
Farouk Mohammed	Magistracy—St. Patrick	“
Inraj Maharaj	Magistracy—St. George East	“
Errol Supersad	Magistracy—St. Patrick	“
Sam Saroop	Magistracy—St. Patrick	30/04/87
Amichand Sookram	Magistracy—St. Patrick	30/04/87
Fatima Gopee	Magistracy—St. George East	30/04/87
Carlton Libert	Magistracy—North Eastern	30/07/87
Henry Seepersad	Magistracy—St. George East	23/07/87
Ramjattan Gadar	Magistracy—St. George East	23/07/87
Ramona Premchand	Magistracy—Caroni	23/07/87
Kelvin Harrilal	Magistracy—Nariva/Mayaro	23/07/87
Virendra Ramcharan	Magistracy—Victoria	23/07/97
Patricia Haddaway	Magistracy—Tobago	07/09/87
Narine Sahadeo	Magistracy—St. George East	12/11/87

Appointments of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)**Magistracy
1988**

NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
------	------------	---------------------

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

Ramchan Ganga	Magistracy—Arima	12/02/88
Ramnanan Ramroop	Magistracy—Tunapuna	22/03/88
Ramona Premchand	Magistracy—Princes Town	22/03/88
Fyzool M. Persad	Magistracy—Point Fortin	22/03/88
Ramchand Gopaul	Magistracy—San Fernando	22/03/88
Ramraj Sookhansingh	Magistracy—Point Fortin	22/03/88
Virendra Ramcharan	Magistracy—Chaguanas	22/03/88
Janice Hypolite	Magistracy—Siparia	31/03/88
Kelvin Harrilal	Magistracy—North Eastern Counties	21/04/88
NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Carlton Libert	Magistracy—South Eastern Counties	21/04/88
Fyzool M. Persad	Magistracy—St. Patrick	05/07/88
Salickram Raghoo	Magistracy—Caroni	18/07/88
Sam Saroop	Magistracy—Caroni	18/07/88
Ramchand Gopaul	Magistracy—Caroni	18/07/88
Mustapha Khan	Magistracy—Tunapuna	18/07/88
Salickram Raghoo	Magistracy—Caroni	26/07/88
Taramati Ramlal	Magistracy—Caroni	08/08/88
Jacqueline Sargeant	Magistracy—Caroni	08/08/88
Messina Mohammed	Magistracy—Victoria	28/09/88
Fatima Gopee	Magistracy—Arima/St. George East	03/10/88
Eugene C. Prince	Magistracy—Arima/St. George East	03/10/88
Yasmin Lachman	Magistracy—Caroni/Chaguanas	25/10/88
Fyzool Persad	Magistracy—Arima/St. George East	25/10/88
Ramchan Ganga	Magistracy—St. Patrick West	25/10/88
Errol Supersad	Magistracy—Victoria East	09/12/88
Ramraj Sookhansingh	Magistracy—St. Patrick East	09/12/88
Leelawatie Saisblan	Magistracy—South Eastern Counties	09/12/88

Appointments of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
Magistracy
1989

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Franchot Redman	Magistracy—St. George East	19/01/89
Franchot Redman	Magistracy—Caroni/Couva	13/03/89
Persad Gangaram	Magistracy—Victoria East	13/04/89
Avril Parisienne	Magistracy—Tobago	13/04/89
Ramraj Sookharsingh	Magistracy—St. George East & Arima	19/04/89
Ali Hosein	Magistracy—St. Patrick East	03/05/89
Eugene Prince	Magistracy—North Eastern Counties	27/06/89
Franchot Redman	Magistracy—St. George East & Arima	22/06/89
NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Lilawatie Hardial	Magistracy—Couva	22/06/89
Ramchan Ganga	Magistracy—Victoria West	18/08/89
Messina Mohammed	Magistracy—St. George West	28/09/89
Kelvin Harrilal	Magistracy—St. Patrick West	13/11/89
Avril Parisienne	Magistracy—Tobago	13/11/89
Krishna Dass	Magistracy—Couva	15/11/89

Appointments of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)**Magistracy****1990**

NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Gail Fraser	Magistracy—Tobago	15/03/90
Salickram Raghoo	Magistracy—St. George West	05/07/90
Camla Ramcharan	Magistracy—North Eastern District	05/07/90
Henry Seepersad	Magistracy—St. George East & Arima	05/07/90
Mustapha Khan	Magistracy—St. George East	13/07/90
Armichand Sookram	Magistracy—Victoria	19/09/90

Appointments of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)**Magistracy****1991**

NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
------	------------	---------------------

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

Fyzool M. Persad	Magistracy—St. George West	26/02/91
Eugene C. Prince	Magistracy—Tobago	26/02/91
Ramnarine Sieunarine	Magistracy—Caroni/Couva	26/02/91
Dennis Ramjohn	Magistracy—St. Patrick East & West	26/02/91
Franchot Redman	Magistracy—North Eastern	26/02/91
Ramnanan Ramroop	Magistracy—St. George East & Arima	26/02/91
Ralph Sadhu	Magistracy—St. George East	26/02/91
Henry Seepersad	Magistracy—St. George West	28/01/91
Fatima George	Magistracy—North Eastern	28/01/91
Ann Marie Roberts	Magistracy—Caroni	28/01/91
NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Sam Saroop	Magistracy—Couva/Caroni	05/02/91
Ramchand Gopaul	Magistracy—St. George West	06/03/91
Fatima George	Magistracy—St. George East	06/03/91
Sam Saroop	Magistracy—Victoria	24/04/91
Aruchand Sookram	Magistracy—Caroni	26/04/91
Paula Pierre	Judiciary—Supreme Court	09/05/91
Rosida Basdeo	Magistracy—Victoria East	15/05/91
Rosida Basdeo	Magistracy—Caroni	25/05/91
Ramchan Ganga	Magistracy—Victoria West	20/08/91
Sam Saroop	Magistracy—St. George West	28/05/91
Ramnarine Sieunarine	Magistracy—Arima/St. George East	23/08/91
Franchot Redman	Magistracy—South Eastern	17/09/91
Farouk ali	Magistracy—North Eastern	17/09/91
Carlton Libert	Magistracy—St. George West	17/09/91
Salickram Raghoo	Magistracy—Arima	22/10/91
Ramsaran Ramroop	Magistracy—Couva	22/10/91
Rammouth Maraj	Magistracy—Caroni	14/02/91

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE (EX OFFICIO)
MINISTRIES/DEPARTMENTS AND SUPREME COURT

NAME & DESIGNATION OF OFFICER	JURISDICTION OF	DATE OF
-------------------------------	-----------------	---------

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

		APPOINTMENT	APPOINTMENT
NAME & DESIGNATION OF OFFICER		JURISDICTION OF APPOINTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Cynthia Trim	Clerk IV, Supreme Court	Trinidad & Tobago	12/01/76
Harold Williams	Ag. Clerk IV, Supreme Court	Trinidad and Tobago	12/01/76
Conrad Douglin	Supreme Court	Trinidad & Tobago	08/03/76
Langley Baiju	Supreme Court	Trinidad & Tobago	09/03/76
Kenwyn Johnhell	Conveyancing Clerk II, Chief State Solicitor's Department	Trinidad & Tobago	30/11/76
Carlton Best	Supreme Court	Trinidad & Tobago	16/06/77
Herbert Charles	Supreme Court	Trinidad & Tobago	16/06/77
Kenneth Stewart	Ag. A.O.IV, Attorney General's Department	Trinidad & Tobago	24/11/77
Sheila Bishop	Attorney General's Department	Trinidad & Tobago	29/03/78
Cecil Pope	Supreme Court	Trinidad & Tobago	15/02/79
Wesley Gopaul	Supreme Court	Trinidad & Tobago	15/02/79
Omar Jokhin	Ag. Clerk III, Sub Registry, Supreme Court	Tobago	03/04/79
Michael Joseph	Ag. Clerk III, Sub Registry, Tobago	Tobago	10/07/79
Esther Payne	A.O.II, Ministry of National Security	County St. George	24/10/79
Olive Ramkissoon	A.O.IV, Ministry of National Security	County St. George	24/10/79
Claudia Shadrach	A.O.IV Ministry of National Security	County St. George	24/10/79
Ronald Cuffy	A.O.V Ministry of National Security		24/10/79
Sen. John S. Donaldson	Ministry of National Security	County St. George	24/10/79

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

Teasley C. Taitt	Permanent Secretary, Ministry of National Security	County St. George	24/10/79
Michael Ferreira	Attorney General's Office	Trinidad and Tobago	12/12/79
Gwendolene Clarke	Attorney General's Office	Trinidad and Tobago	12/12/79
Caudette Cuddle	Asst. Registrar & Deputy Marshall, Supreme Court	Trinidad and Tobago	15/04/80
NAME & DESIGNATION OF OFFICER		JURISDICTION OF APPOINTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Shirley George	A.O.II, Ministry of National Security	Trinidad & Tobago	22/07/80
Brenda Paray	Asst. Registrar & Deputy Marshall, Supreme Court	Trinidad & Tobago	07/04/82
Christine Anne Parris	Temp. Asst. Registrar & Deputy Marshall, Supreme Court	Trinidad & Tobago	29/04/82
Cleri Richardson	Ag. Clerk III, Sub Registry, Tobago Supreme Court	Tobago	30/09/82
Ruby Rebecca Roberts	A.O.II, Ministry of National Security	Trinidad & Tobago	25/04/83
Victorine Carrington	A.O.IV, Ministry of National Security	Trinidad & Tobago	07/07/83
Sherman Mc Nicolls	Asst. Registrar & Deputy Marshall, Supreme Court	Trinidad & Tobago	21/06/83
Carlton Oliver Best	Ag. Deputy Registrar & Marshall, Supreme Court	Trinidad & Tobago	07/02/84
June Ahye	Temp. Asst. Registrar & Deputy Marshall, Supreme Court	Trinidad & Tobago	
Charles Wren	Ag. Principal Officer & 2nd Deputy Marshall,	Trinidad & Tobago	10/12/84

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

NAME & DESIGNATION OF OFFICER	JURISDICTION OF APPOINTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Kathleen Rajnauth	Supreme Court Ag. Principal Officer & 2nd Deputy Marshall, Supreme Court	Trinidad & Tobago 11/12/84
Evelyn Ann Peterson	Asst. Registrar & Deputy Marshall, Supreme Court	Trinidad & Tobago 09/12/85
Jacqueline Saunders	Ag. Principal Officer & 2nd Deputy Marshall, Supreme Court	Trinidad & Tobago 04/07/86
Christie-Ann Morris-Alleyne	Asst. Registrar & Deputy Marshall, Supreme Court	Trinidad & Tobago 04/03/87
Michael Nicholas	Ag. Conveyancing Clerk, Chief State Solicitor	Trinidad & Tobago 06/08/86
Nizam Mungrue	A.O.II, Ministry of External Affairs and International Trade	Trinidad & Tobago 08/10/87
Peter A. Z. Hezekiah	Director Law & Theatres Div., Ministry of External Affairs and International Trade	County St. George 13/11/87
Veronica Thomas	Ag. Principal Officer & 2nd Deputy Marshall, Supreme Court	Trinidad & Tobago 01/03/88
Clifton Warner	Assistant Registrar & Deputy Marshall, Supreme Court	Trinidad & Tobago 04/08/88
Annette Wood	A.O.II, Ministry of Legal Affairs	County St. George West & Victoria 14/11/88
Amar Jokhon	Assistant Registrar & Deputy Marshall, Supreme Court	Judiciary/Supreme Court 30/11/89
Joan Eversley-Gill	Temp. Asst. Registrar &	Judiciary/Supreme 30/11/89

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

NAME & DESIGNATION OF OFFICER	JURISDICTION OF APPOINTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Deputy Marshall, Supreme Court	Court	
Paula Pierre	Temporary Registrar & Asst. Deputy Marshall, Supreme Court	Judiciary/Supreme Court
Grace Furlonge	Indictment Officer, Ministry of Legal Affairs	Trinidad and Tobago
Clifford Chambers	Deputy Registrar & Marshall, Supreme Court	Trinidad and Tobago
Hugh Cox	Conveyancing Officer, Chief State Solicitor	Trinidad and Tobago
Elmo Phillip	Conveyancing Officer, Chief State Solicitor	Trinidad and Tobago
Joseph Pierre	Ag. Conveyancing Officer, Chief State Solicitor	Trinidad and Tobago

**Appointments of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
Ministry of National Security
(Police Department)
1976**

NAME	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Simon Ramlochan	07/4/76
Ruthven Charles	16/7/76
Lionel Reid	16/7/76
Haskell Tull	16/7/76
Neville Sheppard	16/7/76
Randolph Joseph	16/7/76
John Abraham	16/7/76
Goderick Henry	16/7/76
L. Balfour	16/7/76

1160

Written Answer to Question

Friday, April 24, 1992

Elsin Phillips	16/7/76
Lucien Villafana	16/7/76
Milton Stephens	16/7/76
M. Lezama	16/7/76

**Appointments of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
Ministry of National Security
(Police Department)
1978**

NAME	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Errol Hernandez	30/1/78
David Mc Millan	30/1/78
Lorna Jane Robley	17/2/78
Conrad Don Thomas	17/2/78
Theodore Charles	07/4/78
Cephus Mark	07/4/78
Samuel Benjamin James	07/4/78
Leon Gregory Gonzales	11/4/78
Calvin Cox	11/4/78
Leslie Darceuil	11/4/78
Ellis Superville	12/4/78
Wilberforce Denny	23/5/78
Lorell St. Clair Yearwood	06/7/78

**Appointment of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
Ministry of National Security
(Police Department)
1980**

NAME	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Dorset St. Louis	09/12/80
Renwick Bishop	09/12/80

**Appointment of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
Ministry of National Security
(Police Department)
1981**

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

NAME	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Pollard Solomon	22/01/81
NAME	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
A.S.P. Tariera	22/01/81
Arthur Scott	23/01/81
John Reece	23/01/81
Audes Richbrooke	23/01/81
Winston Mathews	23/01/81
Everald Snaggs	23/01/81
Mumtaz Hosein	23/01/81
Horace Samuel	23/01/81
Stephen John	26/01/81
Vernon Thomas	26/01/81
Frederick Phillip	26/01/81
Mervyn Lashley	27/01/81
Russell Gomez	27/01/81
Malcolm Browne	27/01/81
Cecil Voison	27/01/81
Reginald Taylor	27/01/81
Merle Cynthia Bertrand	27/01/81
Earle Williams	28/01/81
Joseph Blackman	28/01/81
Merle Carter	28/01/81
Pearl O'Neale	28/01/81
Marilyn Kirton	29/01/81
Wayne Davis	29/01/81
Ken Tracey	29/01/81
Cecil Carrington	29/01/81
Lawrence M. Wilson	30/01/81
Lloyd K. Lessy	30/01/81
Alexander Charles	02/02/81
John Dick	02/02/81

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

Gladstone Haynes	02/02/81
Dennis Alfred Noel	02/02/81
Cyracus Liverpool	12/02/81
NAME	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Ralph Cummings	20/02/81
Richard McCommie	21/02/81
Vialva Phillip	21/02/81
Hilton Guy	23/02/81
Gary Scott	23/02/81
Fazal Balkaran	23/02/81
Thomas Billy	25/02/81
Theeldon Christopher	25/02/81
Hollingsworth Benjamin	25/02/81
Vernon Nelson	25/02/81
Gladstone Haynes	25/02/81
Earl Warner	27/03/81
A. Jack	21/07/81
Valentine Mc Hardy	21/07/81
Celestine Richards	21/07/81
Emmanuel Cuffie	21/07/81
Hamilton Julien	21/07/81
Carlos Mathura	22/07/81
Francis Urban Wilson	22/07/81
Carlton Phillips	24/11/81
Rudolph Cox	27/11/81
Phyllis Walker	02/12/81
Neville Browne	07/12/81
Lennox Joseph	15/12/81
Stanley Fergusson	15/12/81
Roy Mitchell	15/12.81
Mervyn Arthur	17/12/81
Claude Baynes	17/12/81
Eversley Henry	21/12/81

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

Harold St. Louis	30/12.81
R. Persad	31/12/81
Charles Boney	31/03/81
NAME	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
George Thomas	31/03/81
Oliver Phillip	31/03/81
Sugram Bhagwandeem	31/03/81
Selwyn Glasgow	01/04/81
Uwyn Francis	01/04/81
Lennox Solomon	01/04/81
Wilfred Francis	02/04/81
Modest Estrada	02/04/81
Rudolph James	02/04/81
Alfred Archie	02/04/81
Lennox Boyce	06/04/81
Dwarka Ramsook	07/04/81
Louis Granger	08/04/81
Lennard Nelson	09/07/81
E. Corneal	09/07/81
Norman Ross	14/07/81
Victor Walcott	14/07/81
Santo Alleyne	14/07/81
Cecil Liverpool	15/07/81
Vernon Caracciolo	15/07/81
Roderick Bhagwalsingh	15/07/81

**Appointment of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
Ministry of National Security
(Police Department)
1982**

NAME	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
R. O'Connor	7/01/82

**Appointment of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
Ministry of National Security
(Police Department)
1983**

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

NAME	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Kenneth John	13/04/83
NAME	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Calvin Goodridge	13/4/93
Norman Clarke	“
Rudolph Leache	“
Kyron Arthur	“
Carlton Bobb	“
O’Neil Edwards	“
Peter Mitchell	18/04/83
Rolston Julien	“
Fitzroy Bernard	“
Merle Martin	“
Peter John	19/04/83
Davis Douglas	20/04/83
Jules Riley	22/04/83
Michael Grappie	“
Lennox Downes	“
Andrew Charles	02/05/83
Lloyd Badal	12/05/83
Selwyn Roberts	13/05/83
Basil Sylvester	13/05/83

**Appointment of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
Ministry of National Security
(Police Department)
1984**

NAME	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Simon McFarlane	30/01/84
Leroy Baptiste	“
Aldwyn Regch	“
Errol Cooke	“
Charles Lindsay	“

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

NAME	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Simon Alexander	“
Herberth Mitchell	“
Leslie Logan	30/01/84
John Nixon	“
George Phillip	“
Wilmond Paul	“
Trevor Paul	“
John Carrington	“
Trevor Gall	“
Eugene Rose	“
Lewis Bernard	“
Ralph Roberts	“
Carlton Oliver Best	“
L. George	02/04/84
Marsilline Cardinez	“

**Appointment of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
Ministry of National Security
(Police Department)
1985**

NAME	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Clebert Gordon	11/04/85
Ancil Braithwaite	“
Glen Roach	“
Timothy Gervais	“
Joseph Marcelle	“
Frank Diaz	“
Peter Hills	“
Cyril Bernard	“
Carmen Williams	“
Roger George	“
Wilfred Paul	“

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

NAME	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Cornelius Lewis	“
John James	11/04/85
Wentworth Caesar	“
Milton Kirton	“
Aldwyn Callender	“
Ruby Lewis	“
Ojaran Narace	“
Sylbert Peters	“
Aldwin Ifill	“
Patrick Bernard	“
Samuel Alexander	“
Leberth Legere	“

**Appointment of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
Ministry of National Security
(Police Department)
1986**

NAME	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
R. Gordon	29/12/86
Dennis Graham	“
L. Andrews	“
William Urquhart	“
Clement Waldropt	“
Winston Cooper	“
Deochand Gosine	“
Raymond Khan	“
James Philbert	“
Allan Roach	“
Christopher Downey	“
R. Jack	“

**Appointment of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
Ministry of National Security
(Police Department)
1987**

NAME	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
------	---------------------

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

NAME	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Aldwyn Mc Millan	16/04/87
June Kendall	16/04/87
Hubert Ramsahai	“
Hubert Rameo	“
G. Doyle	“
P. Fraser	“
Wilfred Sylvester	“
Edward Alleyne	“
P. Cumberbatch	“
L. Richards	“
Cyril Pierre	“
H. Mc Kenzie	“
D. Neemar	“
C. Maynard	“

**Appointment of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
Ministry of National Security
(Police Department)
1988**

NAME	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Hugh Glasgow	06/10/88
D. Jack	“
Lloyd Coutain	“
Henry Blackett	“
Trevor Raymond	“
Carlyle Missettee	“
W. Roach	“
Georgianna Duncan	“
L. Warrick	“
Rodvan Neale	“
Kelvin Sifontis	“
James Mitchell	“

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

Farouk Ghany NAME	“ DATE OF APPOINTMENT
T. Phillip	06/10/88
Michael Montute	“
Nazamul Hosein	“
Rodvan Bastien	“
Winston Sylvester	“
Hevin Wilson	“
Phillip Carmona	“
Winston Douglas	“
Knolly Wynne	“
P. Crooks	“
Oswald Ewing	“
E. Wright	“
D. Hicks	“
Winston Craig	06/01/88
W. Brooks	17/01/88
Trevor Gull	06/06/88

**Appointment of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
Ministry of National Security
(Police Department
1989**

NAME	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Donald Ferguson	14/11/89
Kenneth Thompson	“
Vanda Arthur	“
Ronald Ross	“
Felix Nimrod	“
Thomas Hoyte	“
Ronald Phirangee	“
Alvin Anderson	“
Kenneth Saunders	“
Winston Victor	“

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

Verner Leben NAME	“ DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Polimus Alphonso	14/11/89
Jerome George	“
Nolan Rodriquez	“
Rudardeo Ramnasibsingh	“
Edward Mc Kay	“
Desmond Lambert	“
Alex Sampson	“
Winson Gittens	“
Wellington Virgil	“
Eugene Brathwaite	“
Herbert Pierre	“
Leroy Thompson	“
Nadir Mohammed	“
William Jefferies	“
Joshua Gordon	“
Lennox Gonzales	“
Curtis Lloyd	“
Waldron Bishop	“
Harry Joefield	“
Mayhew Cummings	“
Boysie Boodram	“
Charles James	“
Shaffic Mohammed	“
Anthony Gonzales	“
Selwyn Smart	“
Peter John	“
Chingham Rasool	“
Rudolph Douglas	“

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, April 24, 1992*

Oswyn Allard

“

**(Appointment of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
 (Ministry of National Security
 (Police Department)
 1990**

NAME

DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Boysie Boodram

26/1/90

**Appointment of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
 Ministry of National Security
 (Police Department)
 1991**

NAME

DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Jeffrey Alexander

7/6/91

Laurence Guerra

“

Benjamin Watson

“

Wayne Richardson

“

Stephen Quashie

“

Codrington Waldron

“

Lennox Benn

“

Barnet Mayers

“

Carl Williams

“

Keith Renaud

“

Michael Thomas

“

Dawson Victor

“

Junior Valley

“

Stephen Addison

“

Raymond Craig

“

Kenneth O'Connell

“

Anthony Brooks

“

Maurice Charles

“

*Written Answer to Question**Friday April 24, 1992*

Leo Butcher	“
NAME	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Kathleen Weekes	7/6/91
Hidayatt Mohammed	“
Spencer Farrel	“
Fitzroy Phillip	“

**Appointments of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
Ministry of National Security
(Police Department)
1992**

NAME	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Ernas Joseph	10/2/92
George Sayers	“

**Appointments of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
County, City and Borough Councils**

NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Lionel Barnett	Tobago	25/10/77
Mohammed Haniff	Victoria	25/10/77
Clyde Mc Collin	St. George West	3/11/77
Gertrude Kirton	San Fernando	09/11/77
Rennie Matthews	St. Patrick	09/11/77
Zainool Noor	Caroni	11/11/77
Leopold Mc Clean	St. George	21/11/77
Dorothy Benthon	St. George West	28/11/77
Armin Mohammed	Nariva/Mayaro	28/11/77
Indra Rajbansee	St. David/St. Andrew	28/11/77
Alfred Thompson	Arima	03/06/78
Amoy Kong See	St. George	02/08/78
Mc Leod Retess	Victoria	11/08/78

*Written Answer to Question**Friday April 24, 1992*

NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
George Nehall	St. George West	13/06/80
S. Arjoonsingh	Victoria	13/6/80
Vernon Perez	Nariva/Mayaro	27/2/81
Krishna Maharaj	Caroni	27/2/81
Victor Chin Kitt	Point Fortin	06/3/81
Bertrand Robinson	St. George East	09/4/81
Louis John Williams	St. Patrick	9/4/81
Stephenson Sarjeant	St. George West	23/3/84
Mervyn Assam	St. George East	23/3/84
Rakeeb Hosein	San Fernando	23/3/84
Leroy Morris	Arima	23/3/84
George Kangalee	St. George West	23/3/84
Seuchan Mulchan	Caroni	23/3/84
Razack Ali	Nariva/Mayaro	02/4/84
Ramdhanie Ramnanan	St. David/St. Andrew	04/4/84
Latchman Seecharan	Victoria	14/4/84
Surujrattan Rambachan	St. Patrick	18/1/85
Ramkissoon Nagassar	Nariva/Mayaro	18/11/85
Sonilal Mahabir	Victoria	26/1/87
Vishnu Tikashingh	Caroni	20/10/87
Alvin Mahabir	St. Patrick	13/11/87
Allan Michier	Nariva/Mayaro	8/12/87
Cornelius Price	St. George East	09/6/88
Haniff Mohammed	Victoria	10/2/89
Ramkissoon Nagassar	Nariva/Mayaro	10/2/89
Taran B. Sooklal	North-Eastern	02/7/90
Sankar Rampersad	Victoria	26/7/89

**Appointments of Justices of the Peace (Ex officio)
Mental Health Officers**

NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Dr. John Neehall	St. Ann's Hospital	27/2/76

*Written Answer to Question**Friday April 24, 1992*

NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Dr. Leon Ferninand Lewis	“	“
Dr. Iqbal M. Ghany	St. Ann's Hospital	27/2/76
Dr. Ibrahim M. Hosein	“	“
Dr. Jacqueline Sharpe	“	“
Dr. Vivienne James Beckles	“	“
Mr. Wilfred Eburne	“	“
Ms. Dora Gabriel Atherly	“	“
Ms. Josephine Parris	“	“
Mr. Cornelius Quinlan	“	“
Mr. Patrick Joseph	“	“
Dr. Allan Patrick	“	“
Mrs. June Patricia Ballah	“	“
Dr. Edward Moses	“	“
Mr. Vernon Bisnath	“	“
Mr. Samlal Nanan	“	“
Dr. Michael Beaubrun	Ministry of Health	“
Dr. Helene Marcean-Crooks	San Fernando Gernerall Hospital	“
Ms. Bernice Thomas	“	“
Mr. Abzal Raffick Babwah	“	“
Mrs. Sylvia Griffith	“	“
Ms. Michelle Sogren	St. Ann's Hospital	15/2/79
Mr. Roy Dookeran	“	“
Mr. Wesley Gopaul	“	“
Mr. Errol Ambrose	“	“
Mr. Lennox Robert Williams	“	19/2/79
Mr. Carol Joseph	“	“
Ms. Monica Collins	“	“
Mr. Lionel Renny	“	27/3/79
Mr. Aldric Williams	“	“
Mr. Lakhan Jaglal Singh	“	“
Mr. Kenneth Parry	“	“

*Written Answer to Question**Friday April 24, 1992*

NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Ms. Carol Bartholomew	“	“
Mr. Lionel St. Louis	St. Ann's Hospital	30/4/79
Mrs. Linda Suite	“	“
Mrs. Barbara Applewhite	“	“
Mr. Joseph Blugh	“	“
Dr. Kenneth Delpeche	“	6/12/79
Dr. Dickson Marchack	“	6/12/79
Mr. Bhim Ramroop	“	12/5/80
Ms. Sandra Oudit	“	“
Mr. Cecil Boyce	“	“
Mrs. Marjorie Hackshaw	“	“
Ms. Joyce Rambatan	“	28/5/80
Ms. Lenore Savitri Persad	“	“
Mr. Theodora Prescott	“	“
Mr. Desmond Ince	“	“
Dr. Kayoum Ali	Tobago County Hospital	26/9/85
Dr. Franklyn La Hee	Central Administrative Services Tobago	“
Norma Burkett	St. Ann's Hospital	15/1/86
Augustus Smith	“	“
Manikchan Moonesar	“	“
Abraham Abdool	“	“
Cherry Ann Baptiste	“	“
Kelvin Jaggernauth	“	“
Harry Ramharose	“	“
Chabinath Ramkissoon	“	“
Oswald Pierre	“	“
Stephen Bailey	“	“
Joyce Lewis-Smith	“	“
Irma Gaskin-Morris	“	“
Cyril Gulston	“	26/1/90

*Written Answer to Question**Friday April 24, 1992*

NAME	DEPARTMENT	DATE OF APPOINTMENT
Dennis St. Clair	“	“
Kelvin Jaggernath	St. Ann’s Hospital	26/1/90
Chitram Rambharose	“	“
Fernon Saunders	“	“
Paul Pariay	“	“
Hollis Ramlal	“	12/3/90
Gloria Merrit	“	“
Dawn Solomon	“	“
Jaunita Bowen	“	“

APPENDIX IILegislation governing the appointment of Justices of the Peace

- Summary Courts Act Chap. 4:20
 General Appointments, Officers of the Judiciary and
 Ministry of Legal Affairs
 Magistrates (Ex officio)

Section 4
Section 3(2)
- Tobago House of Assembly Act Chap. 25:03
 Chairman (Ex officio)

Section 15
- Police Service Act Chap. 15:01
 Every First Division Officer
 and Inspector (Ex officio)

Section 31(1)
- Mental Health Act Chap. 28:02
 Psychiatric Hospital Director (Ex officio)
 Every duly authorized Medical Officer (Ex officio)
 Every mental health officer (Ex officio)

Section 2(2)
- Municipal Corporation Act No. 21 of 1990
 Mayor of Corporation (Ex officio)
 Deputy Mayor (Ex officio)
 Ex-Mayor of Corporation (Ex officio)
 Ex-Deputy Mayor (for 1 year after leaving office.)

Section 20(1)
Section 20(1)

Written Answer to Question

Friday April 24, 1992

6. The following laws, under which Mayors, Deputy Mayors and Chairmen of County Councils were appointed Justices of the Peace, were repealed by the Municipal Corporation Act No. 21 of 1990.
- (i) Port of Spain Corporation Ordinance
Chap. 39:01

Mayor and Deputy Mayor (Ex officio)
Ex-Mayor and Ex-Deputy Mayor (Ex officio)
(one year after leaving office) Section 17(1)
 - (ii) San Fernando Corporation Ordinance Chap. 39:07

Mayor (Ex officio)
Ex-Mayor (Ex officio) (one year after leaving office) Section 17(1)
 - (iii) Arima Corporation Ordinance Chap. 39:11

Mayor (Ex officio)
Ex-Mayor (Ex officio) (for one year
after leaving office) Section 17(1)
 - (iv) Point Fortin Corporation Act No. 12 of 1980

Mayor (Ex officio)
Ex-Mayor (Ex officio)
(one year after leaving office) Section 13(1)
 - (v) County Council Act Chap. 25:04
Chairman (Ex officio) Section 8