

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES*Friday, July 14, 2000*

The House met at 1.30 p.m.

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

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, I wish to advise that I have received communication from two hon. Members of this House who have asked to be excused from sittings of the House; they are the Member for Port of Spain South, who has asked to be excused until July 20, 2000 and the Member for Port of Spain North/St. Ann's West who has asked to be excused until July 27, 2000. The leave of absence which they seek is granted.

CONDOLENCES**MR. GARFIELD BLACKMAN (Ras Shorty I)**

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, I also wish to draw to the formal notice of this honourable House the passing of one of our citizens who has, undoubtedly, made a widespread contribution in an art form. I believe that both sides of the House may wish to express condolences. I refer to one who has been known as "Ras Shorty I", Mr. Garfield Blackman.

The Minister of Tourism (Dr. The Hon. Adesh Nanan): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Government, it is with the greatest compassion that I express our heartfelt sorrow to Mrs. Blackman and her family on the loss of her beloved husband and a devoted father Garfield Blackman, popularly known as "Ras Shorty I". Also, I speak as the parliamentary representative of the constituency in which Ras Shorty I was a resident and where he will be buried, that is, in the village of Piparo.

Ras Shorty I lived an exemplary life. He was well loved, not only by the residents of Piparo but, by the citizens of the entire country of Trinidad and Tobago.

My personal recollection of Ras Shorty I takes me back to a village in the vicinity of Princes Town, that is, Lengua Village where he was born. At the Lengua Presbyterian School where my father taught, Ras Shorty I was a member of the Lengua Youth Movement better known as the "LYM". It was in the youth

movement that the creative genius of the late Garfield Blackman blossomed. He was crowned calypso king with the tunes “Luna Blake” and “Ten Commandments of Making Love” at a competition held in the youth movement. From then he never looked back.

In the youth movement he displayed his talent in drama. He acted in many plays such as *Julius Caesar* *The Harrowing of Bengy*. In his music he utilized several East Indian musical instruments such as the Dholak, Sitar, Dhantal and he even used Hindi lyrics. He also dressed in East Indian garb.

We are comforted by the fact that the life of Ras Shorty I was rich in creativity and spirituality. His soca music created a unique dimension to the calypso art form which impacted positively on the nation, the Caribbean region, and the world.

His transformation from the love man to the love man of Christ is most comforting. His song “Watch Out My Children” will live on. The message is universal; especially to the young who are the future of our country.

I am confident that his sons and daughters will continue the rich cultural legacy with which Ras Shorty I has blessed this nation.

As parliamentary representative of the constituency of Tabaquite, and Minister of Tourism, I share the solemn sentiments of the residents and the loss to culture and tourism.

In recognition of the signal contribution of Garfield Blackman, Ras Shorty I, to this nation, Government pledges state support for his funeral and commits its assistance to his beloved family in meeting funeral expenses.

May the soul of Garfield Blackman rest in peace and may his family always be comforted.

Mr. Edward Hart (*Tunapuna*): Mr. Speaker, Garfield Blackman, known in calypso circles as “Ras Shorty I”, lost his battle with bone cancer on July 12, 2000. It came as a shocker to everyone. Ras Shorty I broke a bone in his hand while performing at the launch of two of his CDs titled *Jamoo Victory* and *Children of the Jamoo Journey*. Ras Shorty I produced a long string of hits for almost three decades. He thrilled audiences at home and abroad.

Ras Shorty I was a dynamic performer, powerfully built, and very graceful on stage. In 1963, performing at a tent in the southland, Ras Shorty I came up with a super song entitled “Cloak and Dagger”. Mr. Speaker, I still remember the words of the chorus. I quote:

“All ah dem who play criminal and thief, doh leh meh see,

I will inform the police immediately.
 All who think dey big and dey able,
 all who feel dey so terrible,
 touch meh if you think ah making joke,
 but meh dagger always underneath meh cloak.”

Mr. Speaker, this calypso had a beautiful melody and Trinidad All Stars had thousands chipping merrily down Charlotte Street on that J’ouvert morning with this tune.

This was the breakthrough for Ras Shorty I, Mr. Speaker. He immediately moved on to the bright lights of Port of Spain and came up with masterpieces like, “Endless Vibration”, “Zena”, “Indrani”, Money Ent No Problem” and the controversial “Om Shanti”, among others. Mr. Speaker, I understand that Om Shanti made its mark in far off India.

Ras Shorty I was accredited with inventing soca music, which is a crossover or fusion of East Indian music and the authentic calypso.

Mr. Speaker, in 1980 Garfield Blackman became a born-again Christian and took his family to live in the Piparo forest. Being a visionary and a music innovator he came up with Jamoo music because he felt soca music was abused in certain circles. Mr. Speaker, we all know one of his famous hits entitled “Watch Out My Children”: an anti-drug song which was translated into ten other languages and played to millions worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, coming on the heels of the loss of the Grand Master, Lord Kitchener, we have lost yet another great son of this soil. He will be sorely missed by all of us. I sincerely hope that the young calypsonians would work feverishly and try to emulate this great artiste.

On behalf of the Members on this side of the House and the People’s National Movement, I want to extend our heartfelt condolences to his bereaved relatives, his wife and all his talented children.

May his soul rest in peace.

1.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, it is said that the clock of life is wound but once and no man hath the power to say just when the hands will stop, at late or early hour. I am sure that there is a lot in the life of Ras Shorty I, who had proclaimed that he had undergone transformation from his earlier life, that is to be

admired and respected by many of us in this society. I will accordingly ask the Clerk to direct a letter of condolence and the feelings of the entire House to the next of kin of Ras Shorty I.

PAPERS LAID

1. Report of the Auditor General on the accounts of Trinidad and Tobago Forest Products Company Limited for the year ended December 31, 1981. [*The Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs (Hon. R. L. Maharaj)*]
 2. Report of the Auditor General on the accounts of Trinidad and Tobago Forest Products Company Limited for the year ended December 31, 1982. (*Hon. R. L. Maharaj*)
 3. Report of the Auditor General on the accounts of Trinidad and Tobago Forest Products Company Limited for the year ended December 31, 1983. (*Hon. R. L. Maharaj*)
 4. Report of the Auditor General on the accounts of Trinidad and Tobago Forest Products Company Limited for the year ended December 31, 1984. (*Hon. R. L. Maharaj*)
- Papers 1 to 4 referred to the Public Accounts (Enterprises) Committee.*
5. Report of the Auditor General on the accounts of the Sugar Industry Labour Welfare Committee for the year ended December 31, 1992. (*Hon. R. L. Maharaj*)
 6. Report of the Auditor General on the accounts of the Sugar Industry Labour Welfare Committee for the year ended December 31, 1993. (*Hon. R. L. Maharaj*)
 7. Report of the Auditor General on the accounts of the Sugar Industry Labour Welfare Committee for the year ended December 31, 1994. (*Hon. R. L. Maharaj*)
 8. Report of the Auditor General on the accounts of the Tobago House of Assembly for the year ended December 31, 1995. (*Hon. R. L. Maharaj*)
 9. Report of the Auditor General on the accounts of the San Fernando Corporation for the year ended December 31, 1992. (*Hon. R. L. Maharaj*)
 10. Report of the Auditor General on the accounts of the San Fernando Corporation for the year ended December 31, 1993. (*Hon. R. L. Maharaj*)

Papers 5 to 10 to be referred to the Public Accounts Committee.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

**Le Platte Village
(Booster pump)**

73. Mr. Colm Imbert (*Diego Martin East*) asked the Minister of Public Utilities:

- (a) Would the Minister state the year in which the booster pump in Le Platte Village on Morne Coco Road was activated and put into service?
- (b) Could the Minister indicate whether the activation of the Le Platte booster pump adversely affected the water supply in Paramin?

The Minister of Public Utilities (Hon. Ganga Singh): Mr. Speaker, the booster pump in Le Platte Village was commissioned and put into service in 1983.

The Le Platte booster station and the Paramin booster station are not only interlinked but depend on the same source of water, that is, from the Paramin wells located at the base of the Paramin Hill. Over the years, due to the low level of water at the Paramin wells, both the Paramin and Le Platte communities have been affected and receive less than satisfactory supplies of water.

To meet the shortfall and to improve the level of service to both communities, in 1989 a new well was drilled at Morne Coco. This well was not commissioned and activated because of the presence of high levels of hydrogen sulphide and hardness. In 1990 a new source of supply, that is, from the Maraval Waterworks was introduced to serve these communities on a scheduled basis. This increased the amount of water available for distribution and brought some relief to both communities.

This arrangement still continues today. However, a more permanent solution is to be implemented when the rehabilitation of the Maraval Waterworks, at a cost of \$12 million, is completed. This would supplement the water produced at Paramin on a continuous basis. The pumps and storage tanks in the Paramin system are also planned to be refurbished.

Mr. Imbert: Mr. Speaker, a supplemental question. Could the Minister state, since he has referred to the refurbishment of the Maraval Waterworks, when this is scheduled to commence?

Hon. G. Singh: The Maraval Waterworks is part of the north water project and is supposed to commence on the second tranche of the north water project scheme.

Mr. Imbert: Mr. Speaker, a supplemental question. Could the Minister give me an approximate date?

Hon. G. Singh: That is projected for October of this year.

**Road Improvement Fund
(Repairs)**

74. Mr. Colm Imbert asked the Minister of Works and Transport:

- (a) Would the Minister state the expenditure in Trinidad on road repairs under the Road Improvement Fund (RIF) in the years 1996, 1997, 1998 and 1999?
- (b) Would the Minister list the following:
 - (i) the names and location of the roads repaired in Trinidad under the RIF;
 - (ii) the expenditure under the RIF on each road?

The Parliamentary Secretary Ministry of Works and Transport (Mr. Chandresh Sharma): Mr. Speaker, by agreement the Member agreed to accept this answer in writing, because it occupies many pages.

Mr. Imbert: A supplemental question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Member indicate why this information was not made available before, as is required by law?

Mr. Speaker: Just one second. First of all, what I am hearing is that both sides have agreed that the answer to that question would be supplied in writing, which the Speaker knew nothing about and does not have a copy of; that could not be right. Secondly, to compound matters, a supplemental is asked which was not before me, so I am not in any position to judge as to whether it is a proper supplemental question and whether it should be allowed. I do not think that any Speaker should be treated this way, okay. So that supplemental is not to be permitted in the circumstances. I am in no position to indicate whether it is a proper question or not.

In future, I would suggest that whenever there is this type of agreement, as between the two Members, that I should be brought into the picture and I should be told this.

Vide end of sitting for written answer.

**Tanteak
(Sale of)**

75. Mr. Ken Valley (*Diego Martin Central*) asked the Minister of Finance, Planning and Development:

- (a) Would the Minister inform the House whether the Government has accepted any offers for the purchase of Tanteak?
- (b) If the answer is in the affirmative, would the Minister state the date and the medium used to inform the public that Tanteak was for sale?

The Minister for Tobago Affairs and Acting Minister of Finance, Planning and Development (Dr. The Hon. Morgan Job): Mr. Speaker, no decision has been taken as yet with regard to offers made for the purchase of Tanteak.

PriceWaterhouseCoopers who, in consultation with Tanteak, were engaged to provide divestment advisory services, advertised on December 3, 1999, in the *Trinidad Guardian, Newsday* and the *Express* newspapers inviting expressions of interest for investment as a joint venture partner in Tanteak. The deadline date for submission of final bids was December 28, 1999. As at December 22, 1999, copies of the Tanteak Information Memorandum had been issued to 12 firms based on their execution of a confidentiality agreement. Of the 12 firms, two submitted a letter of interest; one of which was withdrawn. The other firm indicated that it was unable to make a firm offer by the deadline date of December 28, 1999. The deadline date was then extended by four weeks to January 25, 2000.

PriceWaterhouseCoopers also wrote directly to all parties who had previously contacted Tanteak or the divestment secretariat expressing an interest in investing in Tanteak, all overseas customers of Tanteak, as well as international companies from a list of selected lumber/forestry websites on the Internet.

PriceWaterhouseCoopers also communicated with its corporate finance partners in each of the 120 countries in which PriceWaterhouseCoopers has offices, through their computer network, seeking interested parties for investment in Tanteak. The proposals received are currently being carefully considered by the Government.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Valley: I am moving on to the next question, Mr. Speaker.

Government Bonds

76. Mr. Ken Valley asked the Minister of Finance, Planning and Development:

(a) Could the Minister state the terms and conditions of the following Government Bonds which are scheduled for early redemption:

<u>Sub-Item</u>	<u>Amount</u>
	\$
(i) \$285,245,000 Fixed and Floating Rate Interim Bonds Government Project Financing Floating (inc. to \$300Mn.)	245,857,063
(ii) FINCOR \$200,000 Floating Rate Notes	129,004,560
(iii) \$402,630,000 (inc. to \$500Mn.) Floating Rate Bonds	414,990,000
(iv) \$500,000 Floating Rate Bonds (2014)	24,750,000
(v) \$91,597,932 Unit Trust Corporation Fixed Rate Bond due 2010	4,579,896
(vi) \$206,740,000 FINCOR Fixed and Floating Rate (1990-1999, 2004, 2009, 2014)	35,620,000
(vii) \$755,000 Fixed and Floating Rate Bonds (1992-2001, 2006, 2011, 2016, 2021)	72,850,000
	927,651,519

(b) Could the Minister also state the terms and conditions on which the new funds were raised?

(c) Further, could the Minister state the lead manager and underwriting team for the new issue and the process used for selection?

The Minister of Tobago Affairs and Acting Minister of Finance, Planning and Development (Dr. The Hon. Morgan Job): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the terms and conditions of bonds scheduled for early redemption, I will read the headings. It says the date of the signature and then the party responsible for arranging, which is called the arranger; and then I will read the loan amount that was arranged, the amount due to be restructured next, the interest rate per cent below prime, and then the maturity period.

	Signature Date	Arranger	Loan Amount	Amount due to be restructured	Interest Rate (% below prime)	Maturity
(i)	15-Nov-88	FINCOR Facility 1	\$285,245,000	\$245,741,519	1.00%	2010-2013
(ii)	28-Sep-89	FINCOR	\$200,000,000	\$130,940,000		
				\$121,790,000	1.00%	2014
				\$ 9,150,000	1.50%	2009
(iii)	29-Mar-90	FINCOR	\$500,000,000	\$417,750,000		
				\$414,990,000	1.00%	2015-2020
				\$ 2,760,000	1.50%	2011-2013
(iv)	26-Oct-89	FINCOR	\$ 50,000,000	\$ 24,750,000	1.00%	2014
(v)	07-Jun-89	FINCOR	\$206,740,000	\$ 35,620,000		
				\$ 29,070,000	1.00%	2014
				\$ 2,700,000	1.50%	2009
				\$ 3,850,000	2.00%	2004
(vi)	28-Jun-91	FINCOR	\$755,000,000	\$ 72,850,000	1.75%	2021
	Total			\$ 927,651,519		

1.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I see where we have terms and conditions of new financing bonds and signature date, the first one was on February 18, 2000, the arranger was FINCOR, the amount loaned was \$153.429 million, the interest rate was fixed at 11.4 per cent to be matured in 2015 and the basis of selection was sole selective.

The other one was March 1, 2000 and the arranger was the Unit Trust Corporation, the loan amount was \$91,597,932 the interest rate was 11 per cent, maturity date 2010, competitive bidding was the basis of selection.

Finally, on May 05, 2000 the Unit Trust Corporation was again the arranger, the loan amount was \$350 million, interest rate 11.25 per cent, maturity date 2015, basis of selection was competitive bidding giving an altogether total of \$595,037,361.

Mr. Speaker, it is to be noted that all these loans have been fixed, or have fixed and floating rate portions. The restructuring exercise focusses on the floating rate portion of the loans which were contracted at rates between one and

two per cent below average prime. The cost of debt servicing is now prohibitively high due to increases in the prime interest rate.

The loan of \$91,597,932 was arranged by the Unit Trust Corporation as part of the Government's restructuring exercise and is therefore not included in the schedule of loans for early redemption.

The refinancing bonds were all raised at fixed rates of interest. This was to avoid the risk and uncertainty inherent in the floating rate structure, particularly in an environment of interest rate volatility. All loans refinanced to date are FINCOR loans, thus when the restructuring exercise began, FINCOR was given the first option, hence the reason for the sole selective tender.

For the other loans, all local financiers were invited to submit bids which were evaluated by the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Development. Of the total amount of \$927,651,519, \$634 million has been redeemed to date.

Mr. Valley: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. Minister would inform the House what manner was used by the Government to finance the difference between the \$927 million and the \$634 million? My calculation says \$595 million, but no problem, I would take \$634 million.

Dr. The Hon. M. Job: Mr. Speaker, I would rather be specific and respond on credible data which I do not have in my possession now, so if the hon. Member would be kind enough to pose that as a question, I would oblige.

Mr. Valley: Mr. Speaker, I will have to, so let me put it in the form of a question. As the Minister of Finance were you unaware of the manner in which Government is financing its obligations and that information is not readily available to the Minister of Finance?

Dr. The Hon. M. Job: Mr. Speaker, it is really readily available, but as the hon. Member for Diego Martin Central knows, when I am on my feet, I like to be totally confident and competent. I do not have all the information that I would require to be in that situation so I refer to my previous statement.

EDUCATION POLICY

The Prime Minister (Hon. Basdeo Panday): Mr. Speaker, as is my duty to report to Parliament on the policies of the Government, I do so today and I report on our education policy.

Mr. Speaker, on July 6, 1968 in the conclusion to his autobiography *Inward Hunger*, published in 1969 by Andre Deutsch, Dr. Williams underlined as a high

priority on his agenda, the elimination of the Common Entrance Examination for 11-plus children and the automatic movement from primary school to secondary education.

I refer to a quote I made sometime ago:

“There could not be a parent or child facing the Common Entrance Examination who does not share that sentiment.

In deference to this stated goal of our nation’s Founding Father, we can do no less than to finally put an end to the Common Entrance Examination in Trinidad and Tobago.

On this day, therefore, in the presence of all assembled here, in tribute to his memory, and in reverence to the luminous mind of Dr. Eric Williams, I now resolve and firmly pledge that by the end of this millennium, the Common Entrance Examination will be history in this country.

I shall shortly have in place, a fully representative Project Team, to formulate the necessary transition strategy to enable the automatic passage of our nation’s children from primary school to an appropriate secondary school; as we dismantle the Common Entrance process, before the start of the new millennium.

I will take up with my Minister of Education, the early establishment of a system of continuous tracking to evaluate the competence of our students across the school year; in order to end for all time, the horrific 11-plus trauma, for children and for parents. We must treat our nation’s children as our nation’s most cherished treasures, indeed, they are our most valuable treasures.”

Mr. Speaker, I have just read verbatim the vow which I pledged to the nation’s children, the nation’s parents, and to the memory of the legitimate “Father of the Nation” on Sunday, March 22, 1998. My pledge that the Common Entrance Examination would be abolished by the year 2000 was publicly made when I had the privilege of delivering the feature address to open the Eric Williams Memorial Collection at the University of the West Indies. That, as I said was two years and almost four months ago. The provision of a place for every child and the placement of every child in a secondary school mark the rebirth of this nation. *[Desk thumping]* For the first time, no child has been deemed a failure, for the first time, no child has been left behind; for the first time, no child has been left without hope. Never more in this land will we cast aside young children.

Over the years, hundreds of thousands of children have been condemned to a lesser status and a future of hopelessness. Never again would such brutality be inflicted upon the children of our nation. From this month, from this year, every child goes forward to a brighter future. Now, universal free secondary education is a reality. [*Desk thumping*] This is a triumph for the nation, we should all rejoice for the children, but sadly, there are persons who appear quite irrationally to be angered, if not traumatized by the Ministry of Education's success in finding a place for every child.

Hon. Member: Not over a rum shop.

Hon. B. Panday: Given the intensity of the Opposition's manifest resentment of the achievement of free secondary education for every child, and the dire implications they have been delivering, I appeal to the Leader of the Opposition to give to this honourable House the sincere pledge that should—God forbid—the PNM ever return to Government, it would not expel from the secondary school system those children whom the leadership and activists of the PNM are vociferously rejecting as being unfit for secondary school. [*Desk thumping*]

I further appeal to the Opposition to give this honourable House the undertaking that should the PNM ever return to government, the Common Entrance Examination with its yearly rejection of close to 10,000 children will not be reintroduced. [*Desk thumping*] Despite the PNM's leadership, opposition to the placement of every child in a secondary school, the reintroduction of the Common Entrance Examination and the expulsion of almost 10,000 children from the secondary school system are measures too brutal even to contemplate.

Mr. Speaker, the nation's teachers, except for a few who have identified themselves in nakedly partisan and callous fashion, are all committed to going the extra mile for every child who has been placed in a Form 1 class. I thank the nation's teachers for being shepherds as well as being mentors to the nation's children.

I thank the public officers in the Ministry of Education for going beyond the extra mile to ensure the smooth transition from education for some, to free secondary education for all.

I thank you, Mr. Clive Pantin, and members of the transition task force that he led in planning the transformation from school places for some to free secondary education for all.

Mr. Speaker, I must commend the members of the Government to whom fell the responsibility for implementation of the transition from school places for some to free secondary education for all.

I thank Minister Adesh Nanan for the first year and a half, and heroically, Minister Kamla Persad-Bissessar since last October. *[Desk thumping]* They are both deserving of our lasting gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, the provision of secondary school places for all the nation's children could not have been achieved without the co-operation and involvement of the religious school boards of every faith. I particularly thank every religious leader for helping the Government to put children first. *[Desk thumping]*

Mr. Speaker, at the heart of the new education plan is a resolve to provide a quality, a standard of education to our children that would be as good as the best in the world. To this end, the secondary schools are being upgraded and equipped, new schools are being built, teachers are being trained and recruited, curricula are being developed, school text books have been standardized, school buses are in place and security systems will be operating.

Come September 01, 2000, it will be a bright new world for close to 10,000 children to whom, before this month, the doors to the nation's secondary schools would have been securely shut. *[Desk thumping]* Those children will no longer be shut out. Now it is the obligation of the parent, the teacher, religious groups and the Government to provide to every child the education which will, in a rational manner, remove the social constraints which before now, would have severely limited so many children.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your indulgence in permitting me to place on record in this honourable House, a concise report on a development deserving of a place in our nation's history, besides such milestones as September 24, 1956; December 16, 1986 and November 5, 1995. *[Desk thumping]* I am confident that our nation's history will chronicle the events of the past fortnight, not merely as the ending of the destructive Common Entrance system, but as the beginning of universal free education for every child in Trinidad and Tobago on the dawn of a bright new world for today's young generation and for all generations to come.

I thank you, Sir.

2.10 p.m.

Mr. Manning: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister and the Government are willing to have that statement debated in the Parliament? *[Desk thumping]*

Hon. B. Panday: The Prime Minister will have no objection to the Opposition filing such a Motion. *[Desk thumping]*

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

ARRANGEMENT OF BUSINESS

The Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs (Hon. Ramesh Lawrence Maharaj): Mr. Speaker, before moving the Second Reading of the first Bill, may I seek leave of the House, in accordance with Standing Order No. 61, to withdraw the second Bill on the Order Paper. The reason is that, having regard to what we are doing and what I propose to do, the second Bill would not be necessary, so I seek leave to withdraw the second Bill: A Bill entitled, “An Act to authorize Service Commissions to summarily dismiss—”I am proceeding with the first Bill and withdrawing the second Bill. *[Interruption]* Do you understand, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Have you got it, Opposition Members?

Hon. R. L. Maharaj: Mr. Speaker, let me explain it again for the Opposition Members.

Mr. Speaker, there are two Bills on the Order Paper for today. The first Bill is entitled, “An Act to amend the Constitution of Trinidad and Tobago”; and the second Bill is, “An Act to authorize Service Commissions to summarily dismiss or suspend officers who have been convicted of a criminal offence.” Mr. Speaker, the Government seeks leave to withdraw the second Bill in light of the fact that the first Bill can deal adequately with the matters the Government intends to move.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Assent indicated.

Bill withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: With the leave of the House, please proceed.

CONSTITUTION (AMDT.) BILL

Order for second reading read.

The Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs (Hon. Ramesh Lawrence Maharaj): Mr. Speaker, I am much obliged. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move,

That a Bill to amend the Constitution of Trinidad and Tobago be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill which is before this honourable House and which has been circulated, would also include the proposed amendments. The intention of

the Bill is to give the service commissions the power to summarily dismiss an officer where the officer is convicted of a criminal offence. Or, where an Order under section 71 of the Summary Courts Act has been made, and the time allotted for an appeal has elapsed. Or, if the officer has appealed and the appeal process has been completed for the commission to be able to dismiss the officer without the disciplinary process which now exists.

Under the present system, if an officer is charged for a criminal offence and the officer comes under the jurisdiction of one of the service commissions, the commission has the power to suspend the officer pending the determination of the charge before the court. The commission also has the power to withhold part of the salary of the officer pending the determination of the charge. If the officer is convicted in the court and the commission wants to take steps against the officer to discipline the officer, apart from suspension, it is not automatic.

What has to happen is that the head of the department has to appoint an investigating officer to investigate the matter and give a report, and the report is given to the head of the department who then sends it to the commission. The commission would then have to consider the matter and if the commission decides that charges should be formulated, the charges are then formulated and the commission then has to appoint a tribunal to determine the charges and the person will then have an opportunity of being heard again.

The position is also that after the process is finished if the person is dissatisfied he or she can then appeal to the Public Service Appeal Tribunal. The position, therefore, under the existing process, is that even though a person may be charged and he has due process of law before the courts—the Magistrate's Court, the High Court, the Court of Appeal, the Privy Council—the commission still has to go through the process of formulating charges on the basis of misconduct and it cannot be an *ipso facto*. In other words, the commission cannot say that because you have been convicted we do not look at the proceedings, we use the certificate of conviction and remove the officer. Mr. Speaker, that is the first thing this Bill would do. I will explain it further. The second thing this Bill would do is remove from the law, the immunity of service commissions from being scrutinized by the courts. Under the present system, there is the Constitution—I will read it in a short while—which ousts the jurisdiction of the courts in scrutinizing the exercise of powers of a service commission in the performance of its functions. Although the Constitution says so, historically, a judge-made law—which has been had in other jurisdictions and followed here—is that the courts would say that if there is breach of the rules of natural justice, then

Constitution (Amdt.) Bill
[HON. R. L. MAHARAJ]

Friday, July 14, 2000

and only then it would show that it has no jurisdiction, and then and only then would the courts be able to intervene.

So there has been a situation in Trinidad and Tobago where, over the years, the service commissions, in the exercise of their powers of discipline, transfer, suspension are not being fully scrutinized by the courts. What this would do is give greater access to justice, in that the aggrieved person, by the act of the commission, would be able to approach the courts to be able to have judicial review of the commission's action. That is to say, whether the commission has acted lawfully; whether it has acted with procedural propriety; or whether it has acted reasonably.

2.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I will delve further into these matters, but let me go to the Bill that is before this House.

The amendments which are being proposed, may I say that even after this Bill has been drafted and been laid in the Parliament, it has been continuously looked at because of its importance. There have been cries by the Public Service Commission over the years asking governments to look at this. I will quote from the Public Service Commission report in which there has been a request for us—well a request for governments—to look at this because it is causing great difficulties to the public interest.

As a result of the present set-up where persons who are convicted cannot be summarily dismissed by the commission, there are, at present in the public service, persons who are convicted of criminal offences, and even in the police service and other services. However, there exists the rule that if someone has a conviction recorded against him/her, that person cannot be employed in the public service. I will quote from what the President of the Public Service Commission has said in a report and I will give some examples, but let me first go through the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

The Explanatory Note of the Bill, I just want to put on record, has been substituted and the amendments which are before the House are to—originally the existing Bill had made certain proposals to amend section 129 of the Constitution, and I should refer to section 129. Under section 129 and the relevant part, subsection (3) deals with what is called the ouster clause. That clause says that the court cannot enquire into the conduct of a service commission and I will read it for the record. Subsection (3) says:

“(3) The question whether—

- (a) a Service Commission has validly performed any function vested in it by this Constitution;
- (b) by a member of a Service Commission or any other person has validly performed any function delegated to that member or person under section 127;
- (c) a member of a Service Commission or any other person or authority has validly performed any other function in relation to the work of the Commission or in relation to any such function as is referred to in paragraph (b),

may not be enquired into in any court.”

That is subsection (3), Mr. Speaker, and by the Bill as amended we are asking for that subsection to be deleted. It would therefore mean with the deletion of that section that the courts could enquire into whether a commission has validly performed any of its functions.

In other words, the person who is aggrieved can apply, the court would look into the matter, the commission would be given an opportunity of being heard, the commission would be able to put forward its views to the court and the court would be able to decide the matters. Then, either the person who is aggrieved initially, or the commission, can appeal to a higher court, to the Court of Appeal or to the Privy Council and, obviously, at a certain time, to the Caribbean Court of Justice. That would mean that there would be full due process of law. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, the deletion of this clause will remove the obstacle or the impediment of persons who are aggrieved and dissatisfied by actions of service commissions from being able to have access to the court to get justice.

As a matter of fact, without expressing a view one way on the judgment, there have been many cases recently. For example, one is familiar with cases in which police officers have challenged the decision of the commission and the courts have ruled that because of this section the court cannot enquire into the conduct of the commission. As a matter of fact, there are teachers, public servants and even members of the public who have done that and the courts have ruled—the High Court, the Court of Appeal and the Privy Council—that because of section 129(3) the man who is aggrieved, who suffers the injustice, must be turned away from the court without even knowing whether the court considers the action of the service commission just or unjust.

So, Mr. Speaker, there would be cases where grave injustices have been done to individuals, but because of this section the courts do not enquire into it and the

people are turned away from the courts without getting justice. In those matters, obviously, where injustice has been done, there is a rationing of justice, there has been an absence of justice and a denial of justice. So this is an amendment brought in order to give to that individual the right to have access to justice.

The other aspect of these amendments deals with the question of the ability of a service commission to summarily dismiss an officer who has been convicted of a criminal offence. In the Bill which is before the House, without the proposed amendments one sees that a government tried to achieve that objective by attempting to delete section 129(4), and subsection (4) says:

“No penalty may be imposed on any public officer except as a result of disciplinary proceedings.”

What that means is that any officer who has done a wrong and has to be penalized by the commission, it cannot occur without disciplinary proceedings. Disciplinary proceedings are governed by the Public Service Commission Regulations, Chap. 1:01, and it has a process, as I described, of the appointment of an investigating officer by the head of the department, the person is told and he is given an opportunity. What then happens is that a report is generated, which is sent to the commission. The commission formulates the charges, then there is a hearing by a tribunal and then there is further consideration by the commission.

So with the Bill which was laid in the Parliament, the Government attempted to do that by, in effect, deleting that and repeating it in a different form, but also saying that a service commission shall dismiss a public officer where he has been convicted of a criminal offence or is the subject of an Order made under section 71 of the Summary Courts Act, and attempted to describe what was penalty, *et cetera*. What the amendment which we just circulated does is keep the policy of the Bill, that is to say, for the service commission to be able to summarily dismiss an officer who has been convicted of a criminal offence, but it goes about it in a different way.

Now, I will explain what it does. We are leaving the existing 129(4) of the Constitution which says:

“No penalty may be imposed on any public officer except as a result of disciplinary proceedings.”

We are not touching that because that is the general principle, in that no public officer can be disciplined or penalized unless there are disciplinary proceedings. What we say now is, and I will read from this proposed amendment,

notwithstanding the general rule that a public officer cannot be penalized except as a result of disciplinary proceedings:

“Notwithstanding subsection (4), where an officer is convicted of a criminal charge in any court and the time allotted for an appeal has elapsed or, if the officer has appealed, the appeal process has been completed or an order has been made in the matter under section 71 of the Summary Courts Act...”

Well, what is section 71 of the Summary Courts Act? If I may pause there, Mr. Speaker, section 71 of the Summary Courts Act provides that even where a person is charged for a criminal offence and the court is of the view that the offence has been proven, the court has a discretion not to record the conviction. I will read what section 71 says:

“(1) Where any person is charged before a Court with an offence punishable by the Court, and the Court thinks that the charge is proved, but is of opinion that having regard to the character, antecedents, age, health, or mental condition of the person charged, or to the trivial nature of the offence, or to the extenuating circumstances in which the offence was committed, it is inexpedient to inflict any punishment or any other than a nominal punishment, the Court may, without proceeding to conviction, make an order either—

- (a) dismissing the complaint or charge, or
- (b) discharging the offender conditionally on his entering into a recognisance, with or without sureties, to be of good behaviour and to appear for conviction and sentence when called on at any time during such period, not exceeding three years, as may be specified in the order.”

What section 71 means is, let us say a police officer, or let us say a public officer, is charged for possession of drugs, cocaine or marijuana. The court listens to the case. He gets an opportunity of being heard; he has his lawyer, but the court finds that, notwithstanding everything, the offence has been established beyond a reasonable doubt and he is, in effect, guilty, but the court is of the opinion that, having regard to his age, character, his health, *et cetera*, the law gives a discretion not to record a criminal conviction against the individual. So he could be discharged, the complaint could be dismissed completely or he could be made to enter into a bond. One knows that recording a criminal conviction against an individual can have certain barriers for life or for a very long time.

So if I may go back now to what we are doing, as I was saying—

Mr. Boynes: I would like to ask just one question, if the Member gives way. Based on what the Member said just a short while ago as it relates to section 71(1)(a) in particular, bearing in mind that the court, having taken into consideration the trivial nature of the offence and extenuating circumstances whereby it dismisses the complaint or the charge, should a public servant then, if his charge has been dismissed under section 71(1)(a), not have the privilege of at least having the disciplinary charges heard or a tribunal to decide whether he will be dismissed or not?

Hon. R. L. Maharaj: No. I believe that he should be given an opportunity of being heard by the commission as to why he should not be dismissed but I do not think that it is necessary for a person who has had all the opportunity of proving that he is not guilty and the court has found that he has committed the offence—because under the regulations the officer could be removed for misconduct and the misconduct would be the facts and circumstances of his conduct. So as far as the law is concerned, his conduct has been proven, but I think that it should not be automatic. Since the commission has the power under the Constitution to discipline, the commission should be able to ask him to show cause why he should not be dismissed. Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Member bears with me, I intend to explain it.

2.35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I was reading from the proposed amendment, which I would ask Members to look at and disregard what we had on the Bill. The Government wanted to ensure that it would be as fair as possible, and still maintain the public interest. So, notwithstanding the general rule of subsection (4) which is before any public officer is removed; before any penalty can be imposed upon him; there must be full disciplinary proceedings, notwithstanding that general rule in subsection (4) which states:

“...where an officer is convicted of a criminal charge in any court and the time allotted for an appeal has elapsed or, if the officer has appealed, the appeal process has been completed or an order has been made in the matter under section 71 of the Summary Courts Act...”

Which I just read.

“...a Service Commission may consider the relevant proceedings on such charge and if it is of opinion that the officer ought to be dismissed or subjected to some lesser punishment in respect of the conduct which led to his conviction on the criminal charge or to the making of the order...”

That is the making of the order under section 71.

“...the Commission may thereupon dismiss or otherwise punish the officer without the institution of any disciplinary proceedings.”

But it does not end there.

“...a certificate of conviction issued by the court shall be sufficient evidence of an officer’s conviction for an offence;”

And it does not end there.

“a certified copy of an order made under section 71 of the Summary Courts Act shall be sufficient evidence of the commission by the officer of the offence for which he was charged.”

But it does not end there.

“An officer referred to in subsection (5) shall be entitled to show cause why he should not be dismissed from office.”

Mr. Speaker, I will read some of the difficulties. I think I should put it on the record. If one looks at the Public Service Commission Regulations from regulation 84 onwards, one would see the disciplinary process, which applies to all public officers. I think a lot of Members in this House are very familiar with it and I do not need to go into detail. It is a very extensive process and that process is to ensure that the person’s misconduct is established, and the person has every opportunity of challenging the facts which are against him.

When the regulations were drafted, there was a regulation 113 which was there. What happened is that regulation did not have the force of law because it was not primary legislation. Regulation 113 anticipated that where a person was convicted for an offence, the public officer should be summarily dismissed. I understand that regulation was challenged, and because it was not passed by Parliament as primary legislation, it was declared to be void.

Regulation 113 reads:

“If an officer is convicted in any Court of a criminal charge, the Commission may consider the relevant proceedings on such charge and if it is of the opinion that the officer ought to be dismissed or subjected to some lesser punishment in respect of the offence of which he has been convicted the Commission may thereupon dismiss or otherwise punish the officer without the institution of any disciplinary proceedings under these Regulations.”

So, Mr. Speaker, the intention was, where you had a criminal charge—because you could have disciplinary proceedings without a person being charged for a criminal offence. As a matter of fact, most of the disciplinary matters in the service are in respect of persons who have not been charged for a criminal offence. What happened is that the regulation deals with two sets of matters, one where there are criminal charges and one where there are no criminal charges. Where there are criminal charges the intention was, where the person has gone through the court system, and the courts have ruled that he has been guilty or the offence has been proven, then it should not stultify the public interest by having further extended proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, there is a report of the Police Service Commission from 1995—1998 and this report is public. From my enquiries these have been representations which—

Mr. Hinds: Thank you very kindly for giving way. But before the Attorney General proceeds to that aspect of it, are we to understand the Attorney General as saying that in respect of the amendment at clause 3—and I am looking at the last four lines “...the Commission may thereupon dismiss or otherwise punish the officer without the institution of any disciplinary proceedings”? Are we to understand that as to mean the extended disciplinary proceedings from regulation 84 onwards in the regulations, and that contrasts with your amended (7) which says:

“An officer referred to in subsection (5) shall be entitled to show cause why he should not be dismissed from office.”?

Are we to understand the Attorney General to mean that in the first part, he is dealing with the extended disciplinary proceedings? If so, what is meant by “show cause”? Does it mean an officer simply sends a document or gives a *viva voce* statement to the service commission? What does the second part mean in practice, in effect? Other than that, if there is not that distinction, there is a clear conflict between the two provisions and I would like to know what is intended.

Hon. R. L. Maharaj: No, there is no conflict at all. Disciplinary proceedings referred to are clearly disciplinary proceedings because that is how they are referred to in the regulations with respect to extended proceedings. The section is drafted that the officer referred to “...shall be entitled to show cause why...” which means that the officer has an entitlement to show cause why, and the commission will have to call upon him to show cause why. So, this means, the officer would be given an opportunity to show cause why. It will depend—for

example, as you know, every hearing does not necessarily have to be an oral hearing; it is up to the discretion of the commission. If, for example, the commission acts unreasonably, then in the light of the amendment of removing the ouster clause, the person can go to court.

Mr. Speaker, let us say, for example, a person is convicted for driving without due care and attention. One would expect that because of that kind of charge if the commission—because the regulation did not say “shall” it says “may”—decides to dismiss the officer, one would expect that there would have to be an opportunity for him to be heard in that kind of situation—an oral hearing. Let us say that an officer was convicted for 20 cases of fraud, rape or something like that, it may be—I am not saying that they should—that if the commission asks him to show cause in writing, there will be no problem with that. I am not too sure whether there will be a problem; I am not advocating that. It may be that the commission may decide because Parliament cannot tell the commission how to operate in that way. It may be that the commission may decide that in every case where it wants to dismiss an officer, the commission may call in an officer and ask him if he has anything to say.

As a matter of fact, I could tell you that the law is quite settled now that if it is not an unreasonable action, and the person gets an opportunity to be heard—whether it is orally or in writing—that is sufficient. *[Interruption]* Yes, because if we did not remove the ouster clause the officer would not be able to go for judicial review.

2.45 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, it is very significant that that ouster clause is not entrenched. This section 129 that we are dealing with is not entrenched because it is recognized that Parliament may, from time to time, have to consider whether to remove it. As a matter of fact, it has been removed in the United Kingdom since the 1930s, I understand; or 1918, I think it is. In other words, if the officer is dissatisfied with the conduct of the commission, the officer can then go for judicial review. If we leave the ouster clause, he cannot go, except it is very limited.

Mr. Hinds: I know that the Attorney General has the benefit of tremendous research from his very extensive department. I want to know, on the basis of that, whether it is the Attorney General's view that the courts in the past have respected and upheld that ouster clause or have they, as we know in other cases, dealt with it as the court does. That is an important matter. I would like to know, if I may put it

slightly differently, from the Attorney General's knowledge on the matters, whether the courts have always observed that ouster clause thereby denying people access to what was done in the commissions by way of judicial review?

Hon. R. L. Maharaj: Mr. Speaker, I did not want to have to deal with that aspect of it, but since it has been asked, we know that this ouster clause started in the United Kingdom as a way to get the courts to not interfere with decisions of public authorities and tribunals. The courts decided to find a way to prevent this from happening.

Then there was that famous Anisminic case in which the House of Lords said that yes, it is correct, that decision is final, but if it can be shown that the tribunal acted without jurisdiction, then the courts would intervene, although one has a discretion to go right or to go wrong, if one had no jurisdiction. Then it developed that it is really if one did not give a person the rules of natural justice.

What has happened is that over the years, it has developed that although there is the ouster clause—there is now the ouster clause only in some of the Commonwealth countries; some of them have abolished it—the courts can find a way of getting around it. What has happened is that it is very limited. For example, in Trinidad and Tobago, I quote some cases, the courts have taken the position that since this ouster clause is in the Constitution, it makes it even more reason why the courts should not interfere.

As a matter of fact, in one of the cases—in the Harry Kissoon case—the Court of Appeal said that yes, ouster clauses were in ordinary laws, but the people of Trinidad and Tobago have put it in a constitution and the Constitution is the supreme law. Therefore, since it is the supreme law, the court must not interfere, no matter what the injustice is. That is what the Constitution says; that is what the Parliament says.

I do not want to quote names of cases, because quite recently there was a senior police officer who went to court and he is saying that the action of the commission was unreasonable to him. The High Court recognized that a grave injustice was done to this man and gave judgment in his favour. The state appealed to the Court of Appeal and the Court of Appeal ruled that this is an ouster clause in the Constitution and the court cannot intervene.

So, this policeman who has suffered, as the High Court recognized, a grave injustice, has to live with that injustice. There are many cases. As Attorney General I see them coming, but that is the law. I am not saying the court is wrong. What I am saying is that is how the court has interpreted it. The position is in law

that because of this ouster clause, the courts have ruled, and will continue to rule, because of this ouster clause, that one cannot challenge these decisions.

Mr. Speaker, what we have to do, what governments have to do, is try to find a way of dealing with this problem, because I want to point out some of the difficulties that this section has caused. Most of these cases, I should mention, are now before the Privy Council, so the state may have to spend much more resources.

I was about to read, when I answered the question of the hon. Member for Laventille East/Morvant, the report of the Police Service Commission 1995—1998. In this report, Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Police Service Commission, Mr. Kenneth Lalla, has documented an important report dealing with the difficulties which the commissions are facing over the years to deal with discipline. One of the matters which the chairman referred to in his report is the whole question of this section: disciplining persons who have been convicted for criminal offences.

Mr. Speaker, on page 27, after referring to the formal procedure, he said:

“On the completion of a report by the Investigating Officer appointed to enquire into allegations made, the report is sent to the Service Commissions to decide whether to charge an officer for an act of misconduct or indiscipline under the code of conduct. The officer is informed in writing that a charge has been preferred against him and that a tribunal has been appointed to hear the matter. The Commissioner of Police is simultaneously informed and is responsible for appointing someone to present the evidence on his behalf. The next stage is the actual hearing of the matter before the tribunal.

Several problems have been encountered in the execution of the above mentioned procedures. These are identified hereunder.”

Then he talks about the time lapse, and so forth. Then he talks about the situation at page 31:

“The situation in respect of matters before the court is much the same. Apart from the fact that matters at times take as long as two years on average to be determined, there are a number of other problems which are set out hereunder.

In cases where Magistrates use section 71 of the Summary Courts Act, Ch. 4:20 to deal with persons against whom criminal charges may have been proved, the Commission is faced with the difficulty of instituting disciplinary proceedings in accordance with Regulations.”

Then he quotes section 71, which I have just quoted. At page 33 he says:

“Under such condition it is difficult to implement a charge of misconduct in accordance with Regulations...”

Because the Act states that the person has to be subjected to disciplinary proceedings. Then he goes on:

“In matters discharged under section 71, the officer would not technically have been ‘found guilty’. Also, recent judgements of both the Court of Appeal and the Public Service Appeal Board have overturned certain decisions of dismissal of officers. These dismissals were based on the record of the Magistrate’s finding of guilt of a criminal charge and not on the basis of a fresh hearing of the allegation of misconduct.

The cases have held that given the present regulations, the Commission cannot simply rely on the records of the Magistrate's finding to dismiss an officer.

Further, where an officer has been incarcerated, there are a number of difficulties in the disciplining of that officer. The records are not often available until after a long period of time, thus preventing the Investigating Officer from conducting a thorough investigation. There are at times difficulties in the locating of witnesses—police assistance is often required in this regard.”

Then he said:

“Then there is the question of calling the tribunals to go to the State’s Prisons.”

Because, Mr. Speaker, there may be the officer who is in prison and one may have to deal with the issue. The commission then has to go to the prison because the commission does not have the power for *habeas corpus* or to summon anybody.

There is a situation where the person, therefore, has been given every opportunity to have his conduct ruled as not unlawful; Magistrates’ Court, High Court, Court of Appeal, Privy Council. When the commission is faced with that situation, the commission cannot rely on the certificate of conviction or certificate of order made under section 71. The law is that one has to go over the whole process again, which takes years and which has resulted in the police officers and public officers with criminal convictions being in the police service and in the public service.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to some matters to give members an idea of what is happening. These are two matters which the chairman of the Public

Service Commission has brought to my attention. There are many others, but these are two. He said that these two judgments have brought home to the Public Service Commission the need for an amendment to the Constitution of Trinidad and Tobago, and he has indicated that he has made these representations to previous governments.

In one case, a public officer has been found guilty of the offence of possession of cocaine at the Fourth Magistrates' Court and is charged under section 71 of the Summary Courts Act. As a consequence, the Public Service Commission interdicted the officer from duty on one-half salary with effect from the date of his receipt of notification of the commission's decision and decided that the Permanent Secretary in his particular Ministry should appoint an investigating officer to enquire into the allegation that he has brought the public service, of which he was a member, into disrepute when he was found guilty of the charge of possession of cocaine.

Upon receipt of the investigating officer's report, the commission was of the opinion that facts therein established that there was sufficient evidence to support a charge and the officer was accordingly charged thus. I now read the charge without calling the name:

“That you did an act in breach of an implied term of your contract of employment, namely to act in a manner so as to bring the public service into disrepute when on so and so date at so and so, you were found guilty on the charge of possession of cocaine which was dismissed by the presiding magistrate pursuant to section 78(1) of the Summary Courts Act without proceeding to a conviction.”

End of the charge. Mr. Speaker, he continues:

“A disciplinary tribunal which was subsequently appointed to hear the evidence and find the facts found the charge against the officer proven. The Commission, having considered the report of the disciplinary tribunal and representations from the officer decided to remove him from the public service. His dismissal took effect from November 3rd, 1992 and he filed an appeal with the Public Service Appeal Board which appeal was dismissed on May 1st, 1994.

On July 15th, 1994, the officer filed an application in the High Court for judicial review of the decision of the Public Service Commission to dismiss him from the public service and on June 1st, 1995, the presiding judge quashed the decision of the Public Service Commission.”

He quashed the decision because the judge said that the commission did not have any jurisdiction to dismiss the officer without having a full disciplinary proceeding because of what is contained in section 129(4): “no penalty may be imposed on any public officer except as a result of disciplinary proceedings”.

The judge went on to say that because of that section, where there are disciplinary charges the evidence has to be got again, it has to be adduced before the tribunal and it has to be the same thing. If it is the same thing, it still has to be adduced, and where possible, if there is independent evidence of witnesses who testified before the magistrate, they should get that evidence because it has to be fully led before the tribunal.

3.00 p.m.

What happened is, that officer who has been convicted, or who the court has found was in possession of cocaine, is now in the public service and he will be entitled to all the rights of a public servant.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to call names because I do not think it is right, but my information is that in the police service, there are approximately 24 persons who have been convicted but, because of this rule, they would, possibly, either have to remain in the police service because you have to go through this procedure and some of the evidence is lost and, in some cases, you cannot get witnesses to testify. At the commission, it is the duty of the commission to get the evidence and adduce it before the tribunal.

Mr. Speaker, I will give another instance of another matter so that we can have an idea of what are some of the difficulties. There are several cases but the other case to which I think I should refer, concerns another officer who was dismissed from his office with effect from March 17, 1993 and who filed an appeal before the Public Service Appeal Board.

In 1990, the Commissioner of Police had reported that the particular officer had gone to Bank of Commerce at Independence Square, Port of Spain, to apply for a loan where he had tendered, among other things, a job letter purportedly signed by an officer of the Comptroller of Accounts Department which was found to be false. He was arrested and charged for forgery and uttering a forged document. The commission in June of 1992 noted that in November 1991, he was found guilty of the court charges, convicted and discharged under section 71(1)(a) of the Summary Courts Act. Having considered representation made on behalf of the officer, he was removed from office by the commission.

The officer filed an appeal before the Public Service Appeal Board which allowed the appeal and set aside the conviction and the Public Service Appeal Board said, having regard to the rulings of the court that you have to have a full hearing, the commission cannot look at the certificate of conviction or the proceedings and regard the conduct as having been proven. You have to have the witnesses again and you have to go through the process. You have to do that and since you cannot do that, you have not complied with section 129(4), which says that:

"No penalty may be imposed on any public officer except as a result of disciplinary proceedings."

So, Mr. Speaker, this explains why the Government has to come, in an effort to try to give to the commission, the discretion to summarily dismiss. As a matter of fact, what is happening here is that the powers of the commission are not being taken away. The rights of the individual, in my respectful view, are not being affected because there is full due process of law for him to challenge his conduct. That is to say, whether he raped, whether he is in possession of cocaine, or whether he stole and the courts of the country find that he is guilty, or find that his offence has been proven and, in those circumstances—and it is only in those circumstances—that is to say, where there has been a conviction or where there has been an order under section 71 where the court could have found that the charge is proven, that the power of the commission is being given to summarily dismiss, that is to say, not to resort to the full disciplinary proceedings but still give him an entitlement to be heard in order to show cause why he should not be dismissed, that is what this aspect of this Bill is about.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution did not say that a person must be given due process of law three and four times and the Constitution did not say if a person's property rights were to be taken away, he would have a multiplicity of opportunities to get due process of law, but in the case of an officer, he does have a multiplicity of opportunities. As a matter of fact, if it is a summary matter and he is convicted, he can go to the Court of Appeal and, under the present law, he can even apply for leave to appeal to the Privy Council.

If it is not a summary matter and it is an indictable matter, there is what is called a preliminary inquiry before a magistrate and at that hearing, he is entitled to cross-examine, either alone or through his lawyers; he is entitled to call witnesses; he is entitled to address the magistrate to make no-case submissions, to call evidence and to try to get the charge dismissed.

If he is committed to stand trial, if he is tried before a judge and jury and under the laws of this country, if it is murder, it is a unanimous verdict. If it is a non-capital offence, it is a majority verdict if the judge decides to take it, and not a simple majority, a majority. I think where there is a jury of nine, there must be a majority of seven. But if after that judge and jury trial he is dissatisfied, he can appeal to the Court of Appeal where there are three judges sitting to review his evidence. That is to say, whether the officer stole, whether he raped, whether he was in possession of cocaine and, then again, if he is dissatisfied with that, under our Constitution, he has a right of appeal to the Privy Council in London.

What we are doing, really, is, we are saying that a person like that who has had all these opportunities and even where a person gets an order under section 71, he can also appeal to get the Court of Appeal to say, "No. The magistrate was right. He should have been acquitted completely", or whatever it is.

Mr. Hinds: Thank you yet again for giving way. Regulation 113 says:

"If an officer is convicted in any Court of a criminal charge..."

I do not have to read it, but it is here in the last line. All right. Let me read it.

"If an officer is convicted in any Court of a criminal charge, the Commission may consider the relevant proceedings on such charge and if it is of the opinion that the officer ought to be dismissed or subjected to some lesser punishment in respect of the offence of which he has been convicted the Commission may thereupon dismiss or otherwise punish the officer without the institution of any disciplinary proceedings under these Regulations."

That suggests that the long-winded disciplinary procedure to which that section made reference, will not apply where he is convicted of a criminal offence. How does that bear on what the Attorney General is proposing today?

Hon. R. L. Maharaj: Well, I do not think you were following me. What I said was that regulation 113 was no longer in force because it was not passed as primary legislation—there was a Legal Notice No. 28 of 1991—because it is *ultra vires* the Constitution because it was passed as regulations so it does not apply. It is not in force. So what I am saying is, we are asking the Parliament to take that policy and put it in the law as primary legislation. If we had this, if regulation 113 was effected and could be law, then we would not need it, but it was not under this administration but under a previous administration in 1991 that this was the spirit of the regulation, but this could not go because it was made in regulation and it should be made part of primary law and that is why we are doing it now.

What the Public Service Commission is saying—as a matter of fact, in the last case referred to, the Public Service Appeal Tribunal said that this should be made law. The Constitution should be amended to put this in the law. But what we are doing, we are, in effect, giving the officer additionally what was there and has been found to be invalid because they were in regulations and not in law passed by Parliament, primary legislation. What we are doing is saying that in addition to this, the officer would still have an opportunity of being heard to show cause why.

Under regulation 113, he did not have an opportunity. The commission could have made its decision without giving him an opportunity but under the amendments which we are making to the Constitution, we are saying that the person would be entitled to show cause why he should not be dismissed.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am very anxious to see how the Opposition is going to deal with this matter because I know that the Opposition sometimes tries to make politics in respect of any matter, but I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, because I know how misinformation can be given and I know how groups of people in the country sometimes like the misinformation to peddle the misinformation. So, it is clear; it is in black and white that the powers of the service commission are not being taken away. As a matter of fact, this is, in effect, to permit the service commission to effectively do its job and that is, to discipline effectively.

The rights of the individual are not being taken away. The individual officer has all the rights before the court in order to question whether his conduct is conduct which amounts to a criminal offence. As I said, Magistrates' Courts, High Court, Court of Appeal, Privy Council. What this does, it merely says that in cases where a court has made a finding, whether a Magistrates' Court, a High Court or a Court of Appeal has made a finding, a finding of guilt or a finding in the case of a Magistrates' Court, an order under section 71 under which the court recognized that the offence is proven, the service commission would have the power not to have to go through this long process to ultimately decide the matter not to allow the individual to use the delays to get away, but the commission would have the power to call him in and say, "You have been convicted. What do you have to say? Why should the commission not dismiss you or give you a lesser punishment?" And he will be given an opportunity to do it.

So, this has nothing to do with taking away people's rights, abridging the Constitution and taking away people's constitutional rights and affecting freedoms. As a matter of fact, what this has to do is that the Police Service Commission, in particular, the Chairman who is both the Chairman of the Police Service Commission and the Public Service Commission, obviously, in which

Constitution (Amdt.) Bill
[HON. R. L. MAHARAJ]

Friday, July 14, 2000

these matters arise more often than in any other commission, has been calling, asking Government to take steps to prevent the public service from acting in a way in which you can have officers who are convicted of criminal offences in the public service. There is even a serious situation where a person with a conviction cannot get in, but persons with convictions can remain. That is one aspect of the Bill. The other aspect of the Bill also has nothing to do with taking away anybody's rights. As a matter of fact, it has to do with giving greater access to justice and that is, if anyone, whether it is the officer in these matters or anyone else, to whom a service commission has done any act which the officer believes is unjust to him, unfair to him, illegal, unreasonable, the person can go to the court and the court would not be able to say that the Constitution says that even if there is an injustice, I cannot investigate it. That is what these amendments are about.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move.

3.15 p.m.

Question proposed.

Dr. Keith Rowley (*Diego Martin West*): Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a brief intervention on the presentation of the Attorney General on the matter before us today. I want to allay the Attorney General's fears by saying that a lot of what he has said, we on this side can associate ourselves with the difficulties and especially the examples that he gave.

Mr. Speaker, in my own experience in the public service, when there used to be something called a Statutory Authorities Service Commission, I remember serving on the Board of the Water and Sewerage Authority. There was one particular officer who, in the opinion of the board, was not only guilty of dereliction of duty with respect to securing the company's assets but when asked to come before the board to provide some kind of explanation as to what might have happened, he flatly refused. That resulted in some attempts at bringing some disciplinary action. Mr. Speaker the end result of that was the officer went home on some kind of suspension on full pay. That went on for years because he had to choose an arbitrator. There was all this talk about who is to look into what, wherefore and so on. After I left the board, a number of years after, I inquired as to what might have happened with that matter. I heard that he was working in New York, but he was still on suspension. Therefore, this kind of thing can happen with some of the disciplinary proceedings that we have: the pathways to discipline which, in fact, in many instances, resulted in no discipline at all.

With respect to the police service, we had to read in the newspapers the galling instances of lawbreaking by some officers who have been jailed, and then to discover that they still are on the establishment and will so remain, until some long drawn-out proceedings take place. In the meantime they might even retire from the service, collecting their benefits, having served their jail term without having paid the penalty for their infractions.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it abundantly clear that we on this side are aware of the difficulties that the Attorney General pointed out and we are also supportive of a measure which seeks to circumvent and to clog the loopholes which people use when they are to be dealt with in a fair manner as described.

Mr. Speaker, as is now current before us on the education matter, it is not because an intention is right that the action to deal with the intention is necessarily right. I want to make that clear. A distinction has to be made there. If a driver is taking someone to the hospital in an ambulance, that is a good intention. But if he speeds at 100 miles an hour and going through all traffic lights and there is an accident and he kills somebody, then the process by which he is seeking to execute that desirable action might be called into question. That is all we are saying on this matter and on the education matter. So, to label us as being uncooperative, as the Attorney General seeks to do or as “don’ts” as the Prime Minister seeks to do, is to misunderstand the whole thing. That is why I, as a non-lawyer, sought my colleague’s approval to speak first on this matter this afternoon, because I do not want to just approach it just from a legal standpoint. I read the laws of the country as a citizen.

Mr. Speaker, even as we agreed, yes, the commission must not have to go and try over a case and to find witnesses—some of whom might be absent or dead. Why is it necessary for the commission to have to go and retry a case that has been tried in a court of law and a person was given every opportunity to defend himself or herself and was found guilty? Why should a commission that is seeking to discipline that person have to go and retry the case? That is what the current law asks. But, if we are going to change that, Mr. Speaker, we have to do it properly. So there is agreement that we should change it. There is not agreement that we are doing it properly. I hope the Attorney General does not heap scorn on us for saying that, because we do not really care what he says.

Mr. Speaker, the service commissions of this country—for better or for worse, those who wrote and gave us a constitution prepared a document that is called the Constitution. Under Part II, section 54(1) it says:

Constitution (Amdt.) Bill
[DR. ROWLEY]

Friday, July 14, 2000

“Subject to the provisions of this section, Parliament may alter any of the provisions of this Constitution or (in so far as it forms part of the law of Trinidad and Tobago)...

(2) In so far as it alters—...”

and it lists a number of sections. One of those sections is section 120. It says if the Parliament is altering those things—

“...a Bill for an Act under this section shall not be passed by Parliament unless at the final vote thereon in each House it is supported by the votes of not less than two-thirds of all the members of each House.”

If I am to take as an example section 120, I may point out, that section which we call the entrenching section covers service commissions and their actions and their powers. Section 120 deals with the Public Service Commission. Section 121(2) states:

“The Public Service Commission shall not remove, or inflict any punishment on, a public officer on the grounds of any act done or omitted to be done by that officer in the exercise of a judicial function conferred upon him unless the Judicial and Legal Service Commission concurs therein.”

I am simply using this as an example; that an officer may do something either in carrying out his duties, failing to carry out his duties, or outside his duties. It says here the commission shall not do certain things without having done other things.

Elsewhere in the Constitution, under the powers of service commissions, disciplinary action is spelt out for the commission as a power. What we are going to do—if we agree with what the Attorney General says we ought to do to rectify the problem of loopholes and inability to deal with people who have been convicted in court, I humbly submit that what, in effect, we will be doing—is altering what is there. Because if we are not going to alter it, then what are we doing? How are we going to change people’s power? I expect that the Attorney General will say: “We are altering section 129.” Section 129 is not entrenched. But the power that we are going to give the commission by altering section 129 is in fact an alteration of the existing power.

As of now the commission does not have the power to summarily dismiss without going through those procedures. Therefore, if you are altering the power, it does not say—I heard him making a big song and dance by saying: “The Opposition will say that we are taking other people’s powers.” But alteration means change for the better or change for the worse. What you might perceive to

be an alteration for the better, may be an alteration for the worse for somebody else. That is why it simply says here: if you are altering the service commissions' powers you must do that alteration by special majority of the Parliament.
[Interruption]

Mr. Manning: What is wrong with you Ramesh!

Dr. K. Rowley: That is how I understand it.

3.25 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, he makes a case about some individuals who have gone to the court and have not found the door open to get justice. By the same token, if we alter the powers of the commission to allow the commission to dismiss people based on a condition in the court, what is to prevent such a person from going to the court and saying that the law that was passed in the Parliament, giving the commission the power to purport to dismiss me, was not properly passed? Therefore, when the court says, "You have given the commission powers which it did not have and those powers were not given in the proper way, and, therefore, the purported dismissal is quashed," how would we have solved the situation?

I think if we are going to give the commission powers to do that, the law seems to be clear that altering the service commission's powers—in fact, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Attorney General might want to say that it has been perfectly done and, therefore, there can be no question about the perfection. I was very happy when I heard him say that he was going to withdraw No. 2, because the same people who are telling us that what I am saying here is stupidly wrong are the same people who drafted the withdrawn Bill. Mr. Speaker, if you had time to look at the Bill you would have seen that what it was doing was also altering the Constitution by restricting the discretionary powers of the service commission and replacing it with "shall", giving the commission no discretion, making it mandatory for the commission to dismiss a person regardless of extenuating circumstances.

Good sense has prevailed in-between then and now, and I must say the amendment, as put here today, has recognized the incorrect approach of what has been withdrawn. If you were going to give the commission that power, removing its discretionary power and replacing it with a mandatory order of "shall dismiss on condition", then you would have had to do that by way of a special majority of the Parliament. When this Bill came before us there was no mention of any special majority here; so had he not withdrawn this Bill, and I made the same argument, they would have got up here and said, "Since it was printed on this

Constitution (Amdt.) Bill
[DR. ROWLEY]

Friday, July 14, 2000

paper and there is no requirement as printed for a special majority, there is no such requirement." But this has been withdrawn and has been replaced by a new section 3, which maintains that discretionary power; so, at least, the Attorney General has recognized that.

I am saying that the powers you are giving to the commission to fire people on the basis of a trial that had taken place in the court, to introduce that power to the commission now is an alteration of the existing power of the commission, and, therefore, it should be properly done by being passed by a special majority.

Mr. Speaker, there is one more point I want to make, and the point is this: all these actions are going to impinge on the Teaching Service Commission, the Police Service Commission, the Judicial and Legal Service Commission and the Public Service Commission. When we got independence it was so important to our founding fathers to protect the rights and tenure of these public officials that their existence and protection were laid in the Constitution and deeply entrenched under section 54. Why then if, as a good case has been made or if a case is to be made for these entrenched provisions or the actions of the commission which are entrenched, to be changed, I want to ask the Attorney General, did he consult with the various bodies representing the public officials who are now to be brought under the action to be taken by the changes? Did he at any time consult with the Public Service Commission?

He comes here and says that he is reading about an officer here and an officer there who may have had a problem somewhere, fine; but what about the interest of the wider body? What we are saying here is that we are allowing the service commission to dismiss without further trial. As it stands now, all those officers have the right to have further investigation take place. We are saying that might not be the best way to go, but you are changing something which exists; should not the Government have had discussion and the blessing of the Public Service Commission? In fact, I wonder if they are aware that you are making those changes.

We are here amending the Constitution of this country. This must be the only Parliament in the world where amendment to the Constitution is treated like going down "de" road to buy a bag of bread. Every Monday morning that we come to this Parliament it is to amend the Constitution. If, in fact, you are seeing it fit to do this, could the Attorney General tell us if there was any notification and consultation with the relevant commissions so that the interest of officers could be protected by those who represent them, and not just by the words of the Attorney General? We have a Teaching Service Commission and a body representing

teachers—are they in agreement with this? Are they aware of this? What are their views?

You see, Mr. Speaker, there are very few offences in this country that carry less than six months' jail term. What we are saying here is that once you are convicted, that conviction is a signal and a catalyst which can cause the commission to summarily dismiss you. Mr. Speaker, are you aware that a number of traffic offences would be covered here? Let me just take one scenario: a public servant, let us say a permanent secretary, may have given this country 20 or 30 years of service. On one occasion he gets into a motor car accident and somebody is killed, and he is charged for manslaughter or something like that. The commission can, according to the new amendment here, summarily dismiss him. What follows from that, what he did not tell you, is loss of benefits; because we did not hear anything about benefits, because I presume that if the policeman who is in jail is dismissed, his benefits will also be dismissed. If I am wrong the Attorney General can put me right when he concludes.

If he is saying that any act which can be deemed a criminal act—and many criminal actions are not by aforethought or malice, you can find yourself before the court where the charge is, in fact, a criminal charge, but there are serious extenuating circumstances. Yes, he has introduced, luckily, the discretion to the commission, but he has given the power to the commission to dismiss summarily. That is why I am asking, since he is making this change, which is going to have this effect on public officials of all classes, teachers, public servants and so forth, has he seen it fit to bring their bodies who speak for them into the picture, so they can, at least, give the blessing to what is going on here? Or, is it that we decide that this order ought to be done and it is going to be done? Then after it is done, points of view of those people will arise in the hated media and the Government will say, "Anybody who criticizes the Government is against the Government and so on and so on," as the Government is wont to do.

I would have thought that the Attorney General would have been able to tell us that these consultations did take place, they have been informed, they know what is going to happen, because we are going to change the Constitution to relieve them of that pathway that they now have for a long and drawn-out tribunal arrangement, because those who put those things in the law, put them there for a purpose. They said it was for the protection of public officers. We have lived with those arrangements, and we are now saying that it may be possible or it is right now to change it, but understand that it is there, having been put there as protection. So what, in effect, we are doing is removing some protection.

Constitution (Amdt.) Bill
[DR. ROWLEY]

Friday, July 14, 2000

Notwithstanding the fact that the protection is tortuous, it is theirs and, therefore, if you are removing it—[*Interruption*]

Mr. Speaker, it is not right to say protection for a criminal. It was not put there for protection of a criminal; it was put there as protection for all public officers. If one or ten or some of them turn out to be criminals and you have to remove them, you do not, on that basis, ignore the fact, the indisputable fact, that what was there was put there for the protection of public officers. Therefore, if you are going to change it, then the least you could do is consult with the people who are going to be affected by your removal of it. If I have a right, even if I do not use it, it is still mine, and if you are going to remove it then—[*Interruption*] I am hearing my colleague say consulting criminals. You are missing the point—

Mr. Assam: Convicted criminals.

Dr. K. Rowley: You are not just changing the law for a convicted criminal, it will cover every other officer. Mr. Speaker, I leave it here because sometimes it makes no sense trying to tell this Government. This is a Government that has to put its finger in the wound to feel it, so I am not going to waste my time.

I want to make one other point, and that is the whole question of sincerity. The language of the Bill says that the attitude of the courts has been—I am talking here about the ouster clause—[*Interruption*] The Attorney General is pointing out to me that in the new one that is not written. I want your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, just to point to what the thinking was that caused the Attorney General to say what he said this afternoon. The thinking was spelt out in the Bill, in the copy before the amended version; we did have it saying that the attitude of the courts has been that the ouster clause does not preclude an inquiry by the court into the legality of the decision-making process of a public authority.

When I read that, the impression being given by that sentence was that this ouster clause was, in fact, superfluous because the courts have, in fact, ruled, or it is the attitude—to use their word—that this ouster clause does not preclude inquiry. It did not specifically say that the court has taken a position that the ouster clause is only valued when the commission has excluded—the ouster clause is only enforced when the commission exceeds its authority or if a case is being argued that natural justice is breached.

3.40 p.m.

Other than that the court has done nothing to disregard the ouster clause. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I seem to have remembered a story and I checked it out.

Contrary to that sentence which I just read about the attitude of the court that the ouster clause is superfluous, Lord Diplock in that infamous case of *Andell Thomas v. the Attorney General* with which we are all familiar, had this to say, and I would quote what Lord Diplock said in that matter. He said:

It was no doubt present to the mind of the draftsman of that section, having granted the Government employees a security of tenure superintended by autonomous commissions, it may well have been thought that not to be in the interest of efficient government if every appointment, promotion, transfer, termination of appointment made by the commission or disciplinary penalty imposed by it were left open to attack in the court of law.

So we are talking about this person who is denied access to the court, and we are talking about opening up the court to give people that right to challenge everything that goes on in the commission, but Lord Diplock, at the level of the Privy Council, the last stop, recognized that the draftsmen who drafted our Constitution recognized that there was a need to give public servants the tenure and also to have that clause to give the commission the right to act without having everything they do being the subject of attack in the court.

So the Attorney General did not give us the whole story, he only gave us a part, and in fact, our own Justice Sharma in the Rajkumar case in the Appeal Court recently had this to say:

There was consent by the Constitution framers to insert an ouster clause in the Constitution of Trinidad and Tobago.

I repeat that for the benefit of the Attorney General unless he will get up and tell me that he is the only person in this country who wants to give the poor man rights and that Justice Sharma is against giving the people rights and Justice Sharma is against giving justice because I know he does not like judges. He has a problem with judges, so I would not be surprised if he says to disregard Justice Sharma's point of view because he does not like to give people justice. [*Desk thumping*] But Justice Sharma said, looking at this very ouster clause, the same one he very glibly said to throw away from our Constitution, and he said we were doing this wonderful thing, but Justice Sharma, following on Lord Diplock in the Privy Council, said there was good sense by the Constitution's framers to insert an ouster clause in the Constitution of Trinidad and Tobago. He went on to say that the instant case classically exemplifies the havoc that would be wreaked by its absence. [*Interruption*] Do you hear him now? He is tuning up. I am simply quoting Justice Sharma. Justice Sharma looked at the whole situation, with all the

Constitution (Amdt.) Bill
[DR. ROWLEY]

Friday, July 14, 2000

evidence before him and came to the conclusion that there was good reason for the ouster clause, and in its absence, there is the potential for havoc if the clause were not so interpreted by the courts to exclude errors, procedure and substance of the kind referred to in this case.

Mr. Speaker, there is another point of view that if that ouster clause is not there, what we are going to get is an opening of the floodgate to frivolous litigation. So on one hand, there is the argument of the Attorney General that everybody would have the right to question everything the commission does, but on the other hand, you would end up with everybody having the right to go to the courts and question everything the commission does, and have a grievance with everything the commission does, and we are going to end up with confusion in the court fuelled by disgruntled persons.

I heard the Attorney General talking about persons who have not been promoted for many years. There are some people in the public service who should not be promoted at all. [*Desk thumping*] It has nothing to do with how many years one has been sitting there, in fact, the next amendment should be if you are found to be there and be unproductive for so long then your production should be removed. As a fact, we know that there are many people who would genuflect before they get the job and from the day they get on the payroll and get the protection of the office they finish with work and service. We have those, so let us not miss the point when Justice Sharma of the Appeal Court said that there is good reason for this ouster clause and its absence would wreak havoc; and those are not my words. So I simply take my seat and leave Justice Sharma to be shredded by the Attorney General as he is accustomed doing.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Patrick Manning (*San Fernando East*): Mr. Speaker, today is the second anniversary of the passing of my father, as a result of which I seek your leave to be excused from this Chamber very shortly. I think it was very understanding of you to permit me to make a brief intervention in this debate before I go. Thank you very much, and I am very grateful to the Government for agreeing.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on a question of principle. Members of Parliament are given the title “honourable” for a very good reason, because Members of Parliament are expected to behave like honourable men and women.

Just over a year ago, when the Ramdhanie Commission of Inquiry was conducting its proceedings, and some very startling revelations were made to the

people of Trinidad and Tobago about the conduct of certain officers of the police service which led to the escape from prison of somebody who was wanted on a number of very serious charges, there was an outcry from the General Council of the PNM that morning—we met that Sunday morning—and at the insistence of its political leader, we agreed. In fact, the political leader and Leader of the Opposition was authorized by the General Council of the PNM to make an approach to the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago, and make an offer of the Opposition and Government getting together and looking at the police service and try to put right what obviously was very wrong.

The letter was written, the approach was made, and it led to a meeting where there were five persons present: the hon. Prime Minister, the Attorney General, the Minister of National Security, the very distinguished representative from the constituency of Arouca South, and the Leader of the Opposition in that capacity. Mr. Speaker, our proposal to the Government was that the time has come for the Government and the Opposition to get together to deal with the police service especially as it is critical in dealing with the crime situation in Trinidad and Tobago. We agreed that we would deal with recruitment in the police service, we agreed that we would deal with promotion in the police service, and we agreed that we would deal with the very vexed question of discipline within the police service. More than that, we gave as an Opposition, the assurance to the Government up front that we come to the table with open minds, pure hearts and clean hands and we are prepared to discuss any matter relating to these three issues for as long as it takes and that we are prepared to take any steps we consider appropriate, right and necessary to ensure that we deal as comprehensively as we can with recruitment in the police service, with promotion in the police service and with the question of discipline.

We gave the Government the assurance that if constitutional changes were required that called for a special majority, they had our assurance up front and beforehand with that special majority. The Opposition would support the Government in arriving at the necessary majority in Parliament to bring about the changes that we consider appropriate. All we asked was that we sit and discuss and agree on the policy and so forth.

I put on the record today, that that exercise on which we are now embarked is one of the more fulfilling exercises of my political career, which, as you know is not inconsiderable, it is quite long, I have had many experiences. You see, we sat down and we were discussing what we believed to be in good faith. We agreed that a technical team should be set up to assist that team of five persons. All this is

public knowledge. I reiterate it for the benefit of hon. Members and for the benefit of the national community so we can understand with whom we are dealing. A technical team was set up and it took us some time to arrive at the composition of that team and the very distinguished former President of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, Sir Ellis Clarke, agreed to chair such a team and there were others.

The author of the report on the reorganization of the police service, Mr. O'Dowd came to Trinidad, he was a member of the team. Mr. Justice Guya Persaud, the chairman of the Law Commission was a member of the team as were a number of other distinguished ex-police officers and serving police officers from other islands. A former Chief of Defence Staff from Jamaica, a number of people came together and discussed this and returned to us with the policy proposals. We discussed the policy proposals one by one; we were acting in good faith and we agreed on the policy and they will tell you it did not take any long time to come to an agreement because we were working hand-in-hand and taking a course of action which we saw to be in the national interest. That is what we were doing.

Why in the face of a clear commitment on the part of the Opposition, will the Government come to the Parliament today with a piece of legislation that impinges on discipline in the police service without consulting the Opposition? Why would they do that? What is worse, in so doing, they obviously took that out of the whole package on which we had already agreed in principle. They took it out of the package for reasons best known to them. What is becoming clear is that among other things they are testing the Opposition this afternoon to see what we would do because the next thing, they are likely to come with other pieces from that package in circumstances where it is already clear to us that the exercise on which we were embarked at that level is so comprehensive that it is going to take more time than they probably anticipated in the first instance when they agreed to get together. They cannot use it for short-term political gain in an election campaign. Everything they do, including the Common Entrance Examination and the statement made by the Prime Minister this afternoon which would go down as one of the worst statements ever made by any Prime Minister.

3.55 p.m.

They do it, not out of altruism; they do it, not because they like the children of the nation, or they are concerned about anybody's children, they do it because they see it as an opportunity for short-term political gains. That is how they see it! *[Desk thumping]* The Prime Minister comes here and talks about the task force.

He did not say they resigned you know—*[Interruption]* Mr. Speaker, I used it purely as an example.

Mr. Speaker: Just for the sake of the record you know we cannot debate that matter.

Mr. P. Manning: Mr. Speaker, we are not debating it.

Mr. Speaker: It is sounding so to me. So please.

Mr. P. Manning: Mr. Speaker, there is a term that we use, *en passant*. *[Desk thumping]* Mr. Speaker, you understand the point I am making. You see the point is, that principle does not matter. It does not matter to them, you know. Mr. Speaker, out of a sense of national commitment we approached them; they did not talk to us. We approached them! *[Desk thumping]* In other words, it is not games. We said to you that we do not like the situation in here. We were in government. We understand what that situation is, and we are coming to you. We are prepared to sit with you and we are going to meet until we come to an agreement and we are taking the agreement to Parliament, if necessary, and if the Constitution needs amending we agreed up front to the votes that would cause the amendments to come about. And then they came with this Bill today.

Mr. Speaker, it is not just the matter that is before us. As important as that matter is, it is what the action signifies, in the context of what else they may want to bring from that package for short-term political gains. Do you understand, Mr. Speaker? *[Interruption]*

Mr. Maharaj: Which package?

Mr. P. Manning: And the Attorney General is asking, which package? Mr. Speaker, he is a member of the team. *[Interruption]*

Mr. Maharaj: Have you got a report as yet?

Mr. P. Manning: Mr. Speaker, we sat and the Attorney General agreed. What report is he talking about? The committee has its work ongoing and we sat and we agreed that we should do this rather than that. And I could tell the national community now that there was a particular position that we had espoused while we were in government in relation to the management of the police service from which we have retreated. We have retreated from it, in the context of the deliberations that have taken place between the Government and the Opposition and in the presence, and with the assistance of a technical team of people carefully selected for the expertise that they bring to the table.

In other words, if we have to retreat from a position the PNM is not afraid to do that. If we can see wisdom in any argument that comes forth then we subscribe to the wisdom. That is why people are called “honourable.” I am not afraid. I am afraid—and I put on the record today—that this is merely the beginning; this is the test to see if they would get through with this, and if they do then you could expect much more coming on the service commissions. We have made it clear that this piecemeal approach to the service commissions we are not agreeing with. We have made that clear, Mr. Speaker. Especially, that exercise in which we have embarked. And as we sat to decide on that exercise we realized that we were quite right in saying that. Because one affects the other and the thing calls for comprehensive review. We are mortally afraid of this Government taking out this piece and that piece and that piece and coming to the Parliament with legislation that looks innocuous—it reminds me of clause 7—but which, at the end of the day, has fundamental implications. That is what we are afraid of. At least, if we wish to earn the term “honourable” or work in accordance with that, the least that the Government could have done was to consult the Opposition on this matter and we would have told them all that we are now saying in the Parliament.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Barendra Sinanan (*San Fernando West*): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a very small contribution to the Bill before us, “An Act to amend the Constitution of Trinidad and Tobago.” When we look at this new clause 5, I want to draw a distinction here between a conviction for a criminal offence and that of an Order under section 71 of the Summary Courts Act. I think my hon. friend from Diego Martin West used the example of a public servant travelling down the road and kills somebody and he is charged for manslaughter. He did not intentionally go to kill somebody but here it is that he is charged for manslaughter, which is a criminal offence.

To me, this section is a little harsh on a public servant or on anybody—but more so in terms of a public servant—who is convicted of manslaughter, where, according to this, once he is convicted of a criminal charge—and manslaughter in this instance involving an accident is, in fact, a criminal charge—he can be dismissed. The section here says:

“The Commission may dismiss.”

Let us assume that this particular public servant is not in the good graces of the Government, it leaves the way open for the Government to exercise a discretion to dismiss somebody who, in their opinion is not in keeping with what

they want. So to that extent it imposes a very serious burden on a convicted public servant who is charged for manslaughter.

The Attorney General went at length in terms of section 71. In section 71—perhaps I ought to read that again. It says:

“Where any person is charged before a Court with an offence punishable by the Court, and the Court thinks that the charge is proved, but is of opinion that having regard to the character, antecedents, age, health, or mental condition of the person charged, or to the trivial nature of the offence, or to the extenuating circumstances in which the offence was committed, it is inexpedient to inflict any punishment or any other than a nominal punishment, the Court may, without...conviction,...”

4.05 p.m.

So under section 71 the person is not convicted at all.

“...without proceeding to conviction, make an order either—

- (a) dismissing the complaint or charge; or
- (b) discharging the offender conditionally on his entering into a recognisance...”

So the distinction in section 71 is that no conviction is recorded.

My contribution today, Mr. Speaker, really centres on that. Here a magistrate hears a case, he hears the prosecution, he hears the defence and he comes to the opinion, after due deliberation and hearing both sides, that because of the age, the character, health, mental condition and the trivial nature of the offence, it is inexpedient to convict that man; so he is not convicted. Here a magistrate, an officer of the court, is saying, “No conviction”. What we are now doing by this legislation is giving the service commission power to override the decision of the magistrate.

The magistrate is the person who has sat in open court, listened to the witnesses and looked at the demeanour of the witnesses and of the defendant. He is in the best position to make a decision whether to record a conviction and to discharge the defendant under section 71. Here we are impinging and questioning the decision and the discretion of the magistrate by giving the service commission power to override what the magistrate has done. This, to me, Mr. Speaker, would certainly lead to some conflict. So I am asking the Attorney General to look carefully at that. We do not want to have situations where there is conflict

Constitution (Amdt.) Bill
[MR. SINANAN]

Friday, July 14, 2000

between the Judiciary on the one hand and service commissions on the other hand and this is a perfect example where such a conflict can arise.

I would have thought that, in keeping with the Attorney General's wish in terms of the legal service, he may have come to the Parliament today to say, "Okay, in terms of service commissions, give them time frames". My understanding is that service commissions do take an inordinate amount of time to deliberate on matters that come before them. To me it would have been better or it would have been nice to see legislation giving some sort of time frame. I remember the Attorney General suggesting in terms of judgments, a six-month time frame, which I think, once the Judiciary has the support, is very reasonable. The same thing here with service commissions—*[Interruption]* I agree with you, there is nothing about firing. We say, if you give the Judiciary the support that is necessary, then judgments can be delivered perhaps in less than six months.

So Mr. Speaker, what the Attorney General should have done was to do something like that, give service commissions a time frame. There are people who have matters pending before service commissions and they take one year, two years, three years or ten years at times to make a determination. That, therefore, is what the Attorney General should be doing. I am happy that the Attorney General has withdrawn—well, he has certainly amended the original Bill. In my constituency of San Fernando West there is a very famous anaesthetist who has been suspended from the public service and luckily for him he has a good lawyer and perhaps that lawyer may be as good as or better than our Attorney General. He has a good lawyer representing him but it has taken the better part of two and a half to three years for this doctor to be nearing some form of justice.

I think the Attorney General has now seen in his wisdom that perhaps the goodly doctor has a case and that the service commission should not have suspended him in the first place. The point I am making is this. Here it is this doctor is suspended, he is on full pay, he is getting all his perks, but he is not working. Now it takes the state two and a half years to arrive at a position that perhaps the commission was wrong to suspend the doctor so the taxpayers will now have to pay damages to this doctor and the attorneys will also obviously be entitled to their just costs.

Hon. Member: Overpriced fees.

Mr. B. Sinanan: Well, I am not sure about overpriced fees, but, senior counsel is entitled to a good fee. The point I am making is, it takes the Attorney General two and a half years to come to the position that this doctor perhaps should not have been suspended and we as the taxpayers have to pay for that.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say to the Attorney General, I want him to look at the conflict he is imposing between magistrates who discharge a defendant under section 71 and the service commission which can now, as it were, overlook and override that decision of the magistrate. In other words, you are giving the service commission appellate status here. If the magistrate says, "You are discharged under section 71", no conviction is recorded. He is now telling the service commission, "We could still dismiss you". [Interruption] No. He is interfering with, as I said before, the decision of the magistrate. He hears the witnesses, he looks at the demeanour, and he has come to the situation, taking into regard everything, the trivial nature of the offence, the extenuating circumstances. He says—[Interruption]

No, we are not talking about that. One does not get discharged under section 71 for peddling cocaine.

Mr. Maharaj: Oh yes, now. Mr. Speaker, the instance I read shows where an officer was charged with possession of cocaine and he got a section 71, and the other instance was where he was charged for fraud, massive fraud, and he got a section 71.

Mr. B. Sinanan: Well, I take the Member's word for that. I only hope that the hon. Attorney General has power to appeal those cases and I hope that he has done so.

The other difficulty I have is this. In section 5 you were saying that the commission may thereupon dismiss or otherwise punish the officer without the institution of any disciplinary proceedings. So no disciplinary proceedings are brought against the officer but he is convicted and then dismissed. The commission, having dismissed the man, we are now coming to section 7 to say that an officer referred to in subsection (5) shall be entitled to show cause why he should not be dismissed. So the public servant is dismissed and now is being told, "Okay, you are still given the opportunity to show cause why you should not be dismissed".

A commission having sat and taken the decision to dismiss the officer, the members of that commission would hardly be likely to change their mind. Having made that decision they may have such an ego or members of the commission may figure, "Well look, we say the man is wrong, we dismissed the public servant". Here you are saying he can now come, having been dismissed by the commission, to show cause why he should not be dismissed. I say that no public servant would benefit from this clause because the commission, having taken the

Constitution (Amdt.) Bill
[MR. SINANAN]

Friday, July 14, 2000

decision to dismiss the public servant, is hardly likely to change its mind when the public servant is given the opportunity to show cause.

With these few words, Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Attorney General to look at the conflict that he is imposing between magistrates and service commissions. He is giving the service commissions the status of an appellate jurisdiction over the magistrates as it relates to section 71. I thank you. [*Desk thumping*]

The Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs (Hon. Ramesh Lawrence Maharaj): [*Desk thumping*] Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I am very, very surprised that the Opposition has tried to raise all sorts of matters in order to take away from the main issue which is before the Parliament. I know why they have done that. They have done that because we see in Trinidad and Tobago from time to time that the main issue is taken away and other trivial issues are blown out of proportion in order to make a very good measure look as if it is anti-people.

Let us look at this. I mentioned, when I opened this debate, that what we are dealing with here was in the Public Service Commission regulations as regulation 113 which was passed in 1962 and which continued in 1976. We did not pass that regulation, this Government. It was as a result of negotiation with all the unions because what is here is all the unions, all the service commissions and 113, for the purposes of clarification again, because this is no new policy. What has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that because this policy, which should be the policy, was put in regulations and was not put in a law, it could not be valid. It was held to be *ultra vires* and it took up to Legal Notice No. 28 of 1991 for it to be formally declared so. What we are doing here, in giving the service commission the power to summarily dismiss, is a policy, which was agreed upon by governments from 1962 till 1976 and 1991, and the unions and all the players.

Let us read slowly so that we will see what regulation 113 says, which is the policy contained in this amendment to the Constitution. If an officer is convicted in any court of a criminal charge, the commission may consider the relevant proceedings on that charge and if it is of the opinion that the officer ought to be dismissed or subjected to some lesser punishment in respect of the offence of which he has been convicted, the commission may thereupon dismiss or otherwise punish the officer without the institution of any disciplinary proceedings under these regulations. That is exactly what we are putting in this amendment now and this has been there, but because of a loophole, because the government of the day

did not put it as primary law, as being passed in the Parliament, it has been held to be not effective.

How could Members of the Opposition seriously say in the presence of the media and the public that this is something new, that this is something to amend, and talk about all kinds of package and say it is altering the Constitution and altering the powers of the service commission? Mr. Speaker, listen to the other submission. The other submission—and I think it must be that it is an affront for the hon. Member for Diego Martin West to read section 120 of a Constitution and say that—he quotes section 120 of the Constitution and he says that section deals with the Public Service Commission. He refers to 120 of the Constitution of Trinidad and Tobago and he says 120 deals with service commission and the Public Service Commission's powers to discipline.

Under section 54 of the Constitution it is expressly stated what sections of the Constitution are entrenched clauses, so you need a specified majority. I will read it, Mr. Speaker. It deliberately leaves out section 129, which is the section we are dealing with. As a matter of fact, it talks about sections 116 to 125 and it stops there. We did not say that. The Parliament said that. The lawmakers said that. Then it went on and it said, "and 133". So it leaves out 126, 127, 128 and 129.

4.20 p.m.

Is the Member saying that the parliamentarians sat here and the people wanted this to be entrenched and the parliamentarians did not see it? It is quite clear that the section we are dealing with is a section which can be passed by a simple majority and a section which only deals with two things. It deals with the ouster clause, in effect, and the power to ensure that the method of discipline is that there are disciplinary proceedings.

Dr. Rowley: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Attorney General very much for giving way, because I do not want him to misrepresent what I said. I, too, recognize that section 129 is not entrenched and I said so, but the point I was making is that the amendment that he is making to section 129 is, in fact, having the effect of changing the power of the commission given elsewhere in an entrenched area. If that is the case, you need to address that. Do not say that I did not notice section 129 was not entrenched.

Hon. R. L. Maharaj: I am coming to that. I wanted to show how clear it is—and I am coming to what the Member was saying. He went on to say that section 120 of the Constitution, as far as the Public Service Commission is concerned, has given the service commission the power to discipline. What we are doing here is,

Constitution (Amdt.) Bill
[HON. R. L. MAHARAJ]

Friday, July 14, 2000

we are not changing that power; we are not altering that power. As a matter of fact that power remains, to discipline. What the Government is merely saying, is that in respect of the method of discipline, in respect of persons who have been convicted, or in respect of whom an order has been made, there will be a different procedure, and section 129 is the section that deals with procedure. Section 129(4) says:

“No penalty shall be imposed on any public officer except as a result of disciplinary proceedings.”

That is the section that deals with procedure and that is the section we are amending and altering. It says that if you want to discipline or penalize, the procedure is that you must have disciplinary proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, what the Government is saying is, yes, the service commission would have that power of discipline but the procedure and method in respect of which a person who is convicted or in respect of whom an order has been made, there would not be disciplinary proceedings for those persons. So there is no merit at all. It is quite clear the Opposition knew that this was the policy under their administration. This is the policy of the unions; this was the policy of the service commissions. The PNM also knew—they are talking about consultation—that the Public Service Commission and the Police Service Commission—I read from a report. As a matter of fact, the media had newspaper cuttings in which the *Guardian* and the *Express* have been calling for action to be taken to ensure that rogue cops—as a matter of fact the editorial of December 3, 1999 says, “Rogue Cops must be dealt with expeditiously.”

Mr. Speaker, what rights is the Opposition talking about? This has nothing to do with rights. This is a situation where the man or the woman has already been found guilty of a criminal offence, or that the offence has been proven by the court. All that is involved, is instead of having a delayed process, that is to say, a delayed process of going through all the channels where you will have to take the same thing and hear it over again, you have the person in, asking to show cause why he or she should not be dismissed. So what rights are being talked about?

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, in regulation 113, which was engineered by the PNM administration, there was no question of rights. The person who was convicted did not have an opportunity of showing cause why he should not be dismissed. Then we hear all this talk about judge this, and judge that. The Member quotes a judge who says Lord Diplock who in England in the United Kingdom—

Dr. Rowley: Is a criminal.

Mr. Speaker: No, please, I must appeal to you. The Member for Diego Martin West made certain statements. The Attorney General in replying is dealing with that. You cannot be shouting things like that. I mean to say, let the Attorney General reply. Please, let us in the late stages of the day, conduct the proceedings in a certain manner. Please, it is just months to go.

Hon. R. L. Maharaj: Mr. Speaker, they do not have any respect for the Privy Council; they do not have any respect for courts. The Member has called a judge a criminal and I hope he will get up and withdraw it.

Hon. Member: No!

Hon. R. L. Maharaj: Mr. Speaker, Lord Diplock, who sits on the Privy Council in the United Kingdom, years ago was dealing with a constitution and he said at the time when the framers put this clause, they knew what they were doing. He was talking at that time. He knew also that in the United Kingdom, the British Parliament got rid of the ouster clause. So, in the United Kingdom, you did not have any question, since 1913, where a court could have said that you have ouster clauses and you cannot decide whether a person has been given justice or not.

Mr. Speaker, governments have to make decisions; judges are entitled to express their views, but the people who go and face the polls are the politicians and the politicians are the people who have to make decisions as to whether people's rights are being trampled upon and with the greatest respect to whichever judge has made statements and expressed opinions, governments have to make decisions. The Member referred to a case of Rajkumar in which Justice Sharma made comments. That was a case in which a High Court Judge ruled that this public officer was not promoted at all. The officer was discriminated against and he got no explanation and Justice Lucky ruled that the officer was given an injustice and the commission must be investigated. The Court of Appeal ruled—including Justice Sharma—that one cannot look behind this clause, that no matter what injustice has been committed, this ouster clause prevents the court from giving justice to this poor man. This matter is now before the Privy Council. Mr. Speaker, how could Rajkumar or Justice of Appeal, Sharma or Lord Diplock, support the contention that the Opposition wants to oppose a measure which is a measure to give people greater access to justice?

The hon. Member for San Fernando West—I just want to say this before tea time because I know that the press would leave after tea. *[Laughter]* I want to say

Constitution (Amdt.) Bill
[HON. R. L. MAHARAJ]

Friday, July 14, 2000

it so that they will have no excuse for not printing accurate information
[*Interruption*].

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. R. L. Maharaj: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for San Fernando West comes here and says this is a conflict between the magistrate and the service commissions; this is a conflict between the Judiciary and the service commissions because when a person is given an order under section 71, it would, in effect, mean that the person is not found guilty and a conviction is not recorded.
[*Interruption*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. R. L. Maharaj: Mr. Speaker, section 71 says that if the court finds that the charge is proven, what the service commission has to do is—not whether it is a criminal conviction or not—to find out whether the offence has been proven. If the offence has been proven, what this Bill says is that the service commission can regard that order as a basis on which the service commission does not have to go and call evidence again.

4.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, what the Opposition is asking the Government to do is to postpone measures which are affecting the life breath of the public service. The Leader of the Opposition has made a statement, and I do not want to go into certain aspects of the statement. It seems to me that he is becoming a nervous man.

I do not know of any finding by any task force. I do not know of any package which has been agreed upon. What I do know, and I will quote it after tea, is that one of the major unions in the country has called for the removal of the ouster clause, and what I do know is that over the years there has been a lot of clamour for the removal of the ouster clause. What I do know is that several countries have done it in the interest of the population.

What I do know is that this is no new policy about any new package. This was a policy of the PNM. It was ruled to be *ultra vires* and they did nothing about it in order to solve the situation and they are responsible now for having persons with criminal convictions in the public service. They want to allow that to continue without taking any steps to assist the Government in solving some of the problems.

I will continue after tea, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, the sitting is suspended for half an hour.

4.32 p.m.: *Sitting suspended.*

5.10 p.m.: *Sitting resumed.*

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members I apologize for being a bit late, but we did have some visitors to the Parliament and I was delayed with them.

Hon. R. L. Maharaj: Mr. Speaker, based on what I have been saying, I do not understand how any question of principle arises or how “honourable” was introduced in this debate. The only conclusion I could come to is that the Opposition Leader has a guilty conscience in that he knows that as a matter of principle, he should support this measure and, as a matter of being honourable, he should support this measure, because this measure is a measure which really was in regulations which he, as part of a government, adopted; which his administration would have liked to have, for which there have been calls from the service commission—at least from the police and Public Service Commission—for law to be passed to regularize this matter. So, I really do not understand how this thing about package and all kinds of things have been introduced in this debate.

I think it is important to put on the record how it is that a public officer can be disciplined. The public officer can only be disciplined for misconduct or for any acts of indiscipline, and regulation 84 says an officer who is alleged to be guilty of misconduct or who is alleged to be guilty of indiscipline by failing to comply with any regulation, order or directive for the time being enforced in the Ministry or department to which he is assigned is liable to disciplinary proceedings in accordance with the procedure prescribed in these regulations.

All that is being attempted here is that in respect of the conviction or in respect of the order made by the magistrate in summary proceedings under section 71 that the offence has been proved, for the misconduct to be, as I read from the case in which an officer was put before the tribunal who had a section 71, all that has to be done is for the particulars of charge to read that the person who was the public officer did not act in a manner—well he acted in a manner to bring the public service into disrepute in that on so-and-so date he was convicted for that offence. Because of the offence, because of the charge, because of the offence being proved, he brought the service into disrepute.

Mr. Speaker, I mention that not everybody who is convicted of criminal offences would obviously be dismissed, but the discretion is in the service commission and there were difficulties putting—whether you want to put driving cases separately or trespass cases. Strictly speaking, a person who is convicted of dangerous driving or careless driving; that is a criminal offence. A person who is found loitering in a field trespassing, that is also a criminal offence.

That is why it is said that the service commission may decide to call in the officer and ask him to show cause why. So, there would be cases that where even if the person is convicted of a petty criminal offence, the service commission may not call in the person to ask the person why he should not be dismissed. If the person is called in, let us assume the person is called in and the service commission acts unreasonably, the ouster clause is now removed, so he can go to the court and say that the service commission has acted irrationally, unreasonably and the court can investigate it and say and give him redress. That is what this is about!

5.15 p.m.

So, Mr. Speaker, to use the argument, also, that havoc would be created because there will be a floodgate of litigation, I have never understood how the ability of people to challenge actions to get justice and to say that if you allow this to happen, there would be a multitude of cases and, therefore, you should not allow it to happen. That is a reason we should allow access to justice because it is the function of the courts to decide and, under the procedure, the person has to apply for leave for judicial review and the frivolous cases would be weeded out and the cases with merit would go on and if people are dissatisfied, they go to the courts. The courts will, obviously, probably have more work to do, but that is the whole purpose of courts.

I think I will be failing in my duty if I do not put this Bill in the perspective of the philosophy which underpins it because legislation must have some philosophy. The philosophy is, really, that service commissions must be accountable for their actions—accountable to the courts—and people who feel that they are injured by the actions of service commissions should have an opportunity of getting redress.

The other aspect of the philosophy which underpins this Bill is a question of openness and transparency. As you know, Mr. Speaker, even on the Order Paper, there is a bill to reform judicial review and under that bill, we are going to have in the substantive law of Trinidad and Tobago, greater access to justice because there may be a situation where the community will be able to file for judicial review—non-governmental organizations. We are going to have a situation in which we are going to have greater access to justice.

In the recent human rights development report which was released a few days ago, it is stated that governments should take steps to introduce legislation so that there can be public interest litigation in their countries, because it is only when

you do that and you open up the system, that people would have real access to the courts.

This is what we are doing, so I cannot understand when a government attempts to do this, the Opposition can say, "Well, you did not consult this one. You did not consult that one." As a matter of fact, as I said, editorials over the years have called for this, politicians have called for it and the unions have called for it.

I think I should put on record one letter, a letter from the Trinidad and Tobago Unified Teachers' Association. It is a recent letter dated March 31, 2000 signed by Orville Carrington, Second Vice-President, Chairman, Industrial Relations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who are in politics and those of us who are in public life, are supposed to feel the pulse of injustice from people. We are supposed to know what happens; we are supposed to see it; we are supposed to feel it. When we see it, it must be as if we are suffering the injustice. Therefore, all of us who have been in public life and who have been MPs, would know we would have had constituents coming to us complaining that they are getting injustice because they cannot get redress in the courts because of this clause which says the courts cannot investigate the injustice. We would have seen the injustice on the people's faces. We have seen it in their children. We have seen how they have been denied entitlement to promotion; they have been denied jobs; they have been denied appointments; they have been transferred unreasonably; they have lost their jobs. Injustice.

This is the Trinidad and Tobago Unified Teachers' Association, as a union, which also would have that kind of profile because it has to talk to its workers because workers go to them. Listen to what it has to say in a letter dated March 31, 2000 addressed to the Attorney General:

"Re: Amendment to section 129(3) of the Constitution of
the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago

The Association has been pursuing on behalf of its member..."

And they called the name of the teacher.

"...a matter concerning the failure of the Teaching Service Commission to appoint her to the post of Principal I at the school although the Commission considered her the preferred candidate.

You may be aware that the ruling of the High Court in favour of..."

—so and so

“...was overturned by the Appeal Court on, *inter alia*, a strict interpretation of Section 129(3) of the Constitution that a decision of the Commission may not be challenged in a Court of Law.

The effect of such a judgment for Teachers and other public officers appointed by a commission is such as to take away a right of redress against decisions of Commissions no matter how wrong such decisions may be.

The Association believes that a Commission should be accountable for decisions which it makes and that such accountability lies within the public domain.

The institution to which Commissions should be accountable must be the Courts of Law since this would bring it into the public domain and would ensure that any review would be done by an impartial and independent body.”

Mr. Speaker: Excuse me. May I just appeal to, particularly the Member for Arouca North, it is coming through too loud. I am hearing it here. I am saying that you are speaking too loudly. Please, pipe down. Please continue.

Hon. R. L. Maharaj: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

“The institution to which Commissions should be accountable must be the Courts of Law since this would bring it into the public domain and would ensure that any review would be done by an impartial and independent body. It would further serve to avoid frivolous or malicious abuse of process by mischievous persons bent on subverting the authority of a Commission.

The Association is of the view that such an interpretation of the Constitution is allowed for by the terminology utilized in this Section.

We are also aware that in other jurisdictions, including the United Kingdom, upon which our system of jurisprudence is founded, is moving to eliminate such ‘ouster clauses’ from their legislation because of the very lack of accountability which it bestows on commissions.

For this reason we submit that progressive governments must ensure that legislation places a burden on commissions to be accountable to the nation for their decisions.

It is in this light we therefore seek your support and assistance in having the relevant Section, i.e. Section 129(3), of the Constitution, amended to allow for a review of a decision of a Commission by a Court of Law.

Sincerely,

s/ Orville Carrington”

So, Mr. Speaker, anybody who is genuinely concerned with the plight and the rights of people, not only poor people, but people from all walks of life, and anybody who wants to be honest with himself or herself, would know that as a Member of Parliament, he or she has had to face this situation and here it is that the Parliament and, given an opportunity—and it must be considered a historic opportunity—in order to remove from the law a clause which is used as an obstruction to give people justice.

Mr. Speaker, it also must be recognized, no matter how one looks at this, no matter what our leanings are, no matter what our political affiliations are, no matter how we feel about any particular individual, party or person, it must be as anyone who has any respect for oneself and who on a morning can look in a mirror at himself or herself and ask, "Did I do justice by voting against such a measure?"

Here is a measure. Apart from that, there is a measure here in which the Parliament is being given an opportunity to remove an obstacle for service commissions to do justice to the people of Trinidad and Tobago. Here it is that the Parliament is being given an opportunity to make it clear that persons who are being convicted and found to have committed criminal offences, cannot use delays to avoid the system and remain in the service. Here it is the Parliament is being given an opportunity to ensure that the police service, the public service, the fire service and all the other public services can be cleared from whatever areas of contamination which exist when you have criminal elements within the service.

There comes a time in history when people will have to remember what they do and all I can say is that I am very surprised at the attitude of the Opposition. As a parliamentarian, as a legislator, as a lawyer, as an individual, as a citizen of Trinidad and Tobago, I want to appeal to them to recognize that what they are doing, they are not serving themselves here, they are serving the people of Trinidad and Tobago and whenever there is injustice and any injustice is caused by these situations, history will record and will not absolve them for not supporting a measure like this.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Bill committed to a committee of the whole House.

House in committee.

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

Clause 3.

Question proposed, That clause 3 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. Maharaj: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that clause 3 be amended in terms of the circulated draft as under:

Delete clause 3 and substitute the following new clause:

Section 129 amended 3. Section 129 of the Constitution is amended by repealing subsection (3) and inserting after subsection (4) the following new subsections:

Chap. 4:20 “(5) Notwithstanding subsection (4), where an officer is convicted of a criminal charge in any court and the time allotted for an appeal has elapsed or, if the officer has appealed, the appeal process has been completed or an order has been made in the matter under section 71 of the Summary Courts Act, a Service Commission may consider the relevant proceedings on such charge and if it is of opinion that the officer ought to be dismissed or subjected to some lesser punishment in respect of the conduct which led to his conviction on the criminal charge or to the making of the order, the Commission may thereupon dismiss or otherwise punish the officer without the institution of any disciplinary proceedings.

(6) In furtherance of subsection (5)—

- (a) a certificate of conviction issued by the court shall be sufficient evidence of an officer’s conviction for an offence;
- (b) a certified copy of an order made under section 71 of the Summary Courts Act shall be sufficient evidence of the commission by the officer of the offence for which he was charged.

(7) An officer referred to in subsection (5) shall be entitled to show cause why he should not be dismissed from office.”

Mr. Chairman, I have already explained it.

Mr. Sinanan: There is a problem with the numbering. If you delete clause 3, there is no clause 3 and you are talking about inserting a clause 5 after clause 4.

Mr. Maharaj: What happened is, subsection (3) of section 129 of the Constitution, if you renumber it, you might cause problems with other things that refer to it, so I have been advised that you have to leave it like this and when it is being revised, there they renumber it.

Question put and agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Question put and agreed to, That the Bill, as amended, be reported to the House.

House resumed.

Bill reported, with amendment, read the third time and passed.

ELECTIONS AND BOUNDARIES COMMISSION ORDER, 2000

The Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs (Hon. Ramesh Lawrence Maharaj): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the Motion standing in my name:

Whereas it is provided by subsection (3) of section 72 of the Constitution of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago (hereinafter referred to as "the Constitution") that as soon as may be after the Elections and Boundaries Commission (hereinafter referred to as "the Commission") has submitted a report under paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of section 72 of the Constitution, the Minister designated by the Prime Minister for this purpose shall lay before the House of Representatives for its approval the draft of an Order by the President for giving effect, whether with or without modifications, to the recommendations contained in the report.

And whereas the Commission has submitted a report to the Prime Minister and the Speaker in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of section 72.

And whereas the draft of an Order entitled "The Elections and Boundaries Commission Order, 2000" giving effect without modifications to the

EBC Order, 2000
[HON. R. L. MAHARAJ]

Friday, July 14, 2000

recommendations of the Commission was laid before the House of Representatives on the 9th day of June, 2000:

Be it resolved that the draft of the Elections and Boundaries Commission Order, 2000, be approved.

5.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the draft order entitled “The Elections and Boundaries Commission Order, 2000”, as was mentioned in the Motion is being laid in the honourable House for its approval. Section 72(1) of the Constitution mandates the Elections and Boundaries Commission to review the number and boundaries of constituencies in which Trinidad and Tobago is divided and to submit to the Prime Minister and Speaker, for presentation to this House, a report showing the constituencies into which it recommends that Trinidad and Tobago should be divided, or stating in the said report that no alteration is required to the existing number or the boundaries of constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, section 72(2) of the said Constitution stipulates that the report must be submitted for presentation to the House not less than two, nor more than five years from the date when the last report was submitted. Subsection (3) stipulates that a draft order must be laid in the House as soon as may be, after the report is presented to the House.

Mr. Speaker, prior to 1996, the last report of the Elections and Boundaries Commission was presented to the House on May 10, 1991. In accordance with section 72 of the Constitution, the Elections and Boundaries Commission submitted a report on May 9, 1996 to the Prime Minister and the Speaker and the said report was presented to the House on the same day. The draft order, which is laid before this House, seeks to give effect to the recommendations contained in the report.

It may appear to the hon. Members of this House that there has been some delay in laying the draft order. I wish to concede that there has been some delay, but the way the law is drafted it permits that to be done. There may be criticisms as to how early it should be laid, but the law permits that to be done by the use of the words which it shows have been used. Be that as it may, what I would like to do is to indicate to this House, Mr. Speaker, what the draft order seeks to give effect to. I think it is my duty to do some of that. It is the report of the Elections and Boundaries Commission which is an independent commission. It is the duty of the Government to explain the report as best as it can.

EBC Order, 2000

Friday, July 14, 2000

The order, as I said, seeks to give effect to the recommendations contained in the report which were based on the annual list of qualified electors published on July 1, 1995. One would understand that it has nothing to do, sort of directly, with any upcoming general elections.

“Published on July 1, 1995 and updated to February 8, 1996, in accordance with the ongoing system of personal registration established under the Representation of the People Act.”

The list showed that on February 8, 1996 the electorate stood at 804,700 in Trinidad and 33,277 in Tobago. The total electorate, for the purposes of that report, was 837,977.

“For the purposes of elections to the House of Representatives section 70 of the Constitution prescribes that subject to the terms of any presidential order made to the contrary, Trinidad and Tobago shall be divided into 36 constituencies and not less than two constituencies shall be allocated to the island of Tobago, and each such constituency shall return one Member to the House.”

The Second Schedule to the Constitution prescribes the rules in accordance with which constituencies are to be delimited. The rules provide as follows:

- “(1) These rules are the delimitation of constituency rules in accordance with which the constituencies of Trinidad and Tobago are to be delimited under section 72(1).
- (2) Subject to paragraph 3, the electorate shall, so as far as is practicable, be equal in all constituencies.
- (3) The number of constituencies in Tobago shall not be less than two.”

It then gives the percentage. It says:

“Special attention shall be paid to the needs of sparsely populated areas which on account of size, isolation or inadequacy of communications cannot adequately be represented by a single Member of Parliament. Natural boundaries such as major highways and rivers shall be used wherever possible...”

It goes on with the rules. I would not go through all the rules.

The present number of constituencies in Trinidad and Tobago: 34 for Trinidad, and two for Tobago, were laid down by the Elections and Boundaries

EBC Order, 2000
[HON. R. L. MAHARAJ]

Friday, July 14, 2000

Commission Order in 1966. This number of constituencies as allocated between Trinidad and Tobago has since then remained unchanged when the report was submitted in 1996.

Taking into consideration that the number of electors as contained in the 1996 report for Trinidad stood at 804,700, then if the present number of 34 constituencies is retained for Trinidad the average number of electors per constituency would be 23,668 which is an increase of 2,239 over the 1991 report.

Mr. Speaker, the report itself goes and deals with the question of Tobago. In respect of Tobago, it shows that if the number of two constituencies is retained, the average number of electors would be 16,639, which would be an increase of 2,468 over the 1991 report, and with the application of the tolerance limits, the maximum permissible would have been 18,302 and the minimum 14,976.

In the light of these figures, the commission has to consider whether the increases in the average and/of the tolerance levels in 1996 over previous years, justified a recommendation for increase in the number of constituencies in Trinidad and Tobago.

The commission, however, noted that in 1986 Parliament approved the recommendation of 34 constituencies for Trinidad when the electorate was recorded at 831,212 with an average per constituency of 24,447. In the light of this fact, the commission concluded that the electorate which was recorded in 1996 at 804,700 with an average per constituency of 23,368 did not justify a recommendation for an increase in the status quo.

In the case of Tobago, with the present electorate being 33,277, with the whole island that is an average of 16,639 per constituency which is about 30 per cent below that of Trinidad, the commission considered that these facts did not furnish any good reason to recommend an increase in the number of constituencies in Tobago.

Mr. Speaker, the data is in the 1996 report on the distribution of the electorate in the 34 constituencies. It is pointed out in the report constituency by constituency; both in Trinidad and Tobago. It showed that the number of electors in 1996 was 804,700, the average was 23,668. It discussed what it had to do with some of the polling divisions which I am sure Members are interested in, the particular constituencies in relation to how they felt—there were transfers. They would obviously be able to deal with that if they want to. I think Members would forgive me if I do not deal with that aspect of the report.

Having reviewed the number and boundaries of the constituencies into which Trinidad and Tobago is divided, the commission submitted the following recommendations for the approval of Parliament showing the constituencies into which it recommended that Trinidad and Tobago should be divided to give effect to the rules set out in the Second Schedule of the Constitution.

- (i) The number of constituencies should be retained at 34 for Trinidad and two for Tobago.
- (ii) Trinidad and Tobago should be divided into 36 constituencies bearing the names and containing the number of electors allocated to each of the electoral districts mentioned in the draft order laid in the House; that is the Elections and Boundaries Commission Order, 2000.
- (iii) The boundaries of the 36 constituencies of Trinidad and Tobago, as recommended, should be described in the manner set out in the draft order.

5.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, the report as I said is dated May 9, 1996, and Members would have had a copy of this report. In the preface, if I may say so, the Elections and Boundaries Commission (EBC) sort of gave a summary of what it was doing.

I beg to move that the Draft Order entitled the Elections and Boundaries Commission Order, 2000, which has been laid in this House be approved by this honourable House.

Question proposed.

Mr. Martin Joseph (*St. Ann's East*): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate on this draft order; let me summarize by calling it the Elections and Boundaries Commission Order, 2000, and I hope I can do that without reading the Motion verbatim.

Let me start off by disagreeing with the position articulated here by the Attorney General when he said that the Constitution gives the Government the leeway to lay this report—I guess the impression given is that—any time between two to four years.

Mr. Speaker, if you read the section of the Constitution that the Attorney General quoted in presenting the Motion it says:

“WHEREAS it is provided by subsection (3) of section 72 of the Constitution of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago...that as soon as may be after the

EBC Order, 2000
[MR. JOSEPH]

Friday, July 14, 2000

Elections and Boundaries Commission...has submitted a report under paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of section 72 of the Constitution, the Minister designated by the Prime Minister for this purpose shall lay before the House of Representatives for its approval the draft of an Order by the President for giving effect, whether with or without modifications, to the recommendations contained in the report;"

I am not a lawyer, but I interpret this to mean that it is supposed to be submitted to the House—well, it is supposed to be submitted, Mr. Speaker, to your good self and the Prime Minister, for the purpose—"shall lay before the House of Representatives for the approval"—but the point made is "as soon as possible".

Mr. Maharaj: As soon as may be possible.

Mr. M. Joseph: As soon as may be possible; but "as soon as may be" is not four years; it cannot be four years. As the hon. Attorney General indicated this report was laid—and I want to quote from the debate of Friday May 10, 1996. I am quoting you, Mr. Speaker:

“**Mr. Speaker:** I also wish to advise hon. Members that I have, in fact, received from the Chairman of the Elections and Boundaries Commission yesterday the 1996 Report of the Elections and Boundaries Commission on the Review of Constituency Boundaries pursuant to Section 72 of the Constitution of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago. Under that relevant section of the Constitution, this Report ought to be presented to this honourable House and I now so do.

I may mention that copies of it are to be made available from the Elections and Boundaries Commission, and these would be made available to Members as they become available.”

Mr. Speaker, you made this statement on May 10, 1996. When the hon. Attorney General laid this report in the Parliament on June 9, 2000, I must confess—[*Interruption*—yes, that it caused some kind of confusion in my mind and it also caused confusion in the minds of the general public. Let me give you the example: I am quoting here from the *Newsday* of Sunday June 11, 2000, headline "EBC recommends maintenance of 36 seats". Let me quote:

"The Elections and Boundaries Commission (EBC) is proposing that Trinidad and Tobago maintains its 36-member House of Representatives.

EBC Order, 2000

Friday, July 14, 2000

The recommendation is contained in the Elections and Boundaries Commission (EBC) Order 2000, laid at Friday's sitting of the House of Representatives. It recommended the maintenance of the 36 constituencies.

The Order proposed that the EBC recommendations of the delimitation of constituency boundaries in its report of May 9, 1996 be accepted without modifications by the Parliament."

Mr. Speaker, it was the *Sunday Express* that came and corrected:

"No new constituency was recommended in the Elections and Boundaries Commission (EBC) Report laid in Parliament on Friday.

But that was the old 1996 Report which was laid, some four years after the document was presented to Prime Minister Basdeo Panday and House Speaker Hector McClean."

So for the Attorney General to come and say this afternoon—you know, Mr. Speaker, clearly it is incompetence on the part of the Government. [*Desk thumping*]

It is quite clear that—well, I have to assume it is incompetence on the part of the Government. When they came to lay the report, they did not even say, "Well, listen, we needed to get the approval of the House of Representatives with respect to this report which was laid four years ago, so we are now laying this report for its approval." But to give the impression that they could lay this report any time and it is "no big ting", is not the case.

Let me just indicate why we are concerned with the manner in which this Government is treating the activities of the Elections and Boundaries Commission. The Elections and Boundaries Commission, as we all know, is an independent institution. The Elections and Boundaries Commission can, on the basis of the Constitution, indicate how it feels as it relates to the number of persons registered, the sizes of constituencies and so forth; but it must by law submit its report through you, Mr. Speaker, and in some instances, the Prime Minister, and in other instances a minister of government.

Let me just give you an example of the way in which this Government is treating the Elections and Boundaries Commission, and by doing that it is likely to bring people to start questioning the Elections and Boundaries Commission. Sometimes I think it is a deliberate attempt being made by this Government. I want to make it clear, because I do not want anybody on the other side to get up and say that I am casting aspersions on the Elections and Boundaries

EBC Order, 2000
[MR. JOSEPH]

Friday, July 14, 2000

Commission; I am doing no such thing. I am saying that the way in which the Government continues to treat the activities and the report of the Elections and Boundaries Commission, causes people to have some concerns about the EBC, especially in an election year.

Let me give you an example, Mr. Speaker. The Elections and Boundaries Commission, again, as required by law, presented to the Minister of Local Government the Elections and Boundaries Commission (Local Government) Order 1999. That report was submitted to the Minister on the second day of November 1998. Let me just quote:

"And whereas in accordance with paragraph (a) of the said subsection (1) of section 4 of the Act the Commission, on the 2nd day of November, 1998, submitted to the Minister a report in which it recommends that for the purposes of Local Government Elections, the boundaries of the electoral districts into which the electoral areas mentioned in the First Schedule to the Act are divided, should be as defined in the Schedule to this Order:"

Mr. Speaker, some four months later, the Minister of Local Government laid that report in Parliament. He laid it on February 26, 1999. You recall when it was debated on April 9, 1999, some four months later, we questioned the length of time the report stayed in the hands of the Minister and, by extension, in the hands of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that that report made recommendations for alterations in a number of electoral districts leading up to the Local Government Elections. In the Port of Spain City Corporation eight out of 12 electoral districts were affected as a result of the recommendations of the Elections and Boundaries Commission. In the San Fernando City Corporation some six out of nine electoral districts were affected. In the Arima Borough Council Corporation all six electoral districts were affected. In the Point Fortin Borough Corporation two out of the six electoral districts were affected. In the Chaguanas Borough Corporation two out of eight were affected. In Diego Martin some five out of nine were affected, and in Princes Town some two out of nine.

Not that it made a big difference in the outcome of the Local Government Elections, but the point I am making is that the Government had a report making recommendations for changes in boundaries that it kept for some four months before it was laid in the Parliament. Let me give you the most recent: the Attorney General laid in this honourable House a few weeks ago an amendment to the Representation of the People Act. In laying that piece of legislation he indicated

EBC Order, 2000

Friday, July 14, 2000

to us—he said here—that the recommendations that formed part of this draft Bill were submitted to him on May 18, 1998, but in June he was bringing a bill, some two and a half years later.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, you will recall the circumstances under which that Bill was being brought. It was a special sitting of the House that our Leader of the Opposition, the hon. Member for San Fernando East, had to intervene in the debate, and the hon. Prime Minister, the Member for Couva North said that in the circumstances we would suspend the debate so that we would have gotten some time to go and treat and discuss with the Elections and Boundaries Commission. We are seeing here a pattern, in terms of how this Government treats with reports from the Elections and Boundaries Commission.

5.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General indicated that the Government could treat with reports whenever they feel like it. As I indicated, the integrity of the Elections and Boundaries Commission is being compromised by the manner in which Government treats with reports by the Elections and Boundaries Commission.

I wish to suggest—and I know that the Government will not adhere to this—it seems to me that reports of the Elections and Boundaries Commission ought to be laid directly in Parliament. If it is necessary that the Government needs to draft laws now to put in place the recommendations of the Elections and Boundaries Commission, fine, but the point is that all parliamentarians would have been in receipt of the report. Some reports that suggest the question about boundary changes are accepted or rejected by the House.

On the basis of the latest list of registered voters published in July 2000, it is quite clear that a report from the Elections and Boundaries Commission will come after that report, because those of us who have followed that report will notice that between 1999 and 2000, some 17,825 new electors have come on the rolls. If you have followed that report and looked at the tolerance level in terms of the upper and lower tolerance levels, there are a number of constituencies that are outside of that tolerance level so at least, before the next general election is held, there will be some boundary changes.

Mr. Speaker, our concern is, given that the report coming from the Elections and Boundaries Commission is submitted to your good self and the Prime Minister, how long will we have to wait before Members on this side are aware of the contents of that report? Because if you use the last Local Government

EBC Order, 2000
[MR. JOSEPH]

Friday, July 14, 2000

Election as an example, they sat on that report for four months. I guess they were looking at the circumstances as a result of the boundary changes, it gave them sufficient time to see what is likely to happen as a result of those changes.

I am sure that the Attorney General is going to say that the Constitution says this is what is to happen, but I do not think the Constitution contemplated a Government like the UNC in terms of how it is behaving. I do not think the framers contemplated that there would be a government that would hold on to an Elections and Boundaries Commission Report for so long before it is laid in Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister, Member for Couva North has said that the next general election is going to be the mother of all battles. There are persons in the society who are concerned with this UNC Government and what it is going to do as it relates to the upcoming election. I smiled this afternoon when I listened to the hon. Prime Minister literally asking the Leader of the Opposition that when we get back into office that we would make sure that the Common Entrance Examination is not adjusted. It was almost like a kind of handing over this afternoon. I think the writing is on the wall and the UNC is quite aware of what is going to happen and we cannot put anything past them, as you know, a dying man will catch at straws. This Government uses the Elections and Boundaries Commission in such a way that people have questions about it. I am saying to you that I think it is significant that this is being laid some four years later. I think I have demonstrated this Government's relationship with the Elections and Boundaries Commission in terms of holding on to reports for an inordinately long period of time.

Mr. Speaker, we are expecting another report and I am confident that one is going to be due to this Parliament before a general election and I am saying that this Government can demonstrate its sincerity, and its trustworthiness in terms of its relationship with the citizens by making sure that when the report is submitted, since we cannot ask, as I suggested, that it be submitted to Parliament so that we all get it at the same time, because I know they will not do that. Barring that, all I am saying is let us ensure that this UNC Government does not keep the next report for some four or five months and bring it to the Parliament as soon as possible.

Thank you.

Mr. Bereaux: I understand that the report is there already.

The Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs (Hon. Ramesh Lawrence Maharaj): Mr. Speaker, I am of the view that the Opposition is

EBC Order, 2000

Friday, July 14, 2000

becoming very, very nervous and I understand how they feel, but I advise them that if they are going into battle, they cannot get cold feet from now. [*Desk thumping*]

Mr. Speaker, the impression is being given that this report has some effect on election. This was a report on the last election about the constituency. After the election was over, then the report was sent by the Elections and Boundaries Commission to the Speaker and the Prime Minister. The hon. Speaker made an announcement, and if anybody wanted to look at the report—as soon as the Speaker makes the announcement it becomes a public record. If the Opposition are interested in studying the report, they could study this Order, it is merely to give effect to what is contained in the report.

Mr. Speaker, the way the law is drafted, is because it recognizes that a Government is busy with legislation. This is purely an incidental matter to give effect to a formality and here it is, the hon. Member for San Fernando East is the election officer of the Opposition.

Hon. Member: He is the General Secretary.

Hon. R. L. Maharaj: He is the General Secretary; if I were them I would be worried because I do not understand how the Opposition can attack the Elections and Boundaries Commission to even consider saying that the integrity of the Elections and Boundaries Commission is being compromised by this kind of action. That is an attack on the Elections and Boundaries Commission and I would hate to think that an Opposition which is considering to be an alternative government would attack the Elections and Boundaries Commission and even believes that the integrity of members of a commission can be so affected because a Government puts an order to give effect to a formality four years after.

Mr. Joseph: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Attorney General for giving way, but I was explicit in saying that this is not an attack on the Elections and Boundaries Commission, it did its job, it submitted the reports and I am not just talking about this report. I am saying this is not intended to be an attack on the Elections and Boundaries Commission, the Elections and Boundaries Commission did its job, it is for the Government to decide when it is to be laid in Parliament.

Hon. R. L. Maharaj: Mr. Speaker, I know that, that is what he said, but anybody who could get up in this House and say that I am not attacking you, but I am questioning your integrity because I think if a government behaves this way, its integrity could come into question. That is what he is saying.

EBC Order, 2000
[HON. R. L. MAHARAJ]

Friday, July 14, 2000

Mr. Speaker, I think the Opposition should be a little more responsible than this. This Order is not about whether a report was changed or anything. According to the Constitution and I would read it so people could understand it. Section 72(1) states:

“The Commission shall, in accordance with the provisions of this section, review the number and boundaries of the constituencies into which Trinidad and Tobago is divided and submit to the Prime Minister and Speaker for presentation to the House of Representatives in accordance with this section reports either—

(a) showing the constituencies...

(2) Reports under subsection (1) shall be submitted by the Commission not less than two nor more than five years from the date of the submission of its last report.”

Mr. Speaker, the election occurred, the Elections and Boundaries Commission acted on the basis of its report, it did not make its report available to anyone before the election, it does not do that, it makes its report after, in this particular case, and the election had occurred. So how could that have affected the election of 1996? That could not have affected the 1996 election. *[Interruption]* Yes there is supposed to be another report and if a report comes it does not come to the Government alone, it comes to the Speaker and the Prime Minister and the Speaker makes an announcement in the Parliament, it says so. And when that is made, just as the hon. Speaker would make an announcement that the document is in the library and who wants to look at it could do so until it is printed by the Government Printery, so if anybody wants to look at it they can look at it, that is how I understand it, Mr. Speaker. So from where is all this nervousness coming?

What is happening is that the Opposition is trying to make excuses in advance for the loss that is going to occur and you could see it coming. As a matter of fact, the Leader of the Opposition talked about package. The Member for St. Ann's East does not say that anything in the report was unjust, or unfair, it is because of that they lost the election. He does not say anything, but he quotes another report, he does not say anything is unfair.

Mr. Speaker, I could now understand why the hon. Member for Diego Martin Central decided not to listen to the hon. Member for San Fernando East. Why do you think the major persons in the Front Bench have left? They have gone home because they know—the Leader of the Opposition knows that he could not agree with that. The hon. Member for Diego Martin West knew that he could not agree

EBC Order, 2000

Friday, July 14, 2000

with that, and I am feeling very sorry for the Member for Diego Martin East because I know that he does not agree with it, but I understand the politics.

Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry and if there is any way I could extend my sympathies to the People's National Movement—I am a man who feels sorry for people when I see suffering and I think they may probably need some public interest litigation because I feel very sorry for them. I would advise them that they must never go into battle being afraid, being nervous, feeling coward, looking for excuses in advance. Go into battle and fight, and if you lose, come out and say; “I lose.” Take “yuh” blows, and then if you want, you could walk. *[Laughter]*

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move.

Question put and agreed to.

Resolved:

That the draft of the Elections and Boundaries Commission Order, 2000, be approved.

ADJOURNMENT

The Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs (Hon. Ramesh Lawrence Maharaj): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to Friday, July 21, 2000 at 1.30 p.m.

On that date, apart from the motions with the amendments from the Senate, we would like to do the Judicial Review Bill, the Supreme Court of Judicature (Amdt.) Bill, the Petty Civil Courts (Amdt.) Bill and the Bill to re-enact the Rent Restriction Act, Chap. 59:50.

6.10 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, before the question is put on the adjournment, there are three outstanding matters which Members had got leave to raise: The Member for La Brea; the Member for Diego Martin East; and the Member for Diego Martin Central. I, accordingly, call on the Member for La Brea with respect to the Motion on: The failure of the Government to make adequate and humane arrangements for the detention and repatriation of citizens of Commonwealth nations who have run afoul of the Immigration laws of Trinidad and Tobago. *[Interruption]*

Detention and Repatriation of Citizens of Commonwealth Nations

Mr. Hedwige Bereaux (La Brea): Mr. Speaker, I want to raise this matter: The failure of the Government to make adequate and humane arrangements for

Detention and Repatriation of Citizens
[MR. BEREUX]

Friday, July 14, 2000

the detention and repatriation of citizens of Commonwealth nations who have run afoul of the Immigration laws of Trinidad and Tobago. Mr. Speaker, our Constitution provides that—one of the rights laid down in the Constitution is the right of a person not to be detained unless done by due process. That detention is as a result of due process. It is not in respect of citizens of Trinidad and Tobago alone, it is in respect of all persons who are in this country.

The Immigration Act, Chap. 18:01 gives the Immigration Authority the right to arrest, detain and deport persons found overstaying their time in Trinidad and Tobago. As a result of that, a number of Commonwealth citizens have been arrested from time and time and kept in detention. Normally, if you arrest somebody, the purpose of the arrest is for that person to be deported, and we have reached a stage in this country, where I know of five citizens from the Commonwealth country of Nigeria; I know of one from the Commonwealth country of Kenya; I know of a number of others from Guyana who are detained in Trinidad and Tobago.

I understand that some of these persons have been in detention for as long as four years. When I tried to get information to bring this Motion before this honourable House, a number of persons who were interested in their welfare, in particular the Nigerian detainees, came to me and retained me, and I tried to go there. First, I called the Ministry of National Security and the Permanent Secretary did not return my call. I would not take it upon myself to call the lofty Minister—because he might think that I want something from him, or they might think that I am trying to cross the floor. So I did not do that.

I called the Permanent Secretary and I could not get any response. Then I went in my capacity as an attorney-at-law to the prisons to try to see the detainees to find out, based on the written instructions I received from their friends outside. Persons in the Communities United to Fight Under- development who have known some of these people gave me written instructions. I went to the Maximum Security Prison and they asked me if I had any instructions from the Nigerian High Commission. I said, “No, they are entitled to have the lawyers see them, if it is necessary.” I was not given the opportunity. I did not make it any problem. I just left. Mr. Speaker, I am just showing you the kind of treatment that is being meted out to them.

Mr. Speaker, we all have our human rights. I am not saying that the persons are entitled to stay here. If they have broken the immigration laws, well they have broken the immigration laws. But that must not prevent them from having access to due process while they are in this country. Firstly, the behaviour of the

Government, through the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of National Security and through the prisons official is a violation of their rights.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights—which I may feel a little funny to quote here today, since we are no longer involved in the United Nations Convention on Human Rights, but I will quote it nonetheless. It states:

“No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment... No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention...”

Mr. Speaker, they are being deprived of seeing an attorney. They are kept in detention with common criminals, maximum security when all they have done is overstayed their time. Something which happens to citizens of this country time and time again, and yet they are not treated in that way. Above all, in breach of the Constitution of Trinidad and Tobago which guarantees to every person in this country—

“(4)(d) the right of the individual to equality of treatment from any public authority in the exercise of any functions;”

And I am speaking about the Immigration Department now.

You see, Mr. Speaker, a gentleman by the name of Dr. Kumar came to this country, overstayed his time and he was found working without a work permit in the San Fernando General Hospital. His name is Narace Kumar. He entered on February 17, 1998. He gave his reason as vacation and he overstayed his time. He never sought an extension but he gained employment. He was arrested on the ward and the same day he got out—I do not know why—and he is still working in this country. But the same thing did not happen for the Nigerians; the same thing did not happen for the Kenyans, and I am saying the same thing did not happen even for the Guyanese and they have them there. And I am saying that it cannot be the expense in order to send back the Guyanese. They are just there. They can be put on a fishing boat and sent home.

Mr. Speaker, I am saying that there is a situation in this country where what is good for one—where you could have found a work permit quickly and dealt with Dr. Kumar, but you cannot deal in the same way with Prince Davidson; you cannot deal with Temitope Omotade and Anthony Iwull—*[Interruption]* it does not matter whether I could pronounce it good or not—it is a fact; you cannot deal so with any of these persons.

This Government is one that purports to treat or say—they pay a lot of lip service to how well they treat people of all races. The hon. Minister of Foreign

Detention and Repatriation of Citizens
[MR. BÉREAU]

Friday, July 14, 2000

Affairs—I am ashamed to have to tell him this but nonetheless—went and spoke at the launching of the African Emancipation. He had glowing words to say. I know his language is always excellent but I want to know if it came from his heart. Because in the same vein there are Nigerians suffering here and they are doing nothing about it. I am calling on this Government—and there is precedent for it—we are an oil-producing country; Nigeria is a member of OPEC; Nigeria is a country that could assist us, and I am saying that we need to have a good relationship with Nigeria. One of the ways we can do it is to treat the Nigerians in a humane manner.

And I am giving this Government a way to escape. You know when you are dealing with people you always give them a way to escape; and I have given them a way to escape. And I am asking you, Mr. Speaker, in a personal capacity, to also support me. I am saying that there is precedent in this country for giving amnesty to persons who have run afoul of the immigration laws.

6.20 p.m.

They have done it in the United States. We did it here years ago when I was still a boy when we were dealing with Grenadians, Vincentians and some other people who came to this country. I call for amnesty for all the persons who are there now and who are not guilty of any crime showing moral turpitude. If the only crime they have committed is that they have overstayed in this country, I call on this Government to give them an amnesty. I am asking in particular in respect of the Nigerians and the Kenyan. If the Government so loves and has so much concern for emancipation in this country, do it in respect of emancipation. By the first of August, let me see them all free. [*Desk thumping*] Let the black go.

I repeat the words of Lord Ellenborough—yes, let him go. I am ashamed to have to mention that here today in this country when we are supposed to have abolished slavery a long time. Let the black go. Let him go. They are holding him. They are keeping him down and I say I want them to be freed by Emancipation Day. I call on this Government to do that because, you see, it is not that they do not know about it. The very—[*Interruption*] No, they are not white. They are black and I ask for them to be let go. Those words were said in 1882. I have to say them here today in 2000. [*Desk thumping*] [*Interruption*] That is not what was said. I am quoting words which Lord Ellenborough said—[*Interruption*] Please! I am quoting the words of Lord Ellenborough when he said that Tobago cannot pass a law to govern the world. Mr. Speaker, you will know the case of which I am speaking. It was when he said it is not possible for slavery to exist in England

and he said, “Let the black go”. That is the point. They are being detained and the Government should let them go now.

Mr. Assam: Let them go where?

Mr. H. Breaux: Let them stay in Trinidad and Tobago under an amnesty.

Mr. Assam: You will let them stay? Do not let them go, then? [*Laughter*]

Mr. H. Breaux: Brilliant! Mr. Speaker, this matter was even raised by the Ombudsman in his 22nd Report when he referred to it. To end this matter, notwithstanding what was said by the Member for St. Joseph—who will not be the Member for St. Joseph in a short while—I call on the Minister and the Government to show the milk of human kindness and give an amnesty to those Nigerians and other Commonwealth citizens who are being held as detainees in that prison and who have been there for two and three years. Let them remain in this country under an amnesty. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [*Desk thumping*]

The Minister of National Security (Sen. Brig. The Hon. Joseph Theodore): Mr. Speaker, I heard the Member for La Brea quote sections of the Immigration Act and I think it is important that we hear the entire section that deals with immigration to this country because it seems as though there is some lack of knowledge as to how the Act applies to foreigners entering Trinidad and Tobago. The Motion as it is worded, Mr. Speaker, talks about the failure of the Government to make adequate and humane arrangements for the detention and repatriation of Commonwealth nations’ citizens who have run afoul of the immigration laws of Trinidad and Tobago. Section 9(1) of the Immigration Act, Chap. 18:01, of the laws of Trinidad and Tobago sets out the conditions under which foreigners are permitted to enter Trinidad and Tobago, and I quote:

“An immigration officer may allow to enter Trinidad and Tobago on such conditions and for such periods as may be fit and proper in any particular case, the following persons or classes of persons, as the case may be:

- (a) persons who are diplomatic or consular officers or representatives or officials duly accredited, of any country, or of the United Nations or any of its agencies or any inter-governmental organisation in which Trinidad and Tobago participates, coming to Trinidad and Tobago to carry out their official duties or passing through intransit, or members of the suites of families of such persons;”

Other people who are permitted, Mr. Speaker, are:

- (b) members of any naval, army or air forces who come to Trinidad and Tobago for training or otherwise in connection with the defence and security interests of Trinidad and Tobago, or under the provisions of any treaty or agreement between Trinidad and Tobago and another country and whose entry into Trinidad and Tobago is approved by the Minister, together with such members of their families or suites as may be approved;
- (c) tourists or visitors;
- (d) persons passing through Trinidad and Tobago to another country;
- (e) clergymen, priests or members of a religious order entering Trinidad and Tobago or who, having entered, are in Trinidad and Tobago in connection with the carrying out of their religious duties in accordance with the regulations made in that behalf;"

Several other people are permitted, Mr. Speaker:

- “(f) students...
- (g) persons who have been accepted as students...
- (h) members of crews entering Trinidad and Tobago...and
- (i) persons entering Trinidad and Tobago for the purpose of engaging in a legitimate profession, trade or occupation.”

So to hear the hon. Member for La Brea suggest that persons who are detained for breaking our laws be granted a work permit seems somewhat far-fetched.

Mr. Bereaux: I did not say “work permit”, I said “amnesty”.

Sen. Brig. The Hon. J. Theodore: Work permit. The amnesty came towards the end.

Mr. Bereaux: All I said was that Dr. Narace Kumar was given a work permit and he came here as a visitor. I said the others must be given. If you think it is not true, then tell me I am wrong.

Sen. Brig. The Hon. J. Theodore: “Why can we not do the same for the others?” That is how the sentence was completed, Mr. Speaker, which suggests “You give one man a work permit, you can do the same for the others”.

Mr. Bereaux: But you gave Narace one.

Sen. Brig. The Hon. J. Theodore: There you go; the Member is reinforcing my argument. I thank you, Member for La Brea.

Mr. Bereaux: Why did you give it to him?

Sen. Brig. The Hon. J. Theodore: Section 8 of the said Act deals with the other side, Mr. Speaker, where it deals with persons who belong to the prohibited class. This section states that persons other than citizens and residents are deemed to be the prohibited class and are subject to deportation where, in the opinion of the Minister such a person, *inter alia*:

“(f) was admitted or deemed to have been admitted to Trinidad and Tobago under subsection (1) and remains therein after the expiration of the certificate issued to him...”

This means, in simple language, somebody who comes here and is given a time to remain, overstays that time and refuses to comply with the permission granted to him. Secondly:

“(i) returns to or remains in Trinidad and Tobago contrary to the provisions of this Act after a deportation order has been made against him or otherwise.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, in cases where a foreigner who enters Trinidad and Tobago in accordance with these provisions is found to have breached any of the stipulated conditions, police and immigration officers are vested with the authority to investigate, arrest and detain for an enquiry or for deportation such person. Again it was suggested earlier that such persons cannot be arrested. If I am wrong, please clarify.

Mr. Bereaux: You are wrong, you are wrong.

Sen. Brig. The Hon. J. Theodore: So these people were arrested and this was within the law and the officers who did so had the right to do so. To suggest that these people were wrongfully incarcerated is certainly trying to mislead not only this honourable House but also the public at large, Mr. Speaker. In the Act, any person in respect of whom an inquiry is to be held or a deportation or rejection order has been made, may be detained—*[Interruption]*

Mr. Valley: Mr. Minister, could I just ask one question, just for my own clarification, please? You see, we would all agree that if one is in breach of the Immigration Act one can be arrested and detained. The issue is whether there ought not to be some limited time for that detention, and whether it is right and just for a country that talks about the Constitution, about liberty, about the

freedom of the individual and so on, to incarcerate these people for periods of two years.

Sen. Brig. The Hon. J. Theodore: Mr. Speaker, I shall not attempt to answer this as a question, but as I proceed with my reply the facts will come out and I am sure it will satisfy the Member for Diego Martin West. Any person in respect of whom an inquiry is to be held or a deportation or rejection order has been made, may be detained pending inquiry, examination, appeal or deportation at an immigration station or other place satisfactory to the Minister.

In the Act, a place of detention is defined as a prison, police station or any place approved by the Minister. Over the years, Mr. Speaker, it has been the practice of the immigration division to detain foreigners who are found in breach of section 9(1) of the Immigration Act at the state prison pending deportation. Now, the reason I say that this has been the practice is because I certainly did not envisage, on taking up office as the Minister of National Security in November of 1995, that I would have had to delve into practices which had been put in place by previous administrations. [*Desk thumping*] Although I find now that many things were not done and there are several omissions and inconsistencies as far as my Ministry is concerned where matters such as this one obtains, but I shall be proceeding to point out what action has been taken by my Ministry.

I continue to read from the Act. In instances where detainees are required to remain for periods of an extended time, it is usually due to the fact that the detainees in question are the subject of an ongoing court matter which must be completed and certain procedures obtain at the place of detention. I have received from the prison authority a letter dated July 6, 2000 which gives information on the treatment, seeing we are dealing with a suggestion that persons have, in fact, been treated in any inhumane manner. On entering the prison system, Mr. Speaker:

“Prohibited immigrants are kept in prison custody on a detention warrant from the Immigration Department pending their deportation to their respective homelands.

Immediately upon reception into prison custody the Welfare Section is informed and the relevant High Commission/Mission is informed of the detention of its citizen and the reasons for detention.”

I am advised that the Immigration Department takes similar action. I am reading the letter, Mr. Speaker, dated July 6. This is a situation that has been reported to me.

“All prohibited immigrants are now being housed in a section of the Maximum Security Prison in an area that has been reserved temporarily for that purpose.

All prohibited immigrants are entitled to twice weekly visits of fifteen (15) minutes duration. However where the visit is from a member of their Consulate/Mission the visit is unlimited except on public holidays and weekends when prior arrangements are made.”

What is significant here, Mr. Speaker, is an article I came across only this morning in today’s *Guardian*, and this is the *Trinidad Guardian* of Friday, July 14, page 3. It is headed, “Let UN deal with illegal immigrants” and it quotes from a report submitted by the Ombudsman.

6.35 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the article reads:

“Ombudsman George Edoe has voiced his concern about illegal immigrants being kept with hardened criminals in the nation’s prisons.

‘At present there are 10 prisoners awaiting deportation, some of whom have been in prison for a long time,’ Edoe observed in his 1999 annual report, which was laid in Parliament last week.

Edoe said from time to time illegal immigrants complained to him about being housed in prisons, where they came into contact with hardened prisoners.”

Mr. Speaker, the article continues:

“Edoe said his predecessor, in his fifth annual report, had called on the Ministry of National Security for illegal immigrants to be kept apart from the prison population and provided with proper facilities.

Quoting from that 1982 report, which noted illegal immigrants ‘are needlessly and unreasonably being kept with hardened criminals,’ Edoe said this situation had not changed.”

Mr. Speaker, this was in 1982, 18 years ago, when the matter was raised by the Ombudsman but, of course, no previous administration had been responsible for this activity. Now, it is the turn of this Panday administration, and the Government will do something about it. [*Desk thumping*] This Government is making sure that what has been allowed to perpetuate like the neglect and bad treatment that people have suffered—including members of the protective services—will not continue. [*Desk thumping*]

Mr. Speaker, the article goes on:

“Some of these cases have been referred to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs...”

We are talking here about 1982.

“...especially where there are no accredited representatives of the country in Trinidad and Tobago, Edoe said.”

Mr. Speaker, this is most interesting and the article continues:

“In most cases, the representatives of their respective countries have facilitated their deportation by providing air or sea passages for their return, Edoe said in the 22nd Ombudsman Report.”

Mr. Speaker, this Government was faced with a situation. I must confess that there were enough things to correct, and enough omissions to deal with in my Ministry without going to the prison to enquire where these detainees were held. I would like to assure this honourable House that there are procedures. When detainees are in prison they are allowed all the facilities. During their confinement, the detainees get three meals per day; they are allowed to engage in recreational activities; friends and relatives are allowed to visit them—

Hon. Member: What about attorneys?

Sen. Brig. The Hon. J. Theodore: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure about attorneys. In the case of the prison, the Member for La Brea mentioned only one document that was required, and that was a document signed by the Nigerian High Commissioner stating that the attorney—whosoever he may be—was hired to represent these detainees or any detainee. But, then again, a letter is also required. If there is not one from the mission, at least, the persons in question, whom an Attorney seeks to represent, should indicate that such representation was requested. Unfortunately, in the case of the Member for La Brea, the Member was not able to produce any of the documents and was unable to see the detainees. *[Laughter]* These detainees are allowed to participate in religious activities; in the event of illness, the detainees are attended to by the Prison Medical Officer, and in critical cases, transferred to one of the Government medical institutions.

Mr. Speaker, generally speaking, we find that the matter of incarceration at the state prison as obtains, deals with the issue of being incarcerated with criminals. Now, I will try to explain at another time that the persons in the Remand Yard are not convicted; they are not convicts; and they are not prisoners. These are people awaiting the hearing of their matters or appeal. That is why the detainees were housed at the various prisons in Trinidad and Tobago. But, again,

out of concern, the issue of detainees being housed with criminals could cast aspersions on the exposure they are faced with. As I said earlier, a section of the Maximum Security Prison has been set aside to house these detainees.

Mr. Speaker, in order to correct the records, there are seven detainees presently awaiting deportation, none of whom is from Guyana.

Dr. Rowley: The Prime Minister said Guyana.

Sen. Brig. The Hon. J. Theodore: Mr. Speaker, at this present time, I am bringing the records up-to-date so that people will not carry on with something that is *passee* like the past administration but, will bring themselves up-to-date and see what is going on in the world today. [*Desk thumping*] What is going on today is, the dealing with deportees, illegal people and getting them out of this country. As we all know, the United States Government—after that government and several governments refused in transit visas to, at least, four of our detainees—has offered to provide the transportation to have the detainees repatriated.

Mr. Speaker, there is also one problem that arises that could delay the departure and I think this is a question that must be dealt with. There are situations that occur when persons are within the prison system awaiting repatriation. First of all, the Government would ask the missions to assist with the return fare. If that is not forthcoming, whether there is a matter taking place right now that could also cause a delay, where the individual in question refuses to cooperate with the authorities and give information concerning his or her whereabouts, because in most cases, some of these detainees have neither passport, identification nor return tickets. I should like to point out that plans have been made to have all persons who stay—I have taken the point—remain here longer than others.

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems had to deal with the provision of funds. The Chief Immigration Officer does not have a vote that deals with buying tickets to send people back to their countries. But, the people who are remaining in the Maximum Security Prison are now being processed.

Mr. Speaker, a policy decision has been taken that persons who are found here illegally, the Government will not only inform their missions, but the Chief Immigration Officer and the Commissioner of Prisons must inform the Ministry of National Security, so that action could be taken to have these people returned to their homes expeditiously, once the processing has been completed.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the existing evidence suggests, therefore, the conditions under which prohibited immigrants are held are consistent with international standards, and do not qualify to be described as inadequate or inhumane.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you. [*Desk thumping*]

**Ministry of Works and Transport
(Waste and Mismanagement)**

Mr. Colm Imbert (*Diego Martin East*): Mr. Speaker, this Motion deals with the waste and mismanagement taking place in the Ministry of Works and Transport and the Ministry's intention to award contracts without tenders for road paving.

Mr. Assam: Like when you were there.

Mr. C. Imbert: Now, I have in my possession, certain documents relating to meetings held in the Ministry of Works and Transport, within the last month or so. What is most interesting is the minutes of a meeting held on June 12, between Asphalt Paving Company, the Contractors Association and officers of the Ministry of Works and Transport. What is revealing is that the Ministry has informed the contractors that it intends to spend about \$200 million on road paving over the next three to four months.

6.45 p.m.

Listen to the suggestion at the meeting.

"It was suggested that due to the limited time for the project, a similar process used in the 1980s where companies involved in the dredging of rivers were mobilized to fast track the cleaning of rivers should be adopted where contractors identify their capacities, a basic price was developed and the work was shared."

Now, the infamy referred to there was the—I do not know what word to use—but certain irregular procedures used by the then Minister of Works and Transport—

Mr. Humphrey: The brilliant initiative of the then Minister.

Mr. C. Imbert:—who brought all his partners in a room and said, "All right. You could do this river; you could do that river; at this price, at that price", and the then Prime Minister, Mr. Robinson, had to come and use his special majority in Parliament to make a retroactive amendment to the Central Tenders Board otherwise the Minister would have been in breach of the law. Now, we hear, in the year 2000, that this is what this UNC Government wants to do.

The meeting went on. They went through a process to develop the price for this asphalt that would be purchased by the Government within the next couple months and I have the costing here. The costing for one metric ton for supply, transport, roll and place is \$381.80.

Now, I have in my possession, Mr. Speaker, the most recent tenders for asphalt paving at the Ministry of Works and Transport and I shall put it into the record: Tender from Seereeram Brothers on March 3, 2000—supply of hot mix, \$160 a tonne. Here we have Coosals Construction—one of their favourite boys—on March 1, 2000, \$158 a tonne. Here we have Jusamco, \$250 per tonne. We have Seereeram Brothers again—to supply, roll and place hot mix—June 15, just last month, \$160 per tonne. Dipcon Engineering on June 15, 2000, \$180 per tonne and Coosals, again, on June 28, \$184 per tonne.

Mr. Speaker, you will see that the most competitive price in Trinidad and Tobago just one month ago was somewhere in the vicinity of \$160—\$180 per metric ton, but these political criminals will sit in a meeting and decide they will no longer have tenders. This is open competitive bidding that produces a price of \$180 but these political criminals sit in a meeting and decide, no tenders; they are going to share the work at \$381 a tonne. That is what is going on in Trinidad and Tobago today and it is obvious, if the going rate is \$180, why are they agreeing in a meeting to \$380? What is going on? There must not be any tenders. They must use the system that was used in the 1980s and so on, just give it to your partners and share it up.

It is ridiculous. It is a waste of taxpayers' money. They are squandering taxpayers' money and it is typical of this administration. That is why they do not want to go through the tender process. They can double the price and then they know what they can do with the excess profits.

I have, also, in my possession, the programme that is being planned in Trinidad and Tobago for this road paving work—July 4, 2000. They are going to spend \$196 million. Now, if we look at the documents that were put before this House today, for the last four years, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, they spent a total of \$170 million, just over \$45 million a year, but in three months, they are going to spend \$196 million. I mean, come on. We are not children. This is blatant, naked electioneering and they are going to do it at double the going rate.

Look at the breakdown—the National Road Enhancement Programme—the only thing this is enhancing is somebody's pocket; this is not enhancing any road. The proposed zoning for the contracting of works: Northwest, six projects for

Ministry of Works and Transport
[MR. IMBERT]

Friday, July 14, 2000

\$5.9 million; Northeast, eight projects for \$9.4 million; Caroni, 18 projects for \$39.9 million; Southwest, 43 projects for \$83.9 million; Southeast 20 projects for \$57.4 million. So, out of \$196 million, they are going to spend just \$14 million in constituencies represented by the PNM and \$182 million in constituencies represented by the UNC. [*Crosstalk*] Naked discrimination: \$182 million out of \$196 million will be spent in constituencies represented by the UNC and the hard part about all this is, they are going to be paying almost \$400 a tonne for asphalt when the going rate is \$200 and out of that almost \$200 million, [*Crosstalk*] \$100 million is going to go in somebody's pocket. Do you see the kind of numbers these people like to deal with? They do not deal in small change.

This is after the last four years, [*Crosstalk*] where, out of \$170 million that has been spent on roads in Trinidad, when you go through, \$150 million spent in UNC constituencies. [*Crosstalk*] Check it out; \$150 million. I will just pull at random. Look at July to September 1998.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. C. Imbert: The expenditure—St. George West, \$500,000; St. George East, \$350,000; Caroni, \$4.5 million; Victoria West, \$4.6 million; St. Patrick, \$4.6 million.

Mr. Narine: National unity.

Mr. C. Imbert: That is national unity. That is just one period. Here we have another. April 1, 1999—September 30, 1999: St. George West, \$2.7 million; St. George East, \$500,000; Caroni, \$5 million; Victoria West, \$17 million; St. Patrick, \$5.5 million; Victoria East, \$4 million. [*Crosstalk*] So out of \$170 million on the Road Improvement Fund in the years 1996—1999, \$150 million spent in UNC areas and out of \$200 million to be spent in the next three months, \$180 million to go to UNC areas.

I am hearing name-calling over there. Do you want to hear the bandits who were involved in this meeting where they want to use the Humphrey system where you do not have tenders, you just zone it and share it out to your partners? Do you want to hear the names of the people involved in this meeting? It is Aztec Asphalt. Who is that? I think that is Galbaransingh. Coosals, Carib, Dipcon, Jusamco, Lutchmeesingh, Seereeram, Trinidad Contractors, Trinity Asphalt, Moonan, Asphalt Road Surfacing. So they brought nine or 10 of their contractor friends to a meeting—

Dr. Mohammed: You forget to mention Elias name there.

Mr. C. Imbert: Oh, I am so sorry. You have the Contractors Association, Varun Mathur and Emile Elias. I am so sorry. [*Laughter*]

Dr. Mohammed: Why did you not read it?

Mr. C. Imbert: I forgot.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, what is going on in this country. People sit in a little room in the Ministry and decide that no longer in Trinidad and Tobago will there be open, competitive tendering for road works, spending \$200 million on roads when, in fact, all you need to spend is \$100 million.

It is an absolute disgrace and I call on the Government to stop this nonsense. If, when you go out for competitive bids, you can get \$180—\$200 a tonne, explain to me now why you are going to share out the work without competitive bidding.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Works and Transport (Mr. Chandresh Sharma): Mr. Speaker, let me thank the Member for Diego Martin East who has now established his short ability to deliver on contempt. He has a history of coming here week after week and being very emotive and very economical with the truth as well.

He made reference to a number of areas here and moved away totally from the Motion at hand. In fact, he hid behind the RIF, which is the Road Improvement Fund, for the periods 1996, 1997, 1998 and 1999 and did not indicate that it was the RIF to which he was referring and let it appear as if the Ministry was spending this money.

In addition to that, he made reference to some alleged minutes of June 12, 2000. Now, we do not know whether those are confirmed minutes, whether it is, in fact, a report, but he indicated—again, not indicating where it came from—a programme that the Ministry is now considering. What he failed to recognize or say in this House, was that the roads to which he referred, Members on both sides of this House—and I want to repeat that, Members on both sides of this House—including his good self, have submitted lists to the Ministry, where they have been requested to give the names of roads and they have identified five critical roads in their areas to be paved.

Mr. Hart: Who sent that memo?

Mr. C. Sharma: At this time, we have obtained that information from 24 Members on both sides of the House under the National Road Enhancement Programme.

What the Ministry has done—and it is very unfair for the Member, being a former Minister to indicate the Ministry. The Ministry has public servants working and they have to follow rules and regulations. Ministers in the ministries make the policies and the others help administer them. It is very clear that the Ministry is following given rules.

What we have implemented here was to bring other players into this programme—the Tourism and Industrial Development Company (Tidco); the Maintenance, Training and Security Company Limited (MTS) and the Urban Development Corporation of Trinidad and Tobago Limited (UDECOTT). What they are going to be doing is following rules as established by the Central Tenders Board. We are following what obtains in Trinidad and Tobago at this point in time which is legal as well.

One would remember that there was a High Court action that prevented paving of roads during the period 1999 and for a large part of 2000 as well. To make sure that the Government discharged its responsibility in attending to the road conditions, we came up with the National Road Enhancement Programme to which the Member has made reference.

As I indicated, Members from both sides of the House have participated in this programme. At the time of sharing this information, 24 Members had submitted at least five roads.

Mr. Hart: I submitted 53, not five.

Mr. C. Sharma: The Member for Tunapuna said he has submitted three. He could have done five.

Mrs. Robinson-Regis: Fifty-three, not three.

Mr. C. Sharma: Mr. Speaker, what also obtains now is, we are utilizing what obtains in terms of what the Central Tenders Board has laid out and this has been the history all along, so we are not bringing into the Ministry any new measures in terms of the contract procedures. We are following what obtains in Trinidad and Tobago.

Again, the contractors have responded as they are required to do and, again, we are following the regulations to make sure that we do it. Also, we are obtaining some of this money from the National Highways Programme which

would finance the first part of it and the others here which I have identified—Tidco, MTS, UDECOTT—are going to bring in moneys from their own areas.

For contracts up to \$100,000 a system of open tendering will be used and the Permanent Secretary will award these contracts which, again, obtain in every ministry and has been there for a while, which came to this Parliament and got approval.

7.00 p.m.

For contracts more than \$100,000 but not exceeding \$500,000, these tenders would be invited and awarded by the ministerial tenders committee of the Ministry of Works and Transport. Again this obtains, and has been so for a long period.

For contracts exceeding \$500,000, the procedures of the implementing agencies—the ones I have identified, MTS and UDECOTT—contract documents would be prepared by the Ministry of Works and Transport and tenders would be evaluated by a technical team comprising officials from the Ministries of Works and Transport, Local Government and the implementing agencies. Again, this is an accepted procedure. The roads that are being considered are roads that come under the Ministry of Works and Transport and the Ministry of Local Government.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Diego Martin East made reference to roads. The Ministry deals with districts and, as a result, does not identify roads by constituencies. The roads he has identified are roads in Trinidad covering all 34 constituencies. It is totally unfair and inaccurate—as I indicated he is very economical with the truth—to indicate that larger sums of money have been spent on a particular area. That is far from the truth. The records are here. The question was answered this morning in question 74.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to say—based on the very short intervention by the Member in terms of what he presented here—is that there is absolutely no waste or mismanagement. Every procedure employed by the Ministry is in keeping with the laws of Trinidad and Tobago.

Thank you, very much. [*Desk thumping*]

Mr. Kenneth Valley (*Diego Martin Central*): I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I thought the Leader informed you that we agreed to postpone that one to next week. My apologies.

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

Mr. Speaker: By agreement of both sides hon. Members, the third matter to be raised is postponed to next week.

Question put and agreed to.

House adjourned accordingly.

Adjourned at 7.05 p.m.

WRITTEN ANSWER TO QUESTION

**Road Improvement Fund
(Repairs)**

The following question was asked by Mr. Colm Imbert (Diego Martin East) earlier in the proceedings:

- (a) Would the Minister state the expenditure in Trinidad on road repairs under the Road Improvement Fund (RIF) in the years 1996, 1997, 1998 and 1999?
- (b) Would the Minister list the following:
 - (i) the names and location of the roads repaired in Trinidad under the RIF;
 - (ii) the expenditure under the RIF on each road?

The following reply was circulated to Members of the House:

- (a) The expenditure in Trinidad on road repairs under the Road Improvement Fund over the period 1996-1999 follows:

Year	Expenditure (RIF)
1996	\$7.4 Mn.
1997	\$73 Mn.
1998	\$50 Mn.
1999	\$ 38 Mn.

- (b) (i) - (ii) the names, locations and expenditure of each road repaired in Trinidad under the Road Improvement Fund (RIF) during -
 - 1996 is detailed at Appendix I

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

- 1997 is detailed at Appendix II
- 1998 is detailed at Appendix III
- 1999 is detailed at Appendix IV
- October, 1999 - March, 2000 at Appendix V

4. *Appendix I (Bi-Annual Report 6)* contains a report of actual works undertaken during September to December, 1996. Actual works were not undertaken during January to August, 1996, because outstanding accounts for works completed in the previous year had to be settled and this delayed the scheduled programme of works for 1996.

5. It should be noted that in *Appendix II (Bi-Annual Reports 7 and 8)* *Bi-Annual Report 7* contains actual works undertaken during the period January to June, 1997; while *Bi-Annual Report 8* contains works undertaken during July to December, 1997 as well as works which continued from the period January to June, 1997.

6. *Appendix III (Bi-Annual Reports 9 and 10)* has actual works undertaken during the period January to September, 1998. The financial year was changed in September 1998, with the new financial year being October, 1998 to September, 1999.

7. In *Appendix IV (Bi-Annual Reports 11 and 12)* details of actual works undertaken during October, 1998 to September, 1999 are provided.

8. *Appendix V (Bi-Annual Report 13)* actual works were not undertaken, as the funds were utilized to settle final accounts with Contractors. A financial statement is provided for the foregoing.

NAME OF ROAD	DISTRICT	AREA PAVED M ²	LENGTH PAVED km	MATERIAL COST \$
Uriah Butler Highway	CAR	8,791		\$305,467.50
Solomon Hchoy Highway	CAR	10,532		\$334,656.00
Old Southern Main Road	CAR	12,838		\$318,458.00

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

NAME OF ROAD	DISTRICT	AREA PAVED M ²	LENGTH PAVED km	MATERIAL COST \$
Caparo Valley Brasso Road	CAR	9,300		\$240,120.00
Perseverance Road	CAR	12,980		\$373,842.00
South Trunk Road	VW		1.20	\$256,826.00
Fyzabad Road	ST. P		2.40	\$464,450.00
Fyzabad Guapo Road	ST. P		3.20	\$570,000.00
TOTAL		54,441	6.80	\$2,863,819.50

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	AREA PATCHED m ²	MATERIAL COST \$	MISC. COST \$
3rd Avenue, Barataria	GW	75	\$1,056.00	\$0.00
4th Street, Maraval	GW	35	\$248.00	\$0.00
Anne Avenue	VW	255	\$4,607.50	\$0.00
Aranguéz Main Road	GW	20	\$0.00	\$0.00
Bissessar Street, El Socorro	GW	210	\$2,880.00	\$0.00
Blue Basin Road	GW	137	\$1,940.00	\$0.00
Bonne Aventure Road	VW	346	\$7,124.20	\$0.00
Brasso Caparo Station Road	CAR	100	\$1,006.25	\$0.00
Brasso Chickland Road	CAR	323	\$4,940.00	\$0.00
Buen Intento Road	VE	88	\$1,920.00	\$0.00
Caparo River Road	CAR	140	\$1,006.25	\$0.00

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	AREA PATCHED m ²	MATERIAL COST \$	MISC. COST \$
Caparo Valley Brasso Road	CAR	896	\$15,081.20	\$5,000.00
Caroni Road	CAR	1102	\$11,607.20	\$1,104.00
Cedar Hill Road	CAR	8092	\$94,793.00	\$0.00
Chickland Caparo Road	CAR	320	\$3,049.00	\$500.00
Churchill Roosevelt Highway	GW	53	\$840.00	\$0.00
City Gate	GW	1330	\$10,288.00	\$0.00
Clarke Road	ST. P	1636	\$22,400.00	\$1,186.00
Couva Road	CAR	745	\$6,037.00	\$0.00
Cumuto Main Road	GE	794	\$31,760.00	\$0.00
Cunapo Southern Road	NM	2293	\$38,019.00	\$0.00
Cunapo Southern Road	CAR	551	\$8,275.01	\$0.00
Cunjal Road	ST. P	1165	\$31,652.80	\$0.00
Dades Road	NM	45	\$874.00	\$0.00
Diego Martin Main Road	GW	134	\$4,360.00	\$0.00
Eastern Main Road	GW	170	\$1,068.00	\$0.00
Eastern Main Road	GE	544	\$21,760.00	\$0.00
Eastern Main Road	A/D	240	\$3,617.00	\$0.00
El Socorro Main Road	GW	15	\$420.00	\$0.00
Endeavour Road	CAR	128	\$140.00	\$140.00
Erin Road	ST. P	435	\$13,600.00	\$583.00
Freeport Mission Road	CAR	1736	\$43,933.00	\$1,500.00

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	AREA PATCHED m ²	MATERIAL COST \$	MISC. COST \$
Freeport Todds Road	CAR	2210	\$33,699.00	\$1,500.00
Guaico Tamana Road	A/D	123	\$1,993.73	\$0.00
Guaracara Tabaquite Road	CAR	30	\$800.00	\$0.00
Guayaguayare Road	VW	128	\$4,980.65	\$0.00
Gunapo Road	GE	160	\$6,400.00	\$0.00
Heights of Gunapo	GE	184	\$7,360.00	\$0.00
Jaipaulsingh Road	VE	265	\$7,192.92	\$0.00
La Brea Road	ST. P	150	\$926.00	\$0.00
La Fortune Pluck Road	ST. P	819	\$24,380.00	\$575.00
Long Circular Road	GW	6	\$352.00	\$0.00
Lopinot Road	GE	120	\$4,800.00	\$0.00
Mahambre Road	VW	206	\$2,921.25	\$0.00
Mamoral Road	CAR	605	\$5,031.25	\$0.00
Maracas Royal Road	GW	145	\$4,264.00	\$0.00
Mayaro Guayaguayare Road	NM	2118	\$56,051.24	\$0.00
Mayo Road	VW	106	\$6,882.14	\$0.00
Monica Drive	VW	263	\$4,165.75	\$0.00
Morne Coco Road	GW	86	\$1,456.00	\$0.00
Moruga Road	VE	4873	\$87,329.64	\$0.00
Munroe Road	CAR	246	\$3,546.75	\$552.00
Naparima Mayaro Road	VW	385	\$1,580.80	\$0.00

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	AREA PATCHED m ²	MATERIAL COST \$	MISC. COST \$
Naparima Mayaro Road	NM	201	\$279.66	\$0.00
Old Southern Main Road	CAR	1783	\$10,090.00	\$0.00
Old Southern Main Road	CAR	1783	\$10,090.00	\$0.00
Papourie Road	VW	2138	\$27,442.10	\$4,225.00
Paria Main Road	GE	130	\$5,200.00	\$0.00
Paria Morne Bleu	GE	120	\$4,800.00	\$0.00
Penal Rock Road	ST. P	565	\$7,322.00	\$357.00
Perseverance Road	CAR	1600	\$18,600.00	\$0.00
Piparo Road	VW	286	\$2,188.00	\$0.00
Plum Mitan Road	A/D	899	\$14,414.06	\$0.00
Priority Bus Route	GW	68	\$2,484.00	\$0.00
Ravine Sable Road	CAR	312	\$5,340.00	\$0.00
Rochard Douglas Road	VE	2712	\$58,033.43	\$0.00
Rochard Road	ST. P	946	\$18,825.00	\$7,469.00
S.S. Erin Road	ST. P	555	\$19,394.00	\$231.00
S.S. Erin Road	WW	164	\$2,508.00	\$0.00
Saddle Road, Maraval	GW	657	\$9,048.00	\$0.00
San Francique Road	ST. P	450	\$17,676.00	\$215.00
San Pedro Road	NM	99	\$1,748.00	\$0.00
Sancho Road	VE	32	\$480.00	\$0.00
Siparia Road	ST. P	144	\$4,812.00	\$276.00
Sisters Road	VE	244	\$2,400.00	\$0.00

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	AREA PATCHED m ²	MATERIAL COST \$	MISC. COST \$
Solomon Hochoy Highway	VW	265	247,00	0.00
Southern Main Road	ST. P	1304	\$18,701.00	\$1,250.00
Southern Main Road	CAR	2272	\$66,863.63	\$3,864.00
St. Croix Road	VW	340	\$7,562.90	\$910.00
St. Gabriel R.C. School	GW	220	\$2,136.00	\$0.00
St. Julien Road	VE	142	\$1,920.00	\$0.00
Tabaquite Brasso Road	CAR	3230	\$47,756.30	\$0.00
Tabaquite Rio Claro Road	NM	2412	\$49,256.00	\$0.00
Tabaquite Rio Claro Road	CAR	544	\$12,401.00	\$0.00
Todds Station Road	CAR	392	\$7,858.20	\$0.00
Torrib Tabaquite Road	VE	5718	\$121,464.86	\$0.00
Tumpuna Road	GE	472	\$1,800.00	\$0.00
Uriah Butler Highway	GW	80	\$880.00	\$0.00
Valencia Road	A/D	700	\$16,462.44	\$0.00
Valencia Road	CAR	70	\$0.00	\$0.00
Vega De Oropouche Road	CAR	28	\$482.96	\$0.00
Will Mohammed Road	GW	180	\$2,496.00	\$0.00
Western Main Road	GW	260	\$2,468.00	\$0.00
Farm Road	GW	40	\$516.00	\$0.00
Goodwood Drive	GW	355	\$3,760.00	\$0.00
West Moorings Boulevard	GW	245	\$2,464.00	\$0.00

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	AREA PATCHED m ²	MATERIAL COST \$	MISC. COST \$
D.P.P. Residence	GW	440	\$5,624.00	\$0.00
Cunapo Southern Road	A/D	527	\$6,769.25	\$0.00
Mc Lean & Lazzari (Palmiste)	VW	190	\$3,781.00	\$0.00
Poonah Road	VW	0	\$278.30	\$0.00
Guaracara Tabaquite Road	VW	0	\$443.39	\$0.00
Scotts Road	VW	110	\$1,150.00	\$119.00
Manzanilla Mayaro Road	NM	49	\$327.75	\$0.00
Pheonix Park Road	CAR	40	\$1,820.00	\$0.00
Waterloo Road	CAR	100	\$910.00	\$0.00
TOTAL		72,210	\$1,278,100.76	\$31,556.00

NAME OF ROAD	DISIRICT	CONTRACT		EQUIPMENT		MISC. COST (\$)
		OUTPUT	COST	OUTPUT	COST	
		(M)	(\$)	(M)	(\$)	
Arima Blanchisseuse Road	GE	783	\$16,042.50	3,275	\$25,300.00	\$0.00
Arima Old Road	GE	0	\$0.00	282	\$690.00	\$0.00
Arima Stock Pile	GE	0	\$0.00	0	\$0.00	\$0.00
Aripo Road	GE	0	\$0.00	26	\$690.00	\$0.00

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

NAME OF ROAD	DISTRICT	CONTRACT		EQUIPMENT		MISC. COST (\$)
		OUTPUT	COST	OUTPUT	COST	
		(M)	(\$)	(M)	(\$)	
Beetham Highway	GW	0	\$0.00	385	\$8,661.00	\$0.00
Blue Basin Road	GW	0	\$0.00	2,400	\$2,904.75	\$0.00
Brasso Caparo Stn. Road	CAR	0	\$1,088.24	450	\$910.01	\$0.00
Brasso Tamana Road	CAR	0	\$911.82	600	\$0.00	\$0.00
Brother's Settlement Road	VE	0	\$0.00	15	\$137.48	\$0.00
Buen Intento Road	VE	0	\$1,574.60	34	\$758.34	\$4,971.29
Caigual Road	A/D	151	\$910.00	1,150	\$12,960.00	\$0.00
Caparo Valley Brasso Road	CAR	0	\$6,141.76	2,361	\$8,381.76	\$0.00
Carmichael Road	A/D	0	\$0.00	360	\$1,440.00	\$0.00
Caroni Road	CAR	423	\$16,401.50	2,592	\$5,370.00	\$12,000.00
Caroni Savannah Road	CAR	0	\$39,610.43	813	\$8,842.25	\$40,432.00

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

NAME OF ROAD	DISTRICT	CONTRACT		EQUIPMENT		MISC. COST (\$)
		OUTPUT	COST	OUTPUT	COST	
		(M)	(\$)	(M)	(\$)	
Cedar Hill Road	CAR	737	19,428.18	7,423	16,056.25	0.00
Chaguanas Road	CAR	0	\$1,453.10	509	\$3,066.00	\$0.00
Chin Chin Road	CAR	360	\$859.44	411	\$1,150.00	\$0.00
Churchill Roosevelt Highway	GE	0	\$0.00	7,956	\$80,883.25	\$0.00
Churchill Roosevelt Highway	GW	0	\$0.00	1,672	\$39,298.00	\$0.00
Clarke Road	ST.P	254	\$13,106.54	5,220	\$13,926.00	\$0.00
Couva Railway Station Road	CAR	0	\$989.64	825	\$1,120.00	\$0.00
Cumuto Main Road	GE	0	\$0.00	3,058	\$25,271.25	\$0.00
Cunapo Junction Road	A/D	760	\$1,547.00	180	\$720.00	\$1,322.57
Cunapo Southern Road	NM	0	\$9,459.18	23,532	\$47,529.00	\$16,400.85
Cunapo Southern Road	A/D	5,838	\$12,387.00	885	\$7,920.00	\$0.00

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

NAME OF ROAD	DISTRICT	CONTRACT		EQUIPMENT		MISC. COST (\$)
		OUTPUT	COST	OUTPUT	COST	
		(M)	(\$)	(M)	(\$)	
Detvetill Street Link Road	CAR	250	\$2,282.00	60	\$11,785.00	\$0.00
Douglas Road	VE	16	\$910.00	0	\$758.34	\$8,715.29
Eastern Main Road	A/D	5,195	\$18,125.96	3,014	\$23,010.00	\$0.00
Eastern Main Road	GW	0	\$0.00	166	\$12,301.50	\$14,791.00
Endeavour Road	CAR	0	\$6,622.50	170	\$1,440.00	\$7,200.00
Erin Road	ST.P	69	\$0.00	0	\$0.00	\$0.00
Erin Road	ST.P	0	\$1,470.00	272	\$3,000.00	\$0.00
Frederick Street	VE	0	\$0.00	0	\$551.54	\$0.00
Freeport Mission Road	CAR	0	\$292.05	218	\$480.00	\$0.00
Freeport Todds Road	CAR	0	\$728.00	712	\$1,920.00	\$0.00
Fuel & Parts	VW	0	\$0.00	0	\$0.00	\$73,437.69
Fuel & Parts	A/D	0	\$0.00	0	\$0.00	\$350,644.00
Fuel & Parts	ST.P	0	\$0.00	0	\$0.00	\$349,906.00
Fullerton Road West	VW	405	\$9,666.00	0	\$0.00	\$0.00
Galera Road	A/D	0	\$95.16	0	\$828.00	\$0.00

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

NAME OF ROAD	DISTRICT	CONTRACT		EQUIPMENT		MISC. COST (\$)
		OUTPUT	COST	OUTPUT	COST	
		(M)	(\$)	(M)	(\$)	
Golden Grove Road	GE	0	\$0.00	773	\$4,054.00	\$0.00
Grand Fond Road	A/D	0	\$762.32	0	\$6,726.00	\$0.00
Guaico Tamana Road	A/D	7,370	\$13,741.00	4,339	\$13,860.50	\$0.00
Gauaracara Tabaquite Road	VW	1,990	\$2,093.00	1,990	\$3,680.00	0.00
Heights of Aripo	GE	0	\$0.00	30	0.00	\$0.00
Hindustan Road	VE	117	\$1,697.64	3,309	\$338,931.00	\$0.00
Inverness Road	VE	0	\$2,172.60	202	\$1,516.68	\$8,684.75
Jaipaulsing Road	VE	0	\$1,281.82	0	\$551.52	\$8,123.53
Kanhai Road	VW	302	\$1,588.06	302	1,680.00	\$0.00
La Fortune Pluck Road	VW	1,011	\$1,783.00	409	\$1,680.00	\$0.00
La Fortune Pluck Road	ST.P	0	\$1,170.00	697	3,500.00	\$0.00
La Lune Road	VE	1,565	\$3,652.60	0	\$2,206.08	\$10,844.94

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

NAME OF ROAD	DISTRICT	CONTRACT		EQUIPMENT		MISC. COST (\$)
		OUTPUT	COST	OUTPUT	COST	
		(M)	(\$)	(M)	(\$)	
Las Lomas # 1 Road	CAR	480	\$951.74	200	\$1,150.00	\$0.00
Lengua Road	VE	0	\$0.00	75	\$30,882.72	\$7,787.80
Link Road, Nagar Site	CAR	0	\$2,046.00	1,619	\$20,265.00	\$0.00
Long Circular Road	GW	8	\$0.00	290	\$836.58	\$0.00
Longdenville Road	CAR	0	\$0.00	303	\$1,437.50	\$0.00
Maculay Road	VW	65	\$29,436.00	1,442	\$17,485.00	\$35,892.00
Madrass Road	CAR	0	\$0.00	106	\$575.00	\$0.00
Madrass Settlement Road	CAR	0	\$215.06	500	\$1,150.00	\$0.00
Mamoral Road	CAR	0	\$6,577.79	2,668	\$20,079.71	\$0.00
Mandingo Road	VE	0	\$0.00	19	\$274.96	\$0.00
Mayaro Guayaguayare Road	NM	1,858	\$41,081.62	15,504	\$34,114.75	\$4,671.69
Mayo Road	VW	48	\$6,376.54	312	\$5,520.00	\$7,499.65
Moka	GW	0	\$0.00	120	\$557.75	\$38,611.00

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

NAME OF ROAD	DISTRICT	CONTRACT		EQUIPMENT		MISC. COST (\$)
		OUTPUT	COST	OUTPUT	COST	
		(M)	(\$)	(M)	(\$)	
Munroe Road	CAR	0	\$645.18	691	3,450.00	\$0.00
Moreau Road # 2	VE	3,060	\$4,455.00	0.00	\$0.00	\$3,105.00
Morne Coco Road	GW	0.00	\$0.00	3.15	\$557.75	\$0.00
Moruga Road	VE	3,858	\$15,798.70	34	\$4,822.94	\$43,553.64
Nagee Road	VE	0.00	\$0.00	0.00	\$551.54	\$0.00
Naparima Mayaro Road	NM	0.00	\$39,098.81	20	\$4,467.75	\$14,244.90
New Colonial Road	VW	842	\$33,635.54	1,556	\$7,475.00	\$21,489.00
New Grant District	VE	0.00	\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00	\$19,478.83
Old Southern Man Road	CAR	380	\$10,634.00	6,454	\$9,035.00	\$0.00
Orange Field Road	CAR	0	\$182.00	0	\$480.00	\$0.00
Oropouche River Road	VE	1,230	\$4,510.32	2,865	\$5,686.06	\$9,853.95
Papourie Road	VW	752	\$19,581.41	5,490	\$52,521.50	\$0.00

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

NAME OF ROAD	DISTRICT	CONTRACT		EQUIPMENT		MISC. COST (\$)
		OUTPUT	COST	OUTPUT	COST	
		(M)	(\$)	(M)	(\$)	
Paria Road	A/D	0	\$384.64	156	\$11,872.00	\$0.00
Penal Rock Road	ST.P	278	\$20,476.68	5,947	\$27,418.00	\$11,548.00
Penal Rock Road	VE	2,580	\$6,242.90	1,361	\$4,825.80	\$0.00
Perseverance Road	CAR	0	\$182.00	0	\$480.00	\$0.00
Plum Mitan Road	A/D	0	\$0.00	430	\$4,050.00	\$0.00
Plum Road	A/D	0	\$0.00	0	\$720.00	\$0.00
Princess Town Sub-District	VE	0	\$0.00	0	\$0.00	\$1,310.74
Railway Road	VE	0	\$0.00	0	\$1,171.98	\$0.00
Ravine Sable Road	CAR	0	\$0.00	1,272	\$5,600.38	\$0.00
Relize Road	VE	0	\$0.00	30	\$551.52	\$0.00
Rio Claro Guayaguayare Road	NM	0	\$113.16	1,020	\$2,530.00	\$0.00
River Estate Road	GW	0	\$0.00	900	\$766.91	\$0.00
Rochard Douglas Road	VE	883	\$7,518.34	3,475	\$12,407.96	\$10,634.77

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

NAME OF ROAD	DISTRICT	CONTRACT		EQUIPMENT		MISC. COST (\$)
		OUTPUT	COST	OUTPUT	COST	
		(M)	(\$)	(M)	(\$)	
S.S. Erin Road	ST.P	236	\$4,119.55	360	\$0.00	\$0.00
San Francique Road	ST.P	5,309	\$86,454.00	2,887	\$13,662.00	\$21,896.00
Sancho Road	VE	0	\$0.00	10	\$206.22	\$0.00
Sangre Grande Oropouche Road	A/D	2,435	\$8,801.44	3,110	\$8,590.50	\$0.00
Sierra Leone Road	GW	0	\$0.00	1,195	\$2,021.64	\$0.00
Southern Main Road	ST.P	203	\$32,389.00	0	\$0.00	\$26,480.17
Southern Main Road	CAR	0	\$45,513.75	5,918	\$18,151.88	\$39,748.00
St. Croix Road	VE	0	\$0.00	0	\$0.00	\$815.94
St. Julien Road	VE	0	\$0.00	238	\$4,196.14	\$0.00
Tabaquite Brasso Road	CAR	0	\$5,730.80	2,446	\$13,610.04	\$0.00
Tabaquite Rio Claro Road	NM	0	\$9,490.58	50,949	\$50,054.05	\$0.00

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

NAME OF ROAD	DISTRICT	CONTRACT		EQUIPMENT		MISC. COST (\$)
		OUTPUT	COST	OUTPUT	COST	
		(M)	(\$)	(M)	(\$)	
Tableland Road	VE	0	\$0.00	657	\$2,757.70	\$0.00
Toco Road	A/D	3,205	\$46,356.20	2,583	\$22,506.00	\$5,827.00
Todds Station Road	CAR	120	\$817.00	488	\$5,750.00	\$0.00
Transport Nariva Mayaro	NM	0	\$0.00	0	\$0.00	\$8,332.61
Transport Victoria East	VE	0	\$0.00	0	\$0.00	\$33,730.45
Uriah Butler Highway	CAR	0	\$0.00	1	\$143.75	\$0.00
Valencia Road	A/D	650	\$2,360.32	625	\$5,472.00	\$0.00
West Moorings	GW	24	\$0.00	540	\$3,859.50	\$0.00
Western Main Road	GW	83	\$0.00	2,550	\$6,012.89	\$0.00
Wm.Sm & Mantacool Road	VE	0	\$770.22	7	\$551.52	\$7,230.15
GRAND TOTAL		56,183	\$704,990.93	212,814	\$1,201,762.39	\$1,281,215.20

BIANNUAL REPORT 7
ROAD IMPROVEMENT FUND PROGRAMME 1997
SUMMARY

PROGRAMME	WORK DONE	COST
Paving	64.45 km	\$38,382,976.55
Patching	247,319 m ²	\$4,794,246.52
Drainage	84,974 m	\$1,234,343.50
TOTAL		\$44,411,566.57

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	AREA PATCHED m ²	MATERIAL COST \$	LABOUR COST \$	MISC. COST \$
Caigual Road	A/D	52	\$817.00	\$660.00	\$0.00
Eastern Main Road	A/D	1129	\$25,930.56	\$11,970.00	\$0.00
Fishing Pond Road	A/D	175	\$2,821.00	\$990.00	\$0.00
Guaico Tamana Road	A/D	5196	\$84,396.87	\$26,460.00	\$0.00
Plum Mitan Road	A/D	341	\$2,665.08	\$4,730.00	\$0.00
Valencia Road	A/D	307	\$1,039.86	\$2,970.00	\$0.00
Cunapo Southern Road	A/D	4950	\$70,669.88	\$30,470.00	\$0.00
Manzanilla Mayaro Road	A/D	693	\$9,603.60	\$3,960.00	\$0.00
Toco Road	A/D	1846	\$19,229.28	\$10,120.00	\$0.00

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	AREA PATCHED m ²	MATERIAL COST \$	LABOUR COST \$	MISC. COST \$
Vega De Oropouche Road	A/D	259	\$6,942.21	\$3,520.00	\$0.00
Brasso Caparo Station Road	CAR	112	\$720.00	\$471.46	\$0.00
Brasso Tamana Road	CAR	97	\$1,638.00	\$1,162.70	\$0.00
Calcutta # 1 Road	CAR	80	\$1,080.00	\$384.00	\$0.00
Calcutta # 2 Road	CAR	2295	\$32,570.00	\$10,274.90	\$0.00
Caparo River Road	CAR	422	\$6,230.51	\$3,722.56	\$0.00
Caparo Valley Brasso Road	CAR	331	\$4,124.36	\$3,890.78	\$0.00
Caroni Savannah Road	CAR	1948	\$23,030.00	\$10,924.60	\$0.00
Cedar Hill Road	CAR	1800	\$33,723.00	\$6,048.00	\$0.00
Chaguanas Road	CAR	446	\$3,265.00	\$2,397.80	\$0.00
Chickland Caparo Road	CAR	1015	\$8,106.00	\$3,916.56	\$0.00
Couva Road	CAR	2060	\$28,215.80	\$21,596.36	\$0.00
Freeport Mission Road	CAR	312	\$2,016.00	\$2,624.00	\$0.00
Guaracara Tabaquite Road	CAR	76	\$772.51	\$1,612.86	\$0.00
Jerningham Junction Road	CAR	625	\$12,567.00	\$3,014.34	\$0.00

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	AREA PATCHED m ²	MATERIAL COST \$	LABOUR COST \$	MISC. COST \$
Mamoral Road	CAR	854	\$4,443.26	\$9,532.51	\$0.00
Mayo Road	CAR	900	\$15,766.58	\$2,493.90	\$935.98
Munroe Road	CAR	225	\$795.00	\$1,146.30	\$0.00
Old Southern Main Road	CAR	80	\$1,106.00	\$570.30	\$0.00
Orange Field Road	CAR	260	\$2,441.00	\$1,412.49	\$0.00
Railway Station Road	CAR	30	\$412.00	\$192.00	\$0.00
Rivulet Road	CAR	30	\$640.00	\$192.00	\$0.00
Solomon Hochoy Highway (N & S)	CAR	160	\$2,497.00	\$1,816.40	\$0.00
Southern Main Road	CAR	313	\$3,073.20	\$2,774.78	\$0.00
Tabaquite Brasso Road	CAR	2020	\$17,163.12	\$8,856.62	\$467.99
Tabaquite Rio Claro Road	CAR	1780	\$41,176.24	\$11,262.20	\$935.98
Todds Station Road	CAR	1922	\$5,365.70	\$10,102.20	\$0.00
Pheonix Park Road	CAR	40	\$896.00	\$576.00	\$0.00
Waterloo Road	CAR	150	\$3,044.00	\$1,344.00	\$0.00
Arima Bye Pass Road	GE	693	\$886.74	\$0.00	\$0.00
Arima Blanchisseuse Road	GE	1052	\$8,746.98	\$0.00	\$0.00

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	AREA PATCHED m ²	MATERIAL COST \$	LABOUR COST \$	MISC. COST \$
Arima Old Road	GE	107	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Calvary Hil	GE	90	\$2,561.50	\$0.00	\$0.00
Carapo Road	GE	997	\$436.50	\$0.00	\$0.00
Caroni Road	GE	561	\$525.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Churchill Roosevelt Highway	GE	503	\$10,488.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Cumuto Main Road	GE	2420	\$17,539.36	\$0.00	\$0.00
Cumuto/Tumpuna Road	GE	121	\$72.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Caroni North Bank Road	GE	403	\$7,720.50	\$0.00	\$0.00
Eastern Main Road	GE	1147	\$18,880.07	\$0.00	\$0.00
Five Rivers Road	GE	333	\$168.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Heights of Aripo	GE	350	\$2,834.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Lopinot Road	GE	38	\$1,075.45	\$0.00	\$0.00
Mausica Road	GE	308	\$225.91	\$0.00	\$0.00
O'Meara Road	GE	443	\$313.48	\$0.00	\$0.00
O'Meara Ferry Road	GE	428	\$210.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Paria Main Road	GE	1509	\$6,486.11	\$0.00	\$0.00
Talparo Road	GE	379	\$228.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Tumpuna Road	GE	120	\$72.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Abbatoir Road	GW	219	\$2,337.14	\$490.00	\$0.00

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	AREA PATCHED m ²	MATERIAL COST \$	LABOUR COST \$	MISC. COST \$
Aranguuez Main Road	GW	40	\$630.00	\$2,323.88	\$0.00
Beetham Highway	GW	75	\$1,296.00	\$1,004.30	\$0.00
Blue Basin Road	GW	280	\$3,308.00	\$6,798.10	\$0.00
Churchill Roosevelt Highway	GW	106	\$1,680.00	\$4,001.58	\$0.00
Diego Martin Main Road	GW	272	\$6,621.00	\$15,460.63	\$0.00
Eastern Main Road	GW	910	\$11,583.50	\$13,886.06	\$50,144.00
El Socorro Main Road	GW	351	\$930.00	\$4,102.33	\$0.00
Lady Chancellor Road	GW	43	\$832.00	\$2,313.94	\$0.00
Long Circular Road	GW	6	\$352.00	\$1,459.00	\$0.00
Maracas Royal Road	GW	405	\$6,774.19	\$14,882.78	\$0.00
Morne Coco Road	GW	126	\$2,248.00	\$6,142.91	\$0.00
Priority Bus Route	GW	88	\$2,904.00	\$3,144.68	\$0.00
Old St. Joseph Road	GW	40	\$504.00	\$756.00	\$0.00
Saddle Road, Maraval	GW	2517	\$3,174.80	\$25,737.58	\$0.00

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	AREA PATCHED m ²	MATERIAL COST \$	LABOUR COST \$	MISC. COST \$
Sierra Leone Road	GW	788	\$9,998.00	\$9,518.43	\$0.00
Southern Main Road	GW	45	\$210.00	\$210.00	\$0.00
St. Lucien Road	GW	43	\$832.00	\$2,397.65	\$0.00
Uriah Butler Highway	GW	190	\$2,180.00	\$5,702.88	\$0.00
Western Main Road	GW	2316	\$25,849.90	\$20,542.18	\$0.00
Farm Road	GW	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Cunapo Southern Road	NM	19213	\$423,682.55	\$35,905.38	\$40,312.00
Biche Ortoire Road	NM	1763	\$9,035.80	\$7,945.21	\$1,145.72
Bros. Railway Station Road	NM	128	\$564.88	\$487.15	\$0.00
Dades Road	NM	266	\$3,692.79	\$1,871.91	\$0.00
District Wide	NM	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$50,426.27
Manzanilla Mayaro	NM	61	\$48.40	\$1,403.92	\$0.00
Mayaro Guayaguayare Road	NM	2119	\$69,231.09	\$25,174.80	\$6,194.47
Naparima Mayaro Road	NM	13974	\$198,960.54	\$57,015.45	\$14,466.89
San Pedro Road	NM	290	\$3,555.85	\$3,393.23	\$460.00

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	AREA PATCHED m ²	MATERIAL COST \$	LABOUR COST \$	MISC. COST \$
Tabaquite Rio Claro Road	NM	18380	\$320,663.63	\$63,558.51	\$16,616.03
Torrib Tabaquite Road	NM	2513	\$34,677.74	\$12,626.27	\$23,764.05
Rio Claro Guayaguayare Road	NM	1077	\$14,371.50	\$5,802.61	\$15,586.16
Clarke Road	ST. P	43	\$622.00	\$596.00	\$0.00
Erin Road	ST. P	214	\$8,007.00	\$770.00	\$119.00
Fyzabad Road	ST. P	72	\$2,068.00	\$1,393.00	\$0.00
Fyzabad Guapo Road	ST. P	104	\$3,150.00	\$1,575.00	\$0.00
Grants Road	ST. P	584	\$25,282.00	\$9,778.00	\$0.00
La Brea Road	ST. P	17	\$749.00	\$433.00	\$0.00
Mon Desir Road	ST. P	697	\$19,614.00	\$2,506.00	\$0.00
Penal Rock Road	ST. P	201	\$5,076.80	\$1,479.00	\$126.00
Rochard Road	ST. P	3862	\$113,673.00	\$23,357.00	\$15,018.00
Scotts Road	ST. P	731	\$19,282.00	\$5,160.00	\$879.00
S.S. Erin Road	ST. P	375	\$9,970.60	\$5 439.00	\$0.00
San Francique Road	ST. P	642	\$17,596.00	\$5,180.00	\$729.00
Southern Main Road	ST. P	1582	\$52,103.00	\$24,620.00	\$6,001.00
6th Company Circular Road	VE	12	\$396.72	\$192.20	\$0.00

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	AREA PATCHED m ²	MATERIAL COST \$	LABOUR COST \$	MISC. COST \$
Buen Intento Road	VE	366	\$7,009.25	\$1,921.41	\$0.00
Cumuto Road	VE	0	\$500.20	\$0.00	\$0.00
Cunjai Road	VE	10479	\$235,849.19	\$62,347.60	\$0.00
District Wide	VE	60	\$770.48	\$485.26	\$50,412.36
Douglas Road	VE	249	\$4,118.80	\$1,371.11	\$0.00
Hindustan Road	VE	773	\$4,429.70	\$4,156.99	\$0.00
Jaipaulsingh Road	VE	7282	\$232,202.42	\$46,437.02	\$0.00
Lengua Road	VE	30	\$1,179.90	\$288.00	\$0.00
Lothians Road	VE	120	\$2,702.50	\$580.00	\$0.00
Martiste Road	VE	84	\$793.44	\$390.10	\$0.00
Mc Nish Road	VE	40	\$528.96	\$390.10	\$0.00
Moruga Road	VE	5607	\$129,344.65	\$33,679.48	\$0.00
Nagee Road	VE	1888	\$19,031.55	\$8,307.32	\$0.00
Naparima Mayaro Road	VE	3988	\$83,247.39	\$17,747.34	\$0.00
Perry Road	VE	46	\$264.48	\$192.00	\$0.00
Realize Road	VE	17282	\$366,670.35	\$70,178.67	\$0.00
Robertson Road	VE	288	\$2,710.92	\$1,640.40	\$0.00
Rochard Douglas Road	VE	1350	\$29,327.90	\$5,772.78	\$0.00
Samuel Cooper Road	VE	161	\$3,639.58	\$2,502.40	\$0.00
Sancho Road	VE	907	\$15,655.56	\$5,177.15	\$0.00

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	AREA PATCHED m ²	MATERIAL COST \$	LABOUR COST \$	MISC. COST \$
Sisters Road	VE	1244	\$18,403.04	\$5,483.91	\$0.00
St.Croix Road	VE	630	\$9,715.76	\$3,533.19	\$0.00
St. Julien Road	VE	9501	\$148,506.45	\$38,922.84	\$0.00
Tableland Road	VE	420	\$4,945.93	\$1,948.80	\$153.50
Torrib Tabaquite Road	VE	7154	\$187,187.05	\$30,353.24	\$0.00
Traffic Management Branch	VE	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$500.20
Unis Road	VE	155	\$1,388.52	\$676.52	\$0.00
Whatts Road	VE	55	\$793.44	\$384.42	\$0.00
William Smith & Mantacool Road	VE	10260	\$245,299.46	\$54,703.74	\$0.00
Anne Avenue	VW	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Bonne Aventure Road	VW	604	\$14,543.68	\$5,451.00	\$0.00
Cedar Drive Marabella	VW	107	\$1,244.50	\$946.00	\$0.00
Cipero Road	VW	395	\$12,827.10	\$4,775.00	\$280.00
Cottage Road	VW	12	\$266.80	\$0.00	\$280.00
Corosal Road	VW	436	\$710.70	\$2,828.00	\$0.00
Dumfries Road	VW	126	\$4,259.55	\$2,290.00	\$0.00
Garth Road	VW	78	\$1,592.77	\$2,357.00	\$0.00
Golconda Road	VW	154	\$6,495.63	\$2,276.00	\$0.00

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	AREA PATCHED m ²	MATERIAL COST \$	LABOUR COST \$	MISC. COST \$
Guaracara Tabaquite Road	VW	4119	\$81,240.03	\$57,233.81	\$0.00
Gulf City Link Road	VW	168	\$7,679.89	\$2,588.00	\$0.00
Hermitage Road	VW	843	\$27,527.70	\$12,517.11	\$0.00
Harmony Hall Road	VW	30	\$1,860.40	\$1,060.00	\$0.00
Kahnai Road	VW	30	\$1,674.40	\$768.00	\$0.00
Manahambre	VW	24	\$1,586.05	\$383.00	\$0.00
Mayo Road	VW	701	\$13,043.20	\$7,844.41	\$0.00
Naparima Mayaro Road	VW	4,480	\$110,471.01	\$31,337.80	\$0.00
New Colonial Road	VW	1676	\$78,820.00	\$15,471.00	\$1,540.00
Pascaul Road	VW	40	\$1,115.85	\$570.00	\$0.00
Plaisance Park Industrial Estate	VW	662	\$6,897.00	\$946.00	\$0.00
Papourie Road	VW	3845	\$56,159.25	\$19,582.10	\$70.00
Phillipine Road	VW	103	\$4,194.60	\$2,889.00	\$0.00
Piparo Road	VW	0	\$0.00	\$472.00	\$0.00
Rochard Douglas Road	VW	21196	\$252,505.25	\$45,794.50	\$2,520.00
Southern Main Road	VW	676	\$22,469.95	\$5,306.00	\$0.00
St. Charles Road	VW	54	\$1,939.25	\$759.00	\$0.00
St.Croix Road	VW	404	\$7,258.50	\$4,475.55	\$480.00
Tarouba Link Road	VW	540	\$11,571.40	\$4,550.00	\$0.00
Manahambre Road	VW	28	\$1,697.05	\$568.00	\$0.00

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	AREA PATCHED m ²	MATERIAL COST \$	LABOUR COST \$	MISC. COST \$
Guaracara Tabaquite Road	VW	309	\$5,032.90	\$5,033.00	\$0.00
TOTAL		247,319	4,493,682.92	1,299,343.24	300,563.60
TOTAL EXPENDITURE = (Material Cost + Misc. Cost)					4,794,246.52

NAME OF ROAD	DISTRICT	MANPOWER		EQUIPMENT		MISC. COST (\$)
		OUTPUT	COST	OUTPUT	COST	
		(M)	(\$)	(M)	(\$)	
Caigual Road	A/D	151	\$0.00	1,150	\$12,960.00	\$0.00
Carmichael Road	A/D	0	\$0.00	360	\$1,140.00	\$0.00
Cunapo Junction Road	A/D	760	\$0.00	180	\$720.00	\$0.00
Cunapo Southern Road	A/D	7,131	\$0.00	885	\$7,920.00	\$5,827.00
Eastern Main Road	A/D	5,195	\$0.00	3,454	\$22,290.00	\$0.00
Fishing Pond Road	A/D	0	\$0.00	810	\$4,320.00	\$0.00
Fuel and Parts	A/D	0	\$0.00	0	\$0.00	\$91,853.22
Guaico Tamana Road	A/D	7,370	\$0.00	4,339	\$13,860.00	\$0.00
Paria Road	A/D	0	\$0.00	906	\$8,352.00	\$0.00
Plum Mitan Road	A/D	0	\$0.00	430	\$4,050.00	\$0.00
Sangre Grande Oropouche Road	A/D	1,900	\$0.00	3,110	\$7,762.00	\$0.00
Toco Road	A/D	3,205	\$0.00	3,383	\$20,746.00	\$19,068.02
Valencia Road	A/D	650	\$0.00	625	\$3,312.00	\$2,645.65
Brasso Chickland Road	CAR	507	\$3,497.00	0	\$0.00	\$0.00
Calcutta #1 Road	CAR	0	\$1,536.00	2,944	\$4,480.00	\$0.00

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

NAME OF ROAD	DISTRICT	MANPOWER		EQUIPMENT		MISC. COST (\$)
		OUTPUT	COST	OUTPUT	COST	
		(M)	(\$)	(M)	(\$)	
Calcutta # 2 Road	CAR	0	\$3,456.00	5,655	\$11,261.25	\$0.00
Caroni Savannah Road	CAR	18	\$15,498.96	11	\$3,489.20	\$0.00
Chin Chin Road	CAR	0	\$1,843.14	116	\$1,159.00	\$0.00
Endeavour Road	CAR	36	\$34,949.40	90	\$23,200.00	\$0.00
Jerningham Junction Road	CAR	0	\$1,843.00	131	\$1,738.80	\$0.00
Ravin Sable Road	CAR	0	\$0.00	76	\$2,789.57	\$0.00
Southern Main Road	CAR	0	\$0.00	264	\$1,731.90	\$0.00
Tabaquite Brasso Road	CAR	3,140	\$5,107.00	0	\$0.00	\$0.00
Todds Station Road	CAR	0	\$0.00	92	\$579.00	\$0.00
Waterloo Road	CAR	4,654	\$1,344.00	0	\$0.00	\$0.00
Beetham Highway	GW	0	\$0.00	289	\$16,543.82	\$0.00
Blue Basin Road	GW	0	\$0.00	2,475	\$2,788.75	\$0.00
Churchill Roosevelt Highway	GW	0	\$0.00	1,680	\$40,708.54	\$0.00
Eastern Main Road	GW	0	\$0.00	266	\$34,798.00	\$0.00
Fuel and Parts	GW	0	\$0.00	0	\$0.00	\$80,952.94
Long Circular Road	GW	0	\$0.00	190	\$15,634.00	\$0.00
Maracas Royal Road	GW	0	\$0.00	0	\$6,062.00	\$0.00
Moka	GW	0	\$0.00	100	\$3,560.25	\$0.00
Morne Coco Road	GW	0	\$0.00	240	\$26,944.67	\$0.00
North Coast Road	GW	0	\$0.00	410	\$2,788.75	\$0.00
Priority Bus Route	GW	0	\$0.00	200	\$2,944.00	\$0.00
Sierra Leone Road	GW	0	\$0.00	1,285	\$2,788.56	\$0.00

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

NAME OF ROAD	DISTRICT	MANPOWER		EQUIPMENT		MISC. COST (\$)
		OUTPUT	COST	OUTPUT	COST	
		(M)	(\$)	(M)	(\$)	
Western Main Road	GW	0	\$0.00	2,982	\$19,699.50	\$0.00
Mayaro Guayaguayare Road	NM	0	\$10,990.66	0	\$2,070.00	\$19,470.28
Naparima Mayaro Road	NM	0	\$5,965.95	0	\$0.00	\$26,269.88
Fuel and Parts	NM	0	\$0.00	0	\$0.00	\$10,393.70
Columbia Road	ST.P	6	\$5,725.00	0	\$0.00	\$778.00
Erin Road	ST.P	2	\$4,971.00	0	\$0.00	\$3,760.00
La Fortune Pluck Road	ST.P	14	\$3,035.00	330	\$4,400.00	\$14,010.00
Penal Roack Road	ST.P	31	\$55,393.00	0	\$1,440.00	\$41,301.13
Railway Station Road	ST.P	42	\$4,556.00	0	\$0.00	\$2,108.00
San Francique Road	ST.P	133	\$21,767.00	0	\$0.00	\$12,952.00
Southern Main Road	ST.P	10	\$2,599.00	225	\$6,579.00	\$10,220.00
Jaipaulsingh Road	VE	0	\$4,848.50	0	\$2,412.99	\$0.00
Lengua Road	VE	0	\$0.00	0	\$1,378.80	\$0.00
Naparima Mayaro Road	VE	0	\$0.00	0	\$0.00	\$7,864.00
Railway Road	VE	0	\$0.00	0	\$1,378.80	\$0.00
Fuel and Parts	VE	0	\$0.00	0	\$0.00	\$3,989.42
Hermitage Road	VW	96	\$28,507.47	2,080	\$5,200.00	\$28,156.88
Garth Road	VW	0	\$25,192.00	0	\$7,430.00	\$14,428.43
Guaracara Tabaquite Troad	VW	10	\$7,620.00	0	\$0.00	\$1,639.00
Southern Main Road	VW	0	\$3,048.20	1,409	\$2,600.00	\$0.00
Lengua Compound	VW	7	\$654.00	0	\$560.00	\$2,487.00
Maculay Road	VW	0	\$306.00	125	\$520.00	\$17,533.00

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

NAME OF ROAD	DISTRICT	MANPOWER		EQUIPMENT		MISC. COST (\$)
		OUTPUT	COST	OUTPUT	COST	
		(M)	(\$)	(M)	(\$)	
Mayo Road	VW	84	\$23,728.10	0	\$0.00	\$13,135.20
New Colonial Road	VW	1,474	\$52,156.91	76	\$4,700.00	\$42,105.40
S.S. Erin Road	VW	0	\$21,055.50	0	\$1,560.00	\$22,079.41
St. Croix Road	VW	45	\$1,545.00	0	\$0.00	\$0.00
Rochard Road	ST.P	2,432	\$4,031.00	2,498	\$2,944.00	\$4,251.00
TOTAL		39,103	\$356,769.79	49,871	\$378,295.15	\$499,278.56
TOTAL EXPENDITURE						\$1,234,343.50

NAME OF ROAD	DISTRICT	AREA PAVED m ²	MATERIAL COST \$	LABOUR COST \$	TOTAL
Manzanilla Mayaro Road	NM	0	\$483.00	\$0.00	\$483.00
Naparima Mayaro Road	NM	70	\$390,788.59	\$88,246.20	\$479,034.79
Tabaquite Rio Claro Road	NM	65	\$344,484.80	\$144,216.60	\$488,701.40
Bridges Maintenance	ST. P	0	\$56,994.00	\$0.00	\$56,994.00
Erin Road	ST. P	60	\$1,367,682.00	\$580,598.00	\$1,948,280.00
Fyzabad Road	ST. P	100	\$503,076.00	\$0.00	\$503,076.00
Fyzabad Guapo Road	ST. P	5	\$282,843.00	\$62,100.00	\$344,943.00
Grants Road	ST. P	10	\$10,767.00	\$0.00	\$10,767.00
Guapo Cap-de-Ville Road	ST. P	90	\$655,521.00	\$451,796.00	\$1,107,317.00
La Brea Road	ST. P	75	\$14,275.00	\$7,360.00	\$21,635.00
La Fortune Pluck Road	ST. P	80	\$573,629.00	\$31,235.00	\$604,864.00
Penal Rock Road	ST. P	25	\$65,895.00	\$95,225.00	\$161,120.00
Rochard Road	ST. P	80	\$778,135.00	\$248,180.00	\$1,026,315.00

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

NAME OF ROAD	DISTRICT	AREA PAVED m ²	MATERIAL COST \$	LABOUR COST \$	TOTAL
Scotts Road	ST. P	10	\$8,280.00	\$24,955.00	\$33,235.00
San Francique Road	ST. P	15	\$168,316.00	\$61,893.00	\$230,209.00
Southern Main Road	ST. P	70 (10)	\$759,308.00	\$56,075.00	\$815,383.00
Miscellaneous Cost	ST. P		\$232,049.00	\$0.00	\$232,049.00
Cunjai Road	VE	75	\$254,883.10	\$46,009.20	\$300,892.30
Jaiipaulsingh Road	VE	50	\$307,541.75	\$40,935.40	\$348,477.15
Moruga Road	VE	80 (60)	\$323,066.75	\$22,107.60	\$345,174.35
Nagee Road	VE	8	\$8,594.82	\$0.00	\$8,594.82
Naparima Mayaro Road	VE	80 (35)	\$661,470.06	\$23,220.80	\$684,690.86
Peal Rock Road	VE	1	\$9,016.00	\$0.00	\$9,016.00
Princes Town Car Park	VE	100	\$141,693.74	\$0.00	\$141,693.74
Railway Road	VE	5	\$24,116.65	\$0.00	\$24,116.65
Realize Road	VE	65	\$224,998.57	\$59,770.10	\$284,768.67
Rochard Douglas Road	VE	10	\$72,329.30	\$6,900.00	\$79,229.30
Sisters Road	VE	5	\$14,603.85	\$11,385.00	\$25,988.85
St. Julien Road	VE	85	\$109,787.74	\$13,800.00	\$123,587.74
Torrib Tabaquite Road	VE	50	\$830,495.50	\$45,931.40	\$876,426.90
William Smitth & Mantacool Road	VE	45	\$101,407.60	\$26,450.00	\$127,857.60
Bonne Aventure Road	VW	72	\$220,110.57	\$95,717.40	\$315,827.97
Dumfries Road	VW	52	\$70,544.05	\$73,265.00	\$143,809.05
Garth Road	VW	15	\$39,764.53	\$25,760.00	\$65,524.53
Guaracara Tabaquite Road	VW	6 (10)	\$247,403.62	\$196,139.40	\$443,543.02
Hermitage Road	VW	52 (10)	\$318,975.08	\$154,235.90	\$473,210.98
Hoseinee Trace	VW	40	\$174,683.58	\$30,043.75	\$204,727.33

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

NAME OF ROAD	DISTRICT	AREA PAVED m ²	MATERIAL COST \$	LABOUR COST \$	TOTAL
Manahambre Road	VW	12	\$3,558.00	\$21,809.40	\$25,367.40
Mayo Road	VW	5	\$0.00	\$12,821.00	\$12,821.00
Naparima Mayaro Road	VW	6	\$48,770.00	\$5,600.00	\$54,370.00
New Colonial Road	VW	30	\$152,479.82	\$139,512.50	\$291,992.32
Papourie Road	VW	15	\$173,829.95	\$286,459.24	\$460,289.19
Phillipine Road	VW	2	\$24,245.00	\$22,505.50	\$0.00
Rochard Douglas Road	VW	40	\$757,799.67	\$280,505.50	\$1,038,305.17
S.S. Erin Road	VW	5	\$13,055.87		\$13,055.87
Southern Main Road	VW	100	\$1,002,407.12		\$1,002,407.12
South Trunk Road	VW	50	\$73,451.76	\$51,006.24	\$124,458.00
Solomon Hochoy Highway (N & S)	VW	2(2)	\$5,540.00	\$20,976.00	\$26,516.00
Miscellaneous Cost	VW		\$83,952.65	\$92,150.30	\$176,102.95
TOTAL			\$33,926,844.12		

Miscellaneous Cost represents costs for parts and for equipment rental

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	% COMP.	MATERIAL COST \$	EQUIPMENT COST \$	TOTAL COST \$
Caigual Road	A/D	20	14,196.00	129,176.00	143,372.00
Plum Mitan Road	A/D	100	1,955,370.00	44,440.00	1,999,810.00
Cunapo Southern Road	A/D	75	399,619.92	134,943.00	534,562.92
Toco Road	A/D	10	9,479.50	67,850.00	77,329.50
Fishing Pond Road	A/D	0	149,238.86	0.00	149,238.86
Adjodha Road	CAR	100	222,712.00		222,712.00
Brassa Caparo Station Road	CAR	100	350,972.20		350,972.20

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	% COMP.	MATERIAL COST \$	EQUIPMENT COST \$	TOTAL COST \$
Brasso Station Road	CAR	100	346,260.00		346,260.00
Brasso Tabaquite Road	CAR	100	410,078.00		410,078.00
Calcutta #2 Road	CAR	100	609,506.47		609,506.47
California Railway Road	CAR	100	138,600.00		138,600.00
Caparo Valley Brasso Road	CAR	100	237,360.00		237,360.00
Caparo Valley Road	CAR	100	634,328.00		634,328.00
Carli Bay Road	CAR	100	125,405.20		125,405.20
Chin Chin Road	CAR	100	198,196.00		198,196.00
Couva River Bay Road	CAR	100	154,146.76		154,146.76
Couva Road	CAR	100	401,600.00		401,600.00
Freeport Mission Road	CAR	100	247,250.00		247,250.00
Freeport Todds Road	CAR	100	61,134.00		61,134.00
Jerningham Junction Road	CAR	100	262,325.40		262,325.40
Mayo Road	CAR	100	256,483.14		256,483.14
Milton Road	CAR	100	178,000.00		178,000.00
<i>Miscellaneous Cost</i>	<i>CAR</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>618,656.00</i>		<i>618,656.00</i>
Old Southern Main Road	CAR	100	318,458.00		318,458.00
Orange Field Road	CAR	100	251,482.29		251,482.29
Perseverance Road	CAR	100	337,842.00		337,842.00
Pheonix Park Road	CAR	100	71,327.95		71,327.95
Rivulet Road	CAR	100	339,200.00		339,200.00
Solomon Hochoy Highway (N & S)	CAR	100	1,612,864.45		1,612,864.45

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	% COMP.	MATERIAL COST \$	EQUIPMENT COST \$	TOTAL COST \$
Tabaquite Brasso Road	CAR	100	510,874.00		510,874.00
Tabaquite Rio Claro Road	CAR	100	1,082,955.46		1,082,955.46
Uriah Butler Highway (SB)	CAR	100	627,612.50		627,612.50
Warren Road	CAR	100	660,180.00		660,180.00
Waterloo Road	CAR	100	1,160,239.92		1,160,239.92
Arima Bye pass Road	GE	5	4,370.00		4,370.00
Arima Blanchisseuse Road	GE	10	29,693.00		29,693.00
Arima Old Road	GE	5	41,906.00		41,906.00
Aripo Road	GE	20	38,456.00		38,456.00
Caura Road	GE	40	8,740.00		8,740.00
Churchill Roosevelt-Highway	GE	100	20,930.00		20,930.00

**BIANNUAL REPORT NO. 8
PAVING PROGRAMME**

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	% COMP.	DESCRIPTION OF WORKS	TOTAL COST
Anglais Road	A/D	100	Strengthening & Paving	512,684.24
Caigual Road	A/D	40	Strengthening & Paving	972,883.70
Plum Mitan Road	A/D	100	Upgrading & Paving	1,657,490.15
Cunapo Southern Road	A/D	100	Upgrading & Paving	534,562.92
Toco Road	A/D	100	Strengthening & Paving	343,631.10
Fishing Pond Road	A/D	55	Strengthening & Paving	476,454.68
Paria Road	A/D	100	Strengthening & Paving	1,018,215.61

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	% COMP.	DESCRIPTION OF WORKS	TOTAL COST
Guaico Tamana Road	A/D	38	Strengthening	142,070.76
Valencia Road	A/D	100	Strengthening & Paving	123,810.50
Sub Total				5,781,803.66
Adjodha Road	CAR	100	Strengthening & Paving	222,511.20
Brasso Caparo Station Road	CAR	100	Strengthening & Paving	336,260.00
Calcutta #2 Road	CAR	100	Strengthening & Paving	640,049.39
California Railway Road	CAR	100	Strengthening & Paving	142,324.00
Caparo Valley Brasso Road	CAR	100	Strengthening & Paving	1,302,254.41
Carli Bay Road	CAR	100	Strengthening	125,405.20
Caroni Savannah Road	CAR	100	Strengthening & Paving	5,404.60
Cedar Hill Road	CAR	100	Resurfacing	321,159.70
Chaguanas Main Road	CAR	100	Resurfacing	144,095.00
Chase Village Ramp & SMR Link	CAR	100	Resurfacing	242,880.00
Chickland Caparo Road	CAR	100	Strengthening & Paving	10,480.00
Chin Chin Road	CAR	100	Strengthening & Paving	475,972.80
Couva River Bay Road	CAR	100	Rehabilitation & Paving	120,252.40
Couva Road	CAR	100	Resurfacing	511,706.30
Endeavour Road	CAR	100	Strengthening	11,025.00
Freeport Mission Road	CAR	100	Spot Paving	247,250.00
Jerningham Junction Road	CAR	100	Strengthening & Paving	457,636.36
Mayo Road	CAR	100	Strengthening & Paving	237,360.00
Munroe Road	CAR	100	Strengthening	13,050.20

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	% COMP.	DESCRIPTION OF WORKS	TOTAL COST
Old Southern Main Road	CAR	100	Strengthening & Paving	205,850.00
Orange Field Road	CAR	100	Strengthening & Paving	640,285.00
Perseverance Road	CAR	100	Rehabilitation & Resurfacing	164,650.00
Ravine Sable Road	CAR	100	Strengthening & Spot Paving	132,462.75
Rivulet Road	CAR	100	Strengthening	57,464.08
Solomon Hochoy Highway (N & S)	CAR	100	Resurfacing & Paving	1,323,847.00
Southern Main Road	CAR	100	Strengthening & Resurfacing	53,786.75
Tabaquite Brasso Road	CAR	100	Strengthening & Resurfacing	715,983.03
Tabaquite Rio Claro Road	CAR	100	Strengthening & Resurfacing	791,496.00
Uriah Butler Highway (SB)	CAR	100	Resurfacing	1,203,404.00
Warren Road	CAR	100	Strengthening & Paving	626,133.14
Waterloo Road	CAR	100	Rehabilitation & Paving	1,096,881.85
• Caroni silver Bridge	CAR	100	Special Project (Bridge)	972,018.18
• Freeman Road	CAR	100	Special Project (Paving)	2,067,488.75
<i>Miscellaneous Cost</i>	CAR			253,390.69
<i>Sub Total</i>				<i>15,572,227.78</i>

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	% COMP.	DESCRIPTION OF WORKS	TOTAL COST
Arima Bye Pass Road	GE	5	Road Rehabilitation	4,370.00
Arima Blanchisseuse Road	GE	12	Road Rehabilitation	39,993.00
Arima Old Road	GE	10	Road Rehabilitation	69,600.00
Aripo Road	GE	20	Road Rehabilitation	38,456.00
Caura Road	GE	40	Road Rehabilitation	8,740.00
Churchill Roosevelt-Highway	GE	100	Road Rehabilitation	20,930.00
Cumuto Main Road	GE	20	Road Rehabilitation	583,580.00
Caroni North Bank Road	GE	100	Road Rehabilitation	182,551.00
Eastern Main Road	GE	5	Road Rehabilitation	242,650.00
Gunapo Road	GE	20	Road Rehabilitation	43,700.00
La Baja North	GE	10	Road Rehabilitation	23,598.00
Lopinot Road	GE	100	Road Rehabilitation	26,220.00
Mausica Road	GE	20	Road Rehabilitation	22,701.00
• Macoya Road Extension	GE	90	Special Project (Road Construction)	1,946,767.33
Paria Main Road	GE	20	Road Rehabilitation	54,165.00
Paria Morne Bleu Road	GE	12	Road Rehabilitation	25,228.00
Talparo Mundo Nuevo Road	GE	75	Road Rehabilitation	1,194,219.00
Tumpuna Road	GE	100	Road Rehabilitation	52,222.00
Tamana Road	GE	20	Road Rehabilitation	21,838.50
Talparo Road	GE	25	Road Rehabilitation	45,770.00
<i>Miscellaneous Cost</i>				2,168,867.45
<i>Sub Total</i>				6,816,166.28

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	% COMP.	DESCRIPTION OF WORKS	TOTAL COST
• St. Anns Roundabout	GW	85	Special Project (Road Construction)	558,460.00
• Churchill Roosevelt Highway	GW	40	Special Project (Widening Highway)	4,172,610.00
Eastern Main Road	GW	100	Road Resurfacing	539,320.91
Second Street	GW	100	Road Resurfacing	145,705.00
Saddle Road, Maraval	GW	100	Road Resurfacing	333,040.00
Knaggs Hill	GW	40	Special Project (Repairs to Surface)	99,790.00
North Coast Road	GW	60	Road Rehabilitation	96,253.00
<i>Miscellaneous Cost</i>	GW			<i>113,487.00</i>
<i>Sub Total</i>				<i>6,058,665.91</i>
Cunapo Southern Road	NM		Strengthening & Paving	2,232,937.57
Manzanilla Mayaro Road	NM		Road Rehabilitation	4,067.58
Mayaro Guayaguayare Road	NM		Road Rehabilitation	469,549.60
Naparima Mayaro Road	NM		Road Rehabilitation	740,824.48
Tabaquite Rio Claro Road	NM		Road Rehabilitation	667,813.65
Biche Otoire Road	NM		Road Rehabilitation	17,715.90
Rio Guayaguayare Road	NM		Road Rehabilitation	19,453.50
Dades Road	NM		Road Rehabilitation	64,617.84
San Pedro	NM		Road Rehabilitation	20,492.16
Torrib Tabaquite Road	NM		Road Rehabilitation	41,443.54
Brothers Railway Station Road	NM		Road Rehabilitation	7,488.34

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	% COMP.	DESCRIPTION OF WORKS	TOTAL COST
Tabaquite Nariva Road	NM		Road Rehabilitation	10,534.92
<i>Miscellaneous Cost</i>	<i>NM</i>			<i>264,115.63</i>
<i>Sub Total</i>				<i>4,561,054.71</i>
Erin Road	St. P	90	Strengthening & Resurfacing	3,082,846.00
Fyzabad Road	St. P	100	Strengthening & Resurfacing	847,189.00
Fyzabad Guapo Road	St. P	80	Strengthening & Resurfacing	599,835.00
Grants Road	St. P	90	Strengthening & Resurfacing	10,768.00
Guapo Cap-de-Ville Road	St. P	100	Strengthening & Resurfacing	1,499,467.00
La Brea Road	St. P	100	Strengthening & Resurfacing	42,693.00
La Fortune Pluck Road	St. P	100	Strengthening & Resurfacing	3,280,999.00
Penal Rock Road	St. P	40	Strengthening & Resurfacing	252,325.00
Rochard Road	St. P	95	Strengthening & Resurfacing	798,761.00
Scotts Road	St. P	90	Strengthening & Resurfacing	76,678.00
San Francique Road	St. P	50	Strengthening & Resurfacing	201,697.00
Southern Main Road	St. P	75	Strengthening	1,709,857.00
Mon Desir Road	St. P		Strengthening	4,683.00
<i>Miscellaneous Cost (Bridges)</i>	<i>St. P</i>			<i>492,266.00</i>
<i>Sub Total</i>				<i>12,900,064.00</i>

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	% COMP.	DESCRIPTION OF WORKS	TOTAL COST
Cunjaj Road	VE		Road Rehabilitation	498,997.47
Jaipaulsingh Road	VE	95	Road Rehabilitation	915,511.26
Moruga Road	VE	80	Road Rehabilitation	223,148.44
Naggee Road	VE	8	Road Rehabilitation	25,087.89
Naparima Mayaro Road	VE	100	Road Rehabilitation	987,212.74
Penal Rock Road	VE	2	Road Rehabilitation	9,559.16
Princes Town Car Park	VE	100	Road Rehabilitation	141,693.74
Realize Road	VE	95	Road Rehabilitation	1,024,648.88
Rochard Douglas Road	VE	15	Road Rehabilitation	209,494.24
Sisters Road	VE	5	Road Rehabilitation	64,088.44
St. Julien Road	VE		Road Rehabilitation	148,126.45
Torrib Tabaquite Road	VE	90	Road Rehabilitation	1,646,987.06
William Smith & Mantacool Road	VE	65	Road Rehabilitation	448,372.41
Buen Intento Road	VE		Road Rehabilitation	8,188.05
Douglas Road	VE		Road Rehabilitation	4,188.80
Lengua Road	VE		Road Rehabilitation	4,671.30
Lothians Road	VE		Road Rehabilitation	5,405.00
Sancho Road	VE		Road Rehabilitation	18,577.08
St. Croix Road	VE		Road Rehabilitation	60,940.20
6 th Company Circular Road	VE		Road Rehabilitation	6,985.56
Hindustan Road	VE		Road Rehabilitation	6,692.66
Martise Road	VE		Road Rehabilitation	1,469.52
Mc Nish Road	VE		Road Rehabilitation	528.96
Perry Road	VE		Road Rehabilitation	25,087.89

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	% COMP.	DESCRIPTION OF WORKS	TOTAL COST
North Road	VE		Road Rehabilitation	8,670.42
Robertson Road	VE		Road Rehabilitation	7,828.00
Samuel Cooper Road	VE		Road Rehabilitation	6,275.88
Tableland Road	VE		Road Rehabilitation	5,846.93
Unis Road	VE		Road Rehabilitation	3,200.76
Whatts Road	VE		Road Rehabilitation	4,995.82
Fredrick Road	VE		Road Rehabilitation	225.36
Fredrick 3 rd Br	VE		Road Rehabilitation	1,244.16
Cumuto Road	VE		Road Rehabilitation	500.20
<i>Miscellaneous Cost</i>	VE			<i>132,479.08</i>
<i>Sub Total</i>				<i>6,656,929.81</i>
Bonne Aventure Road	VW	72	Strengthening & Resurfacing	354,796.87
Dumfries Road	VW	52	Strengthening & Resurfacing	143,809.05
Garth Road	VW	15	Strengthening & Resurfacing	121,087.93
Guaracara Tabaquite Road	VW	10(6)	Strengthening & Resurfacing	593,652.52
Hermitage Road	VW	52	Strengthening & Resurfacing	636,295.26
Hoseinee Trace	VW	40	Strengthening & Resurfacing	229,521.33
Kanhai Road	VW		Strengthening & Resurfacing	5,502.75
Manahambre Road	VW	12	Strengthening & Resurfacing	25,367.40
Mayo Road	VW	5	Strengthening & Resurfacing	132,939.30

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	% COMP.	DESCRIPTION OF WORKS	TOTAL COST
Naparima Mayaro Road	VW	6	Strengthening & Resurfacing	64,189.56
New Colonial Road	VW	30	Strengthening & Resurfacing	409,159.45
Papourie Road	VW	15	Strengthening & Resurfacing	581,138.19
Phillipine Road	VW	2	Strengthening & Resurfacing	64,310.50
Reform Road	VW		Strengthening & Resurfacing	26,355.00
Rochard Douglas Road	VW	40	Strengthening & Resurfacing	1,353,616.20
San Fernando Bye pass	VW		Strengthening & Resurfacing	96,684.14
S. S. Erin Road	VW	5	Strengthening & Resurfacing	44,790.26
Southern Main Road	VW	100	Strengthening & Resurfacing	1,002,407.00
South Trunk Road	VW	50	Strengthening & Resurfacing	124,458.00
Solomon Hochoy Highway (N & S)	VW	2(2)	Strengthening & Resurfacing	77,963.50
St. Croix Road	VW		Strengthening & Resurfacing	50,202.00
M2 Tasker Road (Caroni Limited)	VW		Special Project (Strengthening & Paving)	2,221,904.00
<i>Miscellaneous Cost</i>				<i>354,622.47</i>
<i>Sub Total</i>				<i>8,714,772.68</i>
TOTAL				67,061,684.83

Miscellaneous Cost represents costs for parts and for equipment rental.

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

**SPECIAL PROJECTS DONE UNDER THE
ROAD IMPROVEMENT FUND PROGRAMME**

DISTRICT	PROJECT	COST TO DATE	WORK DONE TO DATE (km)	REMARKS
St. George West	St. Anns Roundabout	558,460.00	0.5	Beautification Works in progress
	Churchill Roosevelt Highway	4,172,610.00	5 (both sides)	Project to be done in 6 Phases
	Knaggs Hill	99,790.00	0.5	Ongoing
St. George East	Macoya Road Extension	1,946,767.83	0.2	Completed
Caroni	Caroni Sliver Bridge	972,018.18		Completed
	Freeman Road	2,067,488.75	2.2	Completed
Victoria West	M2 Tasker Road	2,221,904.00	4.7	Ongoing
TOTAL		\$12,039,038.26	13.1	

AGUA SANTA

Purchasing of Material for the production of Hot and Cold Asphalt Mix and Road Mix Concrete

ITEM	AMOUNT	REMARKS
Release to date	1,763,000.00	For Distribution to the following Districts:
Actual Expenditure to Date	1,762,684.00	Caroni, St. George West, St. George East
Outstanding	1,038,975.00	St. Andrew/St. David, Victoria East
Total Expenditure	2,801,659.00	Nariva Mayaro, Victoria West and St. Patrick

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

HEAD OFFICE

The Sum of \$408,340.00 was used to meet expenditure for the training of Supervisors and Civil Engineers and the Award Ceremony.

Release	\$408,340.00
Expenditure	\$408,340.00

Programme	Work done	Expenditure
Paving	24.59 km	\$13,687,742.05
Patching	0.611 km	\$1,350,246.06
Drainage	24,678m	\$983,712.71
TOTAL		\$16,021,700.82

Item	Cost
Previous Year Expenditure 1997	\$10,251,188.00
Jammat Site Lighting	\$133,000.00
TOTAL	\$10,384,188.00

Item	Expenditure
1998 R.I.F.P. Programme	\$16,021,700.82
Other Expenditure	\$10,384,188.00
GRAND TOTAL	\$26,405,888.82

PAVING & PATCHING PROGRAMME

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED KM	TOTAL COST \$	REMARKS
Bourg Mulatress	GW	Restoration of Bailey Bridge		12,700.00	

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED KM	TOTAL COST \$	REMARKS
Mt. Hololo	GW	Restoration of Bailey Bridge		1,200.00	
Saddle Road (Moka)	GW	Construction of R.M. Wall		14,595.76	
Morne Coco Road	GW	Construct suspend sidewalk		9,832.20	
St. Lucien Road	GW	Construction of footpath		0.00	
Santa Cruz	GW	Construction of footpath		38,866.93	
Pashley Street	GW	Reconstruction of footpath		2,460.00	
Paramin Road	GW	Erecting of mass retaining wall		42,531.69	
Mucurapo Road	GW	Construction to Access Road		206,273.20	
El Socorro Road	GW	Construction of footpath		2,461.49	
K.M. Post Exercise	GW	Construct and place K.M. post		24,000.00	
Picton Road	GW	Construction of footpath		4,923.00	
Saddle Road (Santa Cruz)	GW	Construction of footpath		27,943.81	
Barataria Interchange	GW	Construction Work		0.00	
North Coast Road	GW	Preliminary Work		83,904.96	
Sam Boucard	GW	Cleaning river		9,384.00	
Paxvale	GW	Cleaning river		7,820.00	
Perseverance & Saddle Junc.	GW	Cleaning river		4,692.00	
Morne Coco Junction	GW	Cleaning river		3,128.00	

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED KM	TOTAL COST \$	REMARKS
Barataria Junction	GW	Cleaning river		3,128.00	
Sub-Total			0.00	499,845.04	
Heights of Aripo Road	GE	Rehabilitation of Roadway and reconstruction of culverts	0.118	259,487.00	
Yarra River	GE	Construction of Retaining Wall and reinstating roadway	0.008	17,633.00	
RIF District Wide	GE	Purchase of parts and road patching material	0.036	79,235.00	
Sub-Total			0.162	356,355.00	
Caigual Road	A/D	Painting of guidelines	}	5,082.00	
Fishing Pond Road	A/D	Painting of guidelines			
Toco Road	A/D	Repairs to guard & hand rails	}	20,000.00	
Paria Road	A/D	Repairs to guard & hand rails			
Paria Road	A/D	Patching	}	60,000.00	
San Grande Oropouche Road	A/D	Patching			
Fishing Pond Road	A/D	Patching			
Cunapo Southern Road	A/D	Patching	0.033		

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED KM	TOTAL COST \$	REMARKS
Transport Division	A/D	Purchase of fuel		15,000.00	
Sub-Total			0.033	100,082.00	
Freeman Road Extension	CAR	Construction of roadway	2.560	185,190.25	Strengthening
Calcutta #2	CAR	Construction of roadway	1.000	366,675.20	Strengthening & Paving Comp. of Bridge B1/1
Uriah Butler Highway	CAR	Construction of roadway	1.000	1,088,140.63	
Rivulet Road	CAR	Construction of roadway	4.700	874,132.25	Strengthening & Paving
Mamoral Road	CAR	Construction of roadway	1.000	111,596.23	Strengthening & Paving
Todds Station Road	CAR	Construction of roadway	2.070	318,528.15	Strengthening & Paving
Munroe Road	CAR	Construction of roadway	1.860	396,416.50	Strengthening & Paving
Caparo Valley Brasso Road	CAR	Construction of roadway	3.050	480,756.50	Strengthening & Paving
Caparo River Road	CAR	Construction of roadway	1.760	396,876.50	Strengthening & Paving
Brasso Caparo Station Road	CAR	Construction of roadway	1.250	220,800.00	Strengthening & Paving

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED KM	TOTAL COST \$	REMARKS
Caroni Savannah Road	CAR	Spotting and Patching	0.200	57,781.06	
Solomon Hochoy Highway	CAR	Repairs to cylinder crossing	0.000	16,828.87	1 only
Freeport Mission Road	CAR	Repairs to cylinder crossing	0.000	56,503.18	1 only
Sub-Total			20.450	4,570,225.32	
Cipero Road	VW	Strengthening & Paving	0.964	1,405,977.00	
Bonne Aventure Road	VW	Patching	0.036	123,892.00	
Reform Road	VW	Patching	0.018	64,840.00	
Mayo Road	VW	Patching	0.027	60,017.00	
Guaracara Tabaquite Road	VW	Spot Paving and Patching	0.045	78,502.00	
M2 Ring Road	VW	Road Rehabilitation	0.727	1,008,680.00	
Papourie Road	VW	Strengthening & Paving	0.436	680,886.00	
South Trunk Road	VW	Strengthening & Paving	0.273	187,494.00	
Palmiste Road	VW	Patching	0.005	26,585.00	
S.S. Erin Road	VW	Patching	0.018	43,640.00	
Bye Pass Tarouba Link Road	VW	Strengthening & Patching	0.005	42,913.00	
Southern Main Road	VW	Strengthening & Patching	0.011	55,579.00	
Morne Roche Quarry Road	VW	Patching	0.036	18,671.00	

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED KM	TOTAL COST \$	REMARKS
Golconda Road	VW	Strengthening & Patching	0.109	697,900.00	
Hermitage Road	VW	Patching	0.010	21,270.00	
New Colonial Road	VW	Patching	0.010	21,270.00	
St. Croix Road	VW	Patching	0.034	47,379.00	
Mechanical Repairs	VW			13,101.00	
Sub-Total			2.765	4,598,596.00	
Scotts Road	St.P	Strengthening, Resurfacing & Patching	0.027	126,348.00	
San Francique Road	St.P	Strengthening, Resurfacing & Patching	0.009	179,465.00	
Clarke Road	St.P	Strengthening, Resurfacing & Patching	0.032	296,218.00	
Penal Rock Road	St.P	Strengthening, Resurfacing & Patching	0.033	373,235.00	
Southern Main Road	St.P	Strengthening, Resurfacing & Patching	0.049	332,292.00	
Mon Desir Road	St.P	Strengthening, Resurfacing & Patching	0.009	48,314.00	
Mon Desir Delhi Road	St.P	Strengthening, Resurfacing & Patching	0.009	46,690.00	
Grants Road	St.P	Strengthening, Resurfacing & Patching	0.014	160,308.00	

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED KM	TOTAL COST \$	REMARKS
Rochard Road	St.P	Strengthening, Resurfacing & Patching	0.014	167,679.00	
La Brea Village Road	St.P	Strengthening, Resurfacing & Patching	0.007	60,300.00	
Southern Main Road	St.P	Strengthening, Resurfacing & Patching	0.004	39,790.00	
Morne Diablo Quarry Road	St.P	Strengthening, Resurfacing & Patching	0.014	98,673.00	
Penal Quinam Road	St.P	Strengthening, Resurfacing & Patching	0.011	24,840.00	
Erin Road	St.P	Strengthening, Resurfacing & Patching	0.011	16,990.00	
Millington Road (Orphan Road)	St.P	Strengthening, Resurfacing & Patching	0.109	498,231.00	
M2 Ring Road	St.P	Patching	0.009	9,971.00	
Road to S.M. Road La Romain M2 Tasker - Ghandi Village - La Fortune Pluck Road	St.P	Rehabilitation of Roadway Strengthening, Resurfacing & Patching	0.027	75,855.00	
M2 Tasker - La Fortune Pluck	St.P	Rehabilitation of Roadway	0.727	2,230,277.00	
Road to South Trunk Road		Strengthening, Resurfacing & Patching			
Railway Road	St.P	Patching	0.005	6,707.00	
Parts	St.P			614.00	

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED KM	TOTAL COST \$	REMARKS
Miscellaneous	St.P			264.00	
Sub-Total			1.119	4,793,061.00	
Moruga Road	VE	Spot Sealing	0.036	33,028.00	
Naparima Mayaro Road	VE	Spot Sealing	0.018	17,443.20	
Transport Section	VE	Spot Sealing		9,997.05	
Sub-Total			0.055	60,468.25	
Tabaquite Rio Claro Road	N/M	Spot Sealing	0.036	3,059.00	
Torrib Tabaquite Road	N/M	Spot Sealing	0.029	2,185.00	
Naparima Mayaro Road	N/M	Spot Sealing	0.347	12,454.50	
Mayaro Guayaguayare Road	N/M	Spot Sealing	0.019	2,185.00	
Cunapo Southern Road	N/M	Spot Sealing	0.135	24,472.00	
Transport Section	N/M	Purchase of Fuel		15,000.00	
Sub-Total			0.567	59,355.50	

Paving **24.54** 13,687,742.05
Patching **0.611** 1,350,246.06
TOTAL **25.15** 15,037,988.11

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

DRAINAGE PROGRAMME

NAME OF WATER COURSE	DISTRICT		TOTAL COST (\$)	REMARKS
Waterloo Road	CAR	1,305	17,464.00	Not included in original Programme
Calcutta #2 Road	CAR	600	25,524.36	
Miscellaneous	CAR		142,182.20	
Sub-Total		24,678.00	855,402.36	
VAT			128,310.35	
TOTAL EXPENDITURE			983,712.71	
Triangle River (Diane River)	CAR	4,013	132,429.00	Cleared an additional 1,013m to reach cut off point
Chase Village Tributary (Diane River)	CAR	452	14,916.00	Completed
Uquire River	CAR	3,493	115,269.00	Cleared an additional 493m to reach cut off point
Tributary to Uquire River	CAR	976	32,208.00	Completed
Ravine to Uquire River	CAR	820	27,060.00	Completed. Extra work requested to be done
Chandenmagore River	CAR	2,373	78,309.00	Cleared an additional 373m to reach cut off point
St. Mary's River (La Cuesa River)	CAR	6,000	198,000.00	
Main Drain Caroni Frederick Settlement	CAR	1,400	27,240.80	

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

NAME OF WATER COURSE	DISTRICT		TOTAL COST (\$)	REMARKS
Cali Bay Main Drain	CAR	379	8,000.00	Box Drain
Orange Valley Road	CAR	370	8,000.00	
Bay Road	CAR	782	9,600.00	
Sub-Total	CAR	22,773.00	670,231.80	

BIANNUAL REPORT #10

EXPENDITURE FOR 1998			
District	January - June \$	July - September \$	TOTAL \$
	Paving & Patching	Paving & Patching	
St. George West	499,845.04	3,097,526.75	3,597,371.79
St. George East	356,355.00	783,145.81	1,139,500.81
Agua Santa	0.00	401,784.43	401,784.43
St. Andrew/St David	100,082.00	436,876.83	536,958.83
Caroni	4,570,225.32	1,748,701.44	6,318,926.76
Victoria West	4,598,596.00	880,335.00	5,478,931.00
<i>St. Patrick*</i>	<i>4,600,532.24</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>4,600,532.24</i>
Victoria East	60,468.25	285,886.79	346,355.04
Nariva Mayaro	59,355.50	339,298.46	398,653.96
Head Office	0.00	151,099.84	151,099.84
Sub Total	14,845,459.35	8,124,655.35	22,970,114.70
Jammat Lighting	133,000.00	0.00	133,000.00
Sub Total	14,978,459.35	8,124,655.35	23,103,114.70
Drainage	983,712.71	0.00	983,712.71
Arrears	10,251,188.00	0.00	10,251,188.00
Grand Total	26,213,360.06	8,124,655.35	34,338,015.41

Bi-Annual No.9 Reflects an expenditure of \$4,793,061.00 for St. Patrick. The actual expenditure was \$4,600,532.24. The excess of \$192,528.76 was deducted as shown. This error is regretted.

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

BIANNUAL REPORT NO. 10 – Period: July – September, 1998
PAVING & PATCHING PROGRAMME

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST	REMARKS
Saddle Road (Moka)	GW	Construction of R.M. Wall		18 535.24	24 metres of footpath
Morne Coco Road	GW	Const of footpath & Und/Grd Drain		264 853.80	90 metres of footpath
St. Lucien Road	GW	Const of footpath & Und/Grd Drain		9 517.00	7 metres of drain & footpath
Santa Cruz Road	GW	Clearing & Cleaning River Course		31 280.00	
Pashley Street	GW	Reconstruction of footpath		4 000.29	29 metres
Paramin Road	GW	Erecting of mass retaining wall		183 905.31	Dowels, Conc. F/ting, backfilling
El Socorro Road	GW	Construction of footpath		71 414.93	15 metres concrete to form work
Saddle Road (Santa Cruz)	GW	Construction of footpath		71 449.00	290 metres of footpath
Barataria Interchange	GW	Construction Work		16 823.00	Laying of concrete cylinders

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST	REMARKS
North Coast Road	GW	Preliminary Work		25 566.04	Excavation for inspection of AMCO cyl
Western Main Road (Cocorite)	GW	Construction of R.M. Wall		128 991.64	15 metres
St. Anns Roundabout	GW	Beautification Works		17 353.00	
Saddle Road (Maraval)	GW	Restoration to Culvert Crossing		2 317.00	
Churchill & Uriah Butler Highways	GW	Clean up Campaign		32 686.00	
District Wide	GW	Pothole Patching Programme	1.000	131 277.00	
Aranguez Main Road	GW	Paving	1.000	300 014.56	
Beetham Highway	GW	Paving	4.000	1 493 360.00	
Fifth Street (Barataria)	GW	Paving	1.100	149 891.00	
Miscellaneous	GW	Repairs to footpaths etc.		144 291.94	
<i>Sub-Total</i>			7.10	3 097 526.75	

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

BIANNUAL REPORT NO. 10 – Period: July – September, 1998

PAVING & PATCHING PROGRAMME

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST	REMARKS
Heights of Aripo Road	GE	Rehabilitation of Roadway and reconstruction of culverts		264 646.00	Repairs to 7 landslips. Widening 6km of roadway to prevent landslides Strengthening 8km of road with pitrun
Yarra River		Construction of Retaining Wall		11 867.00	
Trinicity Central Road	GE	Strengthening & Paving	0.500	453 132.81	
Tunpuna Road	GE	Strengthening & Patching	0.135	53 500.00	Drainage
Sub-Total			0.635	783 145.81	
Agua Santa producing hot & cold asphaltic mix and ready mix concrete	A.S.	Production of Hot & Cold Mix Production of Ready Mix Concrete	1300 T 180 m ³	311 784.43 90 000.00	Asphaltic product and readymix concrete to be used on Road Improvement Fund Projects
Sub-Total				401 784.43	

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST	REMARKS
Caigual Road	A/D			0.00	
Fishing Pond Road	A/D	Patching	0.100	10 322.40	
Toco Road	A/D	Repairs to guard & hand rails	0.100	53 305.46	
Paria Road	A/D	Repairs to guard & hand rails		61 955.56	
Paria Road	A/D	Patching	0.200	15 831.24	
San Grande Oropouche Road	A/D	Patching	0.100	12 903.00	
Fishing Pond Road	A/D	Patching	0.100	10 322.00	
Cunapo Southern Road	A/D	Patching	0.100	12 903.00	
Manzanilla Mayaro Road	A/D	Patching	0.900	58 229.10	
Guaico Tamana Road	A/D	Patching	0.300	74 923.21	
Carmichael Road	A/D	Construction of Retaing Wall		48 771.49	
Cumaca Road	A/D	Strengthening and clearing landslide		77 410.37	
Transport Division	A/D	Purchase of fuel		0.00	
Sub-Total			1.700	436 876.83	

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST	REMARKS
Freeman Road Extension	CAR	Construction of roadway	2.560	344,535.93	Strengthening
Calcutta #2	CAR	Paving	1.00	387,777.24	Comp. of Bridge B1/1 and paving
Uriah Butler Highway	CAR	Paving	0.300	18,138.52	
Rivulet Road	CAR	Paving	0.200	44,358.45	
Mamoral Road	CAR	Paving	0.200	47,339.75	
Todds Station Road	CAR	Strengthening and Paving	1.6	244,867.20	
Munroe Road	CAR	Strengthening and Paving	0.600	129,608.00	
Caparo Valley Brasso Road	CAR	Paving	0.600	159,000.00	
Brasso Caparo Station Road	CAR	Strengthening	0.100	33,990.00	
Caroni Savannah Road	CAR	Patching	0.100	16,475.18	
Solomon Hochoy Highway (N&S)	CAR	Repairs to cylinder crossing	0.000	215,648.29	
Freeport Mission Road	CAR	Repairs to cylinder crossing	0.000	79,546.88	
Southern Main Road	CAR	Patching	0.400	27,416.00	
Sub-Total	CAR		7.66	1,748,701.44	

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST	REMARKS
Toruba Exit Ramp (Solomon Hochoy H/way)	VW	Construction of Exit Ramp	0.400	132 656.00	No work done in St. Patrick for this period.
Rienzi Kirton Highway	VW	Completion of Highway	0.300	200 704.00	
Debe Lay By	VW	Construction of Lay By	0.150	79 653.00	
Bonne Aventure Road	VW	Patching	0.000	259 298.00	
Reform Road	VW	Patching	0.270	63 000.00	
Mayo Road	VW	Patching	0.100	122 353.00	
Guaracara Tabaquite Road	VW	Spot Paving & Patching	0.500	22,671.00	
Sub-Total			1.720	880 335.00	
Moruga Road	VE	Strengthening & Patching	0.236	36 300.00	
Naparima Mayaro Road	VE	Strengthening & Patching	0.527	44 393.40	
Sixth Company Circular Road	VE	Strengthening & Patching	0.061	6 955.05	

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST	REMARKS
Buen Intento	VE	Repairs to landslip		13 025.00	1 landslip
Frederick 3 rd Branch Roach	VE	Strengthening & Patching	0.027	1 069.50	
Hindustan Road	VE	Strengthening & Patching	0.015	2 317.25	
Inverness Road	VE	Strengthening	0.035	3 399.30	
La Lune	VE	Patching	0.47	7 370.60	
Nagee Road	VE	Strengthening & Patching	0.103	3 767.40	
Penal Rock Road	VE	Strengthening	0.041	7 697.16	Construction of Box Drain
Realize Road	VE	Strengthening	0.026	2 497.18	
Samuel-Cooper Road	VE	Strengthening & Patching	0.021	5 005.50	
Sisters Road	VE	Strengthening & Patching	0.040	8 875.00	Repairs to Culvert
St. Julien Road	VE	Repairs to Culvert		14 380.00	1 Culvert
Tableland Road	VE	Strengthening & Patching	0.075	7 486.50	
Torrib Tabaquite Road	VE	Strengthening & Patching	0.222	25 885.11	
Unis Road	VE	Strengthening & Patching	0.008	534.75	

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST	REMARKS
Whatts Road	VE	Strengthening & Patching	0.014	1 604.25	
Wn Sm & Mantacool Road	VE	Strengthening & Patching	0.027	1 252.35	
Transport Section	VE	Parts etc.		92 071.49	
Sub-Total			1.527	285 886.79	
Tabaquite Rio Claro Road	N/M	Spot Sealing	0.316	35 099.49	
Torrib Tabaquite Road	N/M	Spot Sealing	0.165	15 577.09	
Naparima Mayaro Road	N/M	Spot Sealing	0.582	53 868.33	
Mayaro Guayaguayare Road	N/M	Spot Sealing	0.314	60 046.36	
Cunapo Southern Road	N/M	Spot Sealing	0.975	91 486.93	
Transport Section	N/M	Purchase of Fuel		59 108.77	
Manazanilla Mayaro Road	N/M	Spot Sealing	0.51	9 488.09	
San Pedro Road		Strengthening & Patching	0.116	14 623.40	
Sub-Total			2.351	339 298.46	

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

HEAD OFFICE ACCOUNTS

ITEM	AMOUNT	REMARKS
Petrotrin Supervisory Training	\$55 273.84	
Auto Rentals	\$95 826.00	
TOTAL	\$151 099.84	

BIANNUAL REPORT NO. 11

Expenditure for 1998/1999		
District	October 1998 March 1999	REMARKS
Paving, Patching and Other Work		
St. George West	2,731,590.90	
St. George East	573,927.00	N.B. 31.9 km of road has been paved and 95.148 km of road has been patched and strengthened.
St. Andrew/St. David	570,460.24	
Caroni	5,036,077.34	
Victoria West	17,704,445.25	
St. Patrick	5,561,953.00	
Victoria East	4,093,821.24	
Nariva Mayaro	1,637,231.80	
Agua Santa	405,853.00	
Head Office	0.00	
Sub Total	38,315,359.77	
Previous years expenditure		
January 1998 – September 1998	17,859,244.00	
Grand Total	56,174,603.77	

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

PAVING & PATCHING PROGRAMME

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST	REMARKS
Upper 7 th Avenue Malick	G.W	Construction of 1 culvert crossing.	0.00	36,163.39	
El Socorro Road	G.W	Construction of 20 m of slipper drain and footpath.	0.00	40,000.00	
Churchill Roosevelt Highway	G.W	Widening of roadway – 2 lanes to 3 lanes from P.B.R. to Maritime Roundabout.	0.50	240,252.25	
Western Main Road Cocorite	G.W	Construction 14 m of retaining wall.	0.00	39,518.72	
St. Ann's Road	G.W	Construction of retaining wall & Restoration of guard rails.	0.00	14,413.42	
Paramin Road	G.W	Construction rubble masonry wall	0.00	107,832.05	
Saddle Road Santa Cruz Pole #48 & 9 km post.	G.W	Underpinning of rubble masonry wall & repairs to bailey bridge, and road repairs.	3.00	112,930.18	
Lady Young Road	G.W	Construction of Inverted Drains and restoration of guard rails. Widening existing shoulder 3 km.	0.00	133,072.25	
Boxhill Trace	G.W	Road rehabilitation & construction of retaining wall	0.10	66,877.36	
Maracas Royal Road	G.W	Under pinning of abutments	0.00	5,520.00	

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST	REMARKS
Mt. Hololo Road	G.W	Restoration works to bridge.	0.00	31,108.70	
Abattoir Road	G.W	Correction to road failure.	0.00	15,640.00	
Bourg Mulatress Road	G.W	Repairs to Bailey Bridge	0.00	35,000.00	
Priority Bus Route	G.W	Construction of rubble masonry wall.	0.00	3,000.00	
Eastern Main Road	G.W	Patching & repairs to footpath.	0.00	124,000.00	
Beetham Highway	G.W	Widening shoulder.	2.00	198,403.15	
Long Circular Road & Barbados	G.W	Installation of iron grill crossing.	0.00	1,825.00	
North Coast Road	G.W	Road failure stabilization.	0.00	11,040.00	
Uriah Butler Highway	G.W	Widening shoulder.	0.00	13,225.00	
Balance c/f			3.60	1,229,821.47	
Priority Bus Route	G.W	Widening shoulder	3.600	32,632.65	
Zorro Road	G.W	Reconstruction of roadway	0.00	98,622.97	
Hotel Road	G.W	Reconstruction of road	0.10	10,000.00	

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST	REMARKS
Miscellaneous	G.W.	Construction of R.M. Post, Slabs, Repairs to footpath & bridges etc.	0.00	244,038.37	
Lady Chancellor Road	G.W.	Repairs to landslip with gabion baskets and paving road surface.	2.20	257,158.00	
Southern Main Road	G.W.	Paving road surface.	1.20	612,631.45	
Soils Lab	G.W.	Purchase of tools.	0.00	23,210.92	
Transport	G.W.	Purchase of fuel & vehicle maintenance.	0.00	223,475.07	
Total			7.10	2,731,590.090	
Cumuto Road	G.E	Clearing 1 km of drains.	0.000	57,063.00	
Golden Grove Road	G.E	Reducing 3 km of road shoulders	0.000	6,842.00	
Aripo Road	G.E	Repairs to 8 landslips	0.000	33,486.00	
Andrew Lane	G.E	Rehabilitation of roadway and drainage	0.200	49,289.00	
Blanchiseuse Paria Road	G.E	Repair to bridges.	0.000	6,548.00	
Churchill Roosevelt Highway	G.E	Repairs to 5 km of shoulders	0.000	38,691.00	
Talparo Mundo Nuevo Rd.	G.E	Repairs to 15 landslips	0.000	57,457.00	

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST	REMARKS
Ramdath Street	G.E.	Chip Sealing.	0.100	24,840.00	
Transport	G.E.	Purchase of parts and fuel etc.	0.00	299,711.00	
Total			0.30	573,927.00	
Eastern Main Road	St. A/D	Patching Potholes	0.065	4,000.00	
Quare Road	St. A/D	Patching Potholes	0.151	8,000.00	
Vega De Oropouche Road	St. A/D	Patching Potholes	0.605	15,000.00	
Sangre Grande Oropouche Road	St. A/D	Patching Potholes	0.030	3,000.00	
Toco Road	St. A/D	Patching Potholes	0.169	18,353.75	
Valencia Road	St. A/D	Patching Potholes	0.169	15,806.75	
Railway Road	St. A/D	Patching Potholes	0.36	3,000.00	
Guaico Tamana Road	St. A/D	Patching Potholes	0.768	11,020.06	
Little Cora Road	St. A/D	Construction of box drain	0.050	5,000.00	
Cunapo Junction Road	St. A/D	Patching Potholes	0.008	2,000.00	
Cunapo Southern Road	St. A/D	Patching Potholes	0.083	17,705.75	
Fishing Pond Road	St. A/D	Patching Potholes	0.152	8,000.00	

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST	REMARKS
Caigual Road	St. A/D	Patching Potholes	0.016	2,000.00	
North Manazanilla Road	St. A/D	Patching Potholes	0.490	22,346.50	
Manzanilla Mayaro Road	St. A/D	Patching Potholes	0.117	8,000.00	
Plum Mitan Road	St. A/D	Patching Potholes	0.014	14,501.50	
Gajadhar Road	St. A/D	Patching Potholes	0.055	1,500.00	
Eastern Main Road	St. A/D	Patching Potholes	0.014	1,000.00	
Toco Road	St. A/D	Patching Potholes	0.240	26,458.25	
Paria Road	St. A/D	Patching Potholes	0.232	21,151.65	
Toco Road	St. A/D	Construction of Box Drain	0.00	8,303.00	
Carmichael Road	St. A/D	Construction of R.M. Wall	0.100	9,939.66	
Paria Road	St. A/D	Construction of Box Drain	0.00	1,052.63	
Tapana Quarry	St. A/D	Hire of Equipment	0.00	12,880.00	
Balance c/f	St. A/D		3,564	240,019.50	

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST	REMARKS
Balance b/f			3.564	240,019.50	
N/Manzanilla Road	St. A/D	Re-construction of culvert.	0.00	1,334.00	
Toco Road	St. A/D	Cutting embankments, reshaping verges, establishing roadside drains and installing guard rails.	0.00	21,814.50	
Paria Road	St. A/D	Cutting embankments and reshaping verges establishing roadside drains and guard rails.	0.00	26,380.00	
Plum Mitan Road	St. A/D	Repairs to landslip	0.00	6,676.00	
Transport	St. A/D	Purchase of fuel and lubricants	0.00	30,311.78	
Cherry Ann Avenue	St. A/D	Road Rehabilitation	0.500	48,835.33	
Mc Shine Street	St. A/D	Road Rehabilitation	0.120	163,315.60	
Henry Road	St. A/D	Road Rehabilitation	0.685	17,835.53	
Cunapo Junction Road	St. A/D	Construction of box drain.	0.000	13,938.00	
Total			4,869	570,460.24	

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST	REMARKS
Caroni Savannah Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.047	28,641.28	
Chaguanas Main Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.21	12,754.32	
Endeavour Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.077	47,213.36	
Freeport Mission Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.013	7,831.60	
Southern Main Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.013	7,831.60	
Chickland Caparo Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.053	32,442.30	
Uriah Butler Highway	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.003	10,613.66	
Freeport Todds Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.012	7,159.68	
Orange Field Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.035	21,255.30	
Perserverance Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.001	894.96	
Jerningham Junciton Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.002	179.44	
Brasso Caparo Station Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.51	12,993.03	
Mamoral Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.130	33,344.12	
Tabaquite Brasso Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.040	10,291.97	
Caparo Valley Brasso Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.038	9,686.56	

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST	REMARKS
Guaracara Tabaquite Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.14	3,632.46	
Tabaquite Rio Claro Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.005	1,397.10	
Couva Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.049	12,620.47	
Mayo Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.025	6,519.80	
Balance c/f			0.629	267,303.01	
Corosal Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.013	3,349.39	
Southern Main Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.072	16,026.00	
Cedar Hill Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.062	123,523.80	
Solomon Hochoy Highway	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.013	85,640.00	
Carli Bay Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.004	36,173.20	
Waterloo Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.012	10,312.90	
Freeport Mission Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.005	3,966.50	
Calcutta #1	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.007	6,346.40	
Couva Railway Stn Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.014	12,692.80	

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST,	REMARKS
Couva Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.005	8,411.70	
Southern Main Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.024	2,368.00	
Chin Chin Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.064	6,350.76	
Longdenville Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.022	2,134.86	
Caparo Valley Brasso Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.017	1,650.48	
Ravine Sable Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.011	1,076.40	
Todds Station Rd. Caroni Rd	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.078	7,732.14	
Caroni Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.019	1,883.70	
Evdeavour Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.014	1,435.20	
Madras Road	CAR	Repairs to potholes and depression	0.005	542.08	
Mamoral Road	CAR	Strengthening and Paving.	2.300	441,600.00	
Endeavour Road	CAR	Strengthening and Paving.	0.907	158,700.00	
Southern Main Road	CAR	Strengthening and Paving.	1.355	453,592.20	
Brasso Caparo St. Road	CAR	Strengthening and Paving.	0.260	679,431.50	
Balance c/f			3,390	2,332,243.02	

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST,	REMARKS
Balance b/f			3.390	2,332,243.02	
Chin Chin Road	CAR	Strengthening and Paving.	2.130	331,200.00	
Old Southern Main Road	CAR	Strengthening and Paving.	0.50	132,480.00	
Freeport Mission Road	CAR	Strengthening and Paving.	1.166	331,200.00	
Todds Station Road	CAR	Strengthening and Paving.	1.330	287,040.00	
Chickland Caparo Road	CAR	Strengthening and Paving.	3.000	722,749.16	
Perseverance B 1/3	CAR	Bridge Reconstruction.	0.000	154,464.13	
Freeport Todd Road	CAR	Strengthening and Paving.	-	229,603.32	
Brasso Tamana Road	CAR	Strengthening and Paving.	0.200	26,720.25	
Griffith Trace	CAR	Strengthening and Paving.	0.200	56,925.00	
Telemaque Road	CAR	Strengthening.	0.000	255,903.75	
Transport	CAR	Purchase Fuel and Parts.	0.000	75,148.71	
Solomon Hochoy & Uriah Butler Highway	CAR	Vegetation Control (6 km)	0.000	50,200.00	
Transport of gravel	CAR			50,200.00	
Total			11.916	5,036,077.34	

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST,	REMARKS
Bonne Aventure Road	V.W.	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.220	49,416.00	
Dumfries Road	V.W.	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.111	24,989.00	
Hermitage Road	V.W.	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.432	98,210.00	
Philippine Road	V.W.	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.110	24,985.00	
Reform Road	V.W.	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.111	24,990.00	
S.S. Erin Road	V.W.	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.045	10,068.35	
Southern Main Road	V.W.	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.600	1,852,644.00	
Pascal Road	V.W.	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.111	24,990.00	
Piparo Road	V.W.	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.111	24,990.00	
Monre Roche Quarry Rd.	V.W.	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.375	84,560.00	
Mayo Road	V.W.	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.595	133,794.00	
Garth Road	V.W.	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.105	24,250.00	
Corosal Road	V.W.	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.111	24,990.00	
St. Croix Road	V.W.	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.111	24,990.00	
Rochard Douglas Road	V.W.	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.743	167,336.00	

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST,	REMARKS
Papourie Road	V.W	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	3.500	4,179,591.00	
Naparima Mayaro Road	V.W	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.108	24,426.00	
New Colonial Road	V.W	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.800	180,272.00	
Kanhai Road	V.W	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.220	49,427.00	
Golconda Road	V.W	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.110	24,990.00	
Cottage Road	V.W	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	.0222	49,980.00	
Balance c/f			8.851	7,102,888.35	
Cipero Road	V.W	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	1.250	261,087.00	
San Fernando Bye Pass	V.W	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.700	771,193.76	
Solomon Hochoy Highway	V.W	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.296	74,040.00	
Guaracara Tabaquite Road	V.W	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.747	168,064.00	
South Trunk Road	V.W	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.400	422,173.00	
Tools	V.W	Purchasing of tools & safety wear	0.000	166,242.82	
Manahambre Road	V.W	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.300	324,300.00	

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST,	REMARKS
Poonah Road	V.W	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.234	52,670.00	
Transport	V.W	Purchase of parts and fuel	0.000	56,483.00	
Grove Park	V.W	Strengthening roadway.	1.600	418,103.00	
Palmiste B'lvd	V.W	Strengthening roadway.	5.600	401,543.00	
Tarouba Ramp	V.W	Construction of roadway.	0.80	1,597,051.40	
S.S. Erin Road – Lay Bye	V.W	Construction lay bye.	0.300	750,698.00	
Rienzi Kirton Highway	V.W	Rehabilitation of roadway.	0.300	635,587.75	
M2 Ring Road	V.W	Rehabilitation of roadway.	7.000	4,432,357.35	
Orophan Road – Guaracarite Road	V.W	Rehabilitation of roadway.	1.200	69,962.82	
Total			29.578	17,704,445.25	
T.J's to Ciperio Road	ST.P.	Rehabilitation of roadway, strengthening, resurfacing and patching.	2.808	2,083,565.00	1.5 km drainage
Southern Main Road	ST.P.	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.930	69,946.00	.900 km drainage

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST,	REMARKS
Rochard Road	ST.P	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	1.675	421,695.00	1.2 km drainage
Clarke Road	ST.P	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	1.283	212,978.00	.85 km drainage
Penal Rock Road	ST.P	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	2.714	708,764.00	1.5 km drainage
Southern Main Road	ST.P	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	4.906	204,969.00	.300 km drainage
Scotts Road	ST.P	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.300	49,266.00	.600 km drainage
Fyzabad Branch Road	ST.P	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.403	24,633.00	.250 km drainage
La Brea Road	ST.P	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.696	24,633.00	.125 km drainage
Penal Quinam Road	ST.P	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.740	165,837.00	.500 km drainage
Coora Road	ST.P	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.401	24,242.00	.250 km drainage
Mon Desir Road	ST.P	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.910	138,413.00	.500 km drainage
La Brea Village Road	ST.P	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.420	24,633.00	.150 km drainage
San Francique Road	ST.P	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	1.851	401,771.00	.800 km drainage
Morne Diablo Quarry Rd	ST.P	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.830	185,098.00	.720 km drainage
Delhi Settlement Road	ST.P	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.435	24,633.00	.450 km drainage
Transport	ST.P	Repairs to vehicles, fuel, safety supplies etc		57,341.00	

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST,	REMARKS
Fyzabad Guapo Road			0.027	24,633.00	.200 km drainage
Grants Road			0.023	24,633.00	.225 km drainage
Balance c/f			21.352	4,871,683.00	
Erin Road	ST.P	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.045	56,584.00	.400 km drainage
S.S. Erin Road, Cedros and Siparia	ST.P	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.088	77,474.00	.230 km drainage
Chatham (South) Road	ST.P	Strengthening, resurfacing and patching & bridge reconstruction.	0.033	97,192.00	
Agapito Trace Branch Tr.	ST.P	Rehabilitaiton of roadway (Chip Seal)	0.602	294,285.00	
Granville Road	ST.P	Strengthening, resurfacing & patching	0.024	9,580.00	
Morichal Quarry	ST.P	Hire of equipment.		24,984.00	
Tapana Quarry	ST.P	Hire of equipment		99,936.00	
Chatham Quarry	ST.P	Hire of equipment		24,985.00	
Tools	ST.P			5,250.00	
Total			22.144	5,561,953.00	

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST,	REMARKS
6 th Co. Circular Road	V.E.	Strengthening roadway.	0.137	70,689.20	
Buene Intento Road	V.E.	Reconstruction of bridge and strengthening roadway.	1.000	246,228.51	
Cumuto Road	V.E.	Hire of equipment.	0.000	87,244.50	
Cunjaj Road	V.E.	Strengthening roadway.	0.055	7,264.80	
Douglas Road	V.E.	Strengthening and sealing roadway.	0.300	35,196.00	
Frederick 3 rd Branch Road	V.E.	Strengthening rd way with pitrun gravel	0.185	147,816.57	
Hindustan Road	V.E.	Strengthening and sealing roadway.	0.440	24,788.85	
Jipaulsingh Road	V.E.	Strengthening roadway	0.058	63,212.77	
La Lune Road	V.E.	Strengthening and sealing roadway.	0.056	5,506.00	
Lothians Road	V.E.	Sealing roadway.	0.591	112,125.00	
Martiste Road	V.E.	Strengthening roadway	0.107	110,596.80	
Moreay #2	V.E.	Strengthening roadway	0.080	5,058.00	
Moruga Road	V.E.	Strengthening roadway	0.375	59,178.30	
Naggee Road	V.E.	Strengthening rd way with pitrun gravel	1.593	237,289.86	

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST,	REMARKS
Naparima Mayaro Road	V.E.	Strengthening and sealing roadway.	0.844	2,177,839.86	
Penal Rock Road	V.E.	Strengthening roadway.	0.053	690.00	
Railway Road	V.E.	Strengthening roadway.	0.123	3,366.00	
Realise Road	V.E.	Strengthening roadway.	0.150	19,721.99	
Robertson Road	V.E.	Strengthening roadway.	0.050	995.00	
Rochard Douglas Road	V.E.	Strengthening roadway.	0.004	510.00	
Balance c/f			6.201	3,415,318.01	
Rochard Douglas Road	V.E.	Repairs to one culvert.	0.000	6,790.23	
Samuel Cooper Road	V.E.	Strengthening roadway.	0.300	878.30	
Sancho Road	V.E.	Strengthening and sealing roadway.	0.500	37,759.20	
Sisters Road	V.E.	Strengthening roadway	0.027	2,280.00	
St. Croix Road	V.E.	Strengthening and sealing roadway	2.460	393,870.00	
Tableland Road	V.E	Strengthening roadway.	0.048	4,158.40	
Transport	V.E	Purchase of parts and supplies.	0.0.00	99,936.00	

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST,	REMARKS
Unis Road	V.E.	Strengthening roadway.	0.139	5,029.50	
Whatts Road	V.E.	Strengthening roadway.	0.126	94,871.60	
Wm Sm & Mantacool	V.E.	Strengthening and sealing roadway	0.300	32,930.00	
Total			16.302	4,093,821.24	
Cunapo Southern Road	N/M	Strengthening and sealing roadway	0.223	756,611.26	
Rio Claro Guayaguayare Rd.	N/M	Construction of box drain & repairs to bridge $\frac{3}{4}$.	0.000	44,186.01	
Transport	N/M	Parts and supplies.		41,197.99	
Dades Road	N/M	Strengthening and sealing roadway	0.120	4,094.20	
San Pedro Road	N/M	Strengthening roadway.	0.019	9,844.23	
Tabaquite Rio Claro Road	N/M	Strengthening and sealing roadway	0.304	258,316.37	
Torrib Tabaquite Road	N/M	Strengthening roadway.	0.041	3,139.18	
Entrance to R.C.J.S.S.	N/M	Sealing roadway.	0.032	1,348.95	
Manzanilla Mayaro Road	N/M	Strengthening and sealing roadway and construction of slipper drain (61m)	0.040	28,911.60	

Written Answer to Question

Friday, July 14, 2000

ROAD NAME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AREA PAVED PATCHED km	TOTAL COST,	REMARKS
Mayaro Guayaguayare Rd	N/M	Strengthening & sealing roadway and construction of footpath (30 m)	0.110	122,658.47	
Naparima Mayaro Road	N/M	Strengthening & sealing roadway and repairs to footpath & box drain	0.335	361,830.43	
Mayaro Guayaguayare Rd	N/M	Repairs to footpath.	0.000	5,093.21	
Total			1.224	1,637,23.90	

AGUA SANTA

PROGRAMME	DISTRICT	DESCRIPTION OF WORK	AMOUNT PRODUCED (tonnes)	TOTAL COST,	REMARKS
Road Improvement Fund Programme	Agua Santa	Production of Hot Mix	2,728	545,600.00	Asphaltic mix produced to be used as Road Improvement Fund projects.
		Production of Cold Mix	2917	72,754.00	
			5,645	618,354.00	

Written Answer to Question
[MR. SHARMA]

Friday, July 14, 2000

BIANNUAL REPORT NO. 12
Period April 1, 1999 – September 30, 1999

EXPENDITURE FOR 1998/1999			
District	October 1998- March 1999	April 1, 1999 – September 1999	Remarks
Paving, Patching and Other Work			
St. George West	2,731,590.90	No work was done due to unavailability of funds	N.B. During the period October 1998 – March 1999 31.9 km of road was paved and 95.148 km of road was patched and strengthened.
St. George East	573,927.00		
St. Andrew/St. David	570,460.24		
Caroni	5,036,077.34		
Victoria West	17,704,445.25		
St. Patrick	5,561,953.00		
Victoria East	4,093,821.24		
Nariva Mayaro	1,637,231.80		
Agua Santa	405,853.00		
Head Office	0.00		
Sub-Total	38,315,359.77		
Previous years expenditure			
January 1998 – September 1998	17,859,244.00		
GRAND TOTAL	56,174,603.77		

*Written Answer to Question**Friday, July 14, 2000***BIANNUAL REPORT #13****Period October 1, 1999 to March 31, 2000
ROAD IMPROVEMENT FUND – FINANCIAL STATEMENT**

District	Release to Date	Actual Expenditure	Commitment	Total
St. George West	2,504,503.00	2,037,783.00	466,720.00	2,504,503.00
St. George East	468,946.25	323,212.00	145,735.00	468,947.00
St. Andrew/St. David	209,185.00	207,374.00	1,811.00	209,185.00
Caroni	4,876,524.04	2,148,978.00	2,198,286.00	4,347,264.00
Victoria East	2,388,931.38	2,114,180.00	264,697.00	2,378,877.00
Nariva Mayaro	696,537.83	669,064.00	616,541.00	1,285,605.00
Victoria West	9,448,162.50	7,698,573.00	2,398,994.00	10,097,567.00
St. Patrick	3,218,468.00	3,072,217.00	247,386.00	3,319,603.00
Head Office	0.00	0.00	74,669.00	74,669.00
TOTAL	\$23,811,258.00	\$18,271,381.00	\$6,414,839.00	\$24,686,220.00