

*Leave of Absence**Friday, January 09, 2004***HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES***Friday, January 09, 2004*

The House met at 1.30 p.m.

Clerk of the House: In accordance with standing Order 5(5), I have to announce that the Speaker of the House of Representatives is unavoidably absent, and that the Deputy Speaker shall preside.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Members, I have received correspondence from the hon. Member for Fyzabad, (Mr. Chandresh Sharma) requesting leave of absence from today's sitting of the House of Representatives. The leave, which the Member seeks, is granted.

MEDIATION (NO. 2) BILL

Bill to provide for mediation in Trinidad and Tobago, brought from the Senate [*The Attorney General*]; read the first time.

PETITION**National Carnival Bands Association of Trinidad and Tobago**

The Minister of Trade and Industry and Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Hon. Kenneth Valley): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition on behalf of the National Carnival Bands Association of Trinidad and Tobago of the Grand Stand, Queen's Park Savannah, Port of Spain.

I now ask that the Clerk be permitted to read the petition and that the promoters be allowed to proceed.

*Petition read.**Question put and agreed to, That the petition be granted.***PAPERS LAID**

1. Report of the Auditor General of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago on a special audit of certain areas of internal control at the Eastern Regional Health Authority. [*The Minister of Trade and Industry and Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Hon. Kenneth Valley)*]

2. Report of the Auditor General on the accounts and financial statements of the Project Execution Unit of the Ministry of Housing and Settlements for the year ended September 30, 2001 in respect of the National Settlements Programme as required by Loan Contract No. 584/OC-TT between the Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago and the Inter-American Development Bank. [*Hon. K. Valley*]
3. Report of the Auditor General of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago on the financial statements of the Strategic Services Agency for the financial year ended September 30, 1999. [*Hon. K. Valley*]
4. Report of the Auditor General of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago on the financial statements of the Agricultural Society of Trinidad and Tobago for the year ended December 31, 1992. [*Hon. K. Valley*]
5. Report of the Auditor General of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago on the financial statements of the Agricultural Society of Trinidad and Tobago for the year ended December 31, 1993. [*Hon. K. Valley*]
6. Report of the Auditor General of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago on the financial statements of the Trinidad and Tobago Civil Aviation Authority for the period October 01, 2001 to September 30, 2002. [*Hon. K. Valley*]

Papers 1 to 6 to be referred to the Public Accounts Committee.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Minister of Trade and Industry and Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Hon. Kenneth Valley): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to inform the House that of the eleven questions on today's Order Paper for Oral Answers, the Government will answer nine. We are asking for questions Nos. 26 and 45 to be deferred for one week.

Leave granted.

The following questions stood on the Order Paper:

Solicitor General's Instructions (Details of)

26. Would the hon. Attorney General state:
 - (a) Whether the Attorney General gave instructions to the Solicitor General to settle any court cases since January 2002?
 - (b) If the answer to (a) is in the affirmative, the date(s) on which such instructions were given to the Solicitor General, the name(s) of the

parties, the name(s) of the attorney(s) on record and the instructions given by the Attorney General as to the terms and/or quantum of settlement for each of the cases?

- (c) The criteria utilized by the Attorney General in each case for giving the aforesaid instructions? [*Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar*]

**Mount Hope Maternity Hospital
(Neonatal Deaths)**

45. Would the hon. Minister of Health inform this House as to how many neonatal deaths have occurred on a monthly basis at the Mount Hope Maternity Hospital from January 2002 to the present? [*Dr. H. Rafeeq*]

Questions, by leave, deferred.

**Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding
(GTECH)**

1. **Mr. Ganga Singh** (*Caroni East*) asked the hon. Minister of Finance:
- (a) Would the Minister indicate whether the National Lotteries Control Board (NLCB) and the Betting Levy Board (BLB) entered into an Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding with GTECH for the provision of Video Terminals in Trinidad and Tobago?
- (b) If the answer to (a) is in the affirmative, would the Minister:
- (i) indicate the terms and conditions of this agreement;
- (ii) advise whether this agreement was approved by the Minister of Finance?

The Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Sen. The Hon. Conrad Enill): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the answer to this question is as follows. Yes, the Memorandum of Understanding was signed with GTECH for the provision of the new terminals in Trinidad and Tobago. It should be noted however that this Memorandum of Understanding is subject to the approval of the Minister of Finance.

The Minister of Finance has not approved the Memorandum of Understanding but has however taken the decision to set up a committee to review this memorandum and all other aspects of the gaming industry.

Mr. Singh: Could the hon. Minister indicate when this agreement came into being? [*Interruption*] When was the agreement signed?

Sen. The Hon. C. Enill: The agreement was signed in June, I believe it was.

Mr. Singh: July, July. [Interruption] On July 15, the agreement was signed.

Mr. Valley: You know the answer.

Mr. Singh: Yes, we have to know the answers to the questions. Mr. Deputy Speaker, another supplemental question. Has the hon. Minister familiarized himself with the contents of this agreement?

Sen. The Hon. C. Enill: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Minister has set up a committee whose responsibility would be to look at that.

Mr. Singh: Another supplemental, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Could the hon. Minister indicate when he acquired knowledge of this signed agreement?

Sen. The Hon. C. Enill: I do not have the exact information, but it came out of your question.

Mr. Singh: So it meant that the hon. Minister found out sometime about six or seven months subsequent to the signing in July?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is that a supplemental question?

Mr. Singh: Yes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: He has answered you.

Mr. Singh: Okay, a further supplemental. Consistent with the ministerial approach to corporate governance, has any action been taken against the board of directors who signed this agreement without ministerial approval?

Sen. The Hon. C. Enill: The answer is very clear, that it was signed subject to the approval of the Minister of Finance. That approval has not been given, and in these circumstances the committee has been set up to look at that memorandum and at that point in time a recommendation will be made.

Mr. Singh: Could the hon. Minister indicate to this honourable House the members of that committee?

Sen. The Hon. C. Enill: That information is not currently available.

High Court Actions (Policy Position of)

8. Mrs. Kamla Persad-Bissessar (*Siparia*) asked the hon. Attorney General:

Would the Attorney General state:

- (a) The exact amount of money owed to the State by Mr. Patrick Manning arising out of his unsuccessful 1997 High Court actions against the State?

- (b) What steps has the Attorney General taken to recover these moneys?
- (c) Does the government have a policy position with respect to citizens who have lost legal matters against the State and have been ordered to pay costs?
- (d) If so, can he provide a brief outline of this policy?

The Acting Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs (Hon. Camille Robinson-Regis): Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker. [*Interruption*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Member for Couva South, please.

Mr. Ramnath: My apologies, Sir.

Hon. C. Robinson-Regis: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in answer to question No. 8, the costs awarded to the State in the 1997 High Court Action totalled \$1,153,811.08 with a statutory interest of 6 per cent from the date of judgment, April 28, 1997. The total sum of \$555,000 has been paid as at December 27, 2002.

An application has been made to the Chief State Solicitor for a waiver of the outstanding balance, which, as at December 01, 2003 totalled \$1,072,018.82 on the payment of a further \$240,000.

It is to be noted that the payments already made by the hon. Patrick Manning ranked amongst the largest sums ever paid by any person to the State in respect of legal costs.

The application for the waiver of the outstanding balance is at present under consideration by the Ministry of the Attorney General.

On various occasions since the date of judgment, in the case of *Patrick Manning vs. the hon. Attorney General*, the Chief State Solicitor has sent demand letters to the attorneys for plaintiffs on record, in respect of outstanding costs.

In answer to part (c) of the question, the Government has no officially stated or written policy position dealing with costs owed to the State. The practice has been that the State through the Chief State Solicitor would pursue costs by written demand to the other side whenever costs are awarded to the State.

While the position of the State has in the past been to generally rely upon the Chief State Solicitor to pursue costs owed to the State, there has never been a stated official position to treat with what may be described as the varying circumstances of each case in which costs were awarded.

It should be noted that cases in which costs have been awarded to the State run the gamut in terms of public importance and circumstances unique to the litigants.

Costs have in the past been awarded to the State in circumstances where the action was ill conceived though well intentioned, or malicious and absolutely without merit, the latter category in the main would be tort actions concealed as constitutional law actions.

Equally, costs have been awarded to the State in circumstances where the issue at hand was one of the interpretation of the law of the land and the attendant effects that such an interpretation would have on the country's citizenry.

The recovery of costs in any matter is a long and involved process, which includes the preparation and actual taxation of the bill of costs, to the tracing and identification of assets of an unsuccessful party for purposes of levying of execution, since almost no unsuccessful party willingly pays the State's taxes/costs on requisition. The exercise can also be expensive if bailiffs have to be employed to levy on properties and chattels. These chattels have to be stored or warehoused until sale or auction to realize the debt. There might also be third party or interpleader proceedings challenging and levy or seizure.

The State has as a general rule met with very little or no success in the recovery of costs in both private and public law matters. The average quantum of costs awarded to the State in any one matter, which has gone to trial, is normally in the vicinity of \$12,000 to \$15,000. Matters such as the Manning consolidated matters (two matters) where joint costs awarded amounted to just over \$1,000,000 are extremely rare and an aberration in practice.

The time has come for the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, and by extension, the State, to adopt a clear and measured policy with regard to the pursuit of costs awarded to the State.

It is clearly recognized that in each case where costs are awarded to the State, each matter must be treated in an individual manner.

In this regard, the Chief State Solicitor had in the year 2000, during the tenure of the UNC administration, formulated a draft policy treating with the collection of costs awarded to the State. This draft policy is at present being studied by the Attorney General and will be submitted to Cabinet in the very near future.

The recommendations put forward by the Chief State Solicitor as the policy of the Government regarding the pursuit and payment of costs awarded to the State are as follows:

- (i) Costs should be waived in all matters where the orders awarding such costs are over five years old.

- (ii) Costs should be waived on humanitarian grounds where the subject matter of the action is related to applications under the Status of Children Act. Applications brought by widows for Letters of Administration or where the litigant, though well intentioned, has through some deficiency in pleading or limitation of time, found himself or herself shut out of the process with costs to be paid.
- (iii) Costs should be waived in matters that involve interpretation of Constitutional Provisions, enquiry into constitutional appointments, or matters that genuinely touch and concern the public or national interest.
- (iv) Costs should be waived against litigants who are impecunious such as condemned prisoners, suspended or dismissed public servants or other persons accessed to be “men of straw”.
- (v) Costs should be pursued against litigants who have brought tort actions disguised as constitutional motions in keeping with the analogies used in the Jaroo case decided by the Privy Council last year, which was a false imprisonment, malicious prosecution and detention of motor vehicle; cases that involve no national or public interest.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mrs. Persad-Bissessar: The hon. Attorney General mentioned that on several occasions demand letters were sent by the Chief State Solicitor to the Member for San Fernando East, would you be able to tell us the date when the last demand letter was sent?

Hon. C. Robinson-Regis: Mr. Deputy Speaker, unfortunately I do not have that information.

Mrs. Persad-Bissessar: A supplemental question please, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Member mentioned that an application was made for a waiver, would the Member be able to tell us when that application was made?

Hon. C. Robinson-Regis: Mr. Deputy Speaker, unfortunately I do not have that information.

Mrs. Persad-Bissessar: A supplemental question please, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Would the hon. Member for Arouca South be able to tell us the basis on which the application was made for the waiver? Is it impecunious or any one of the other grounds that you mentioned?

Hon. C. Robinson-Regis: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not have that information, and may I just point out the Member has suggested some of the

Oral Answers to Questions
[HON. C. ROBINSON-REGIS]

Friday, January 09, 2004

recommendations that were made by the UNC administration as perhaps one of the reasons, but these recommendations were made by the UNC administration in 2000 and I do not have that information.

**Regional Judicial and Legal Service Commission
(Privileges and Benefits to Members)**

10. Mrs. Kamla Persad-Bissessar asked the hon. Attorney General:

Would the Minister state:

- (a) The amount of money spent on the installation ceremony and cocktail reception for the members of the Regional Judicial and Legal Service Commission held on Thursday August 21, 2003?
- (b) What was the source of funding for this expenditure?
- (c) When, and by whom, were the members of the Regional Judicial and Legal Service Commission appointed?
- (d) What remuneration, privileges and benefits, if any, are the members of the Regional Judicial and Legal Service Commission being given by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, and the head and sub-head and/or vote within the appropriations for fiscal year 2002/2003 and/or 2003/2004 from which moneys have been drawn and/or would be drawn to meet these costs?

The Acting Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs (Hon. Camille Robinson-Regis): Thank you very much. Mr. Deputy Speaker, from information provided by the Caricom Secretariat and the Judiciary of Trinidad and Tobago, the amount of money spent on the installation ceremony and cocktail reception for the members of the Regional Judicial and Legal Service Commission held on Thursday, August 21, 2003, totalled TT \$101,783.12.

Costs, which were met by Caricom, include:

PARTICULARS	COST \$
Per diem	63,973.22
Airfare	10,412.39
Stationery	69.87
Sound system	2,300.00
Transporting chairs	469.98

Oral Answers to Questions

Friday, January 09, 2004

Rental of tables and table cloth	1,201.73
Artwork & cover for Oath Book	641.72
Postage	<u>295.22</u>
Total Expenditure:	<u>79,364.13</u>
Other costs, which were met by the Judiciary, include:	
PARTICULARS	COST
	\$
Ground Transportation	5,604.00
Preparation of Hall (inclusive of dismantling)	<u>16,815.00</u>
Total Expenditure:	<u>22,419.00</u>

Mr. Deputy Speaker, funding for these expenditures were met by Caricom as well as the Chief Justice, under his Entertainment Vote.

The date of appointment of the members of the Regional Judicial and Legal Service Commission was August 20, 2003. They were appointed by letter under the hand of the heads of the Judiciary of the contracting parties in accordance with Article VI of the Agreement Establishing the Caribbean Court of Justice.

No remuneration, privileges or benefits are being given to the members of the Regional Judicial and Legal Service Commission by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago.

Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mrs. Persad-Bissessar: Mr. Deputy Speaker, a supplemental question, please. The Member mentioned Article VI of the Agreement establishing the Caribbean Court of Justice, would the Member confirm that this is not part of the domestic laws of Trinidad and Tobago?

Hon. C. Robinson-Regis: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this matter has not yet come into the law of Trinidad and Tobago, as you are well aware.

Mrs. Persad-Bissessar: Mr. Deputy Speaker, a supplemental question, please. Would the Member please confirm that therefore Trinidad and Tobago is not bound by the Agreement?

Hon. C. Robinson-Regis: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as the Member for Siparia is well aware, it was the UNC administration—[*Interruption*] I am; if you do not like the answer it is a different thing—[*Interruption*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Members, would you please allow the Minister to answer the question?

Hon. C. Robinson-Regis: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it was the UNC administration that bound Trinidad and Tobago to the establishment of the Caribbean Court of Justice, and it was the UNC administration that insisted that the Caribbean Court of Justice be housed in the Winsure Building on Richmond Street, Port of Spain, in Trinidad and Tobago.

In keeping with this PNM Administration's continuous decision to accept those issues by which we were previously bound, we will continue to make every effort to ensure that the Caribbean Court of Justice is set up in Trinidad and Tobago as was agreed to by the previous UNC administration. [*Desk thumping*]

Mrs. Persad-Bissessar: Mr. Deputy Speaker, a supplemental question, please. Has any other Caribbean country made this agreement part of their domestic laws? We have not. Has any other country done so?

Hon. C. Robinson-Regis: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am at this time able to speak very cogently about Trinidad and Tobago's position. I am unable to say what any other Caricom country has done, but please file another question.

2.00 p.m.

**Ramgoolie Trace, Curepe Farmers
(Compensation)**

25. Mrs. Kamla Persad-Bissessar (*Siparia*) asked the hon. Minister of Housing:

Would the Minister please state the criteria used or to be used to compensate farmers who have been in occupation of lands at Ramgoolie Trace, Curepe where such lands are to be used for the construction of houses and when would such compensation be paid?

The Minister of Housing (Hon. Dr. Keith Rowley): Mr. Deputy Speaker, a crop count was conducted by the Ministry of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources. The crop count was in accordance with the Valuation of Crops Plants Revised Schedule of 1996. Claims were calculated by the Ministry of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources based on this same law which is the Schedule of 1996, and a report was forwarded to the National Housing Authority and submitted to its Board for approval.

The intention is that compensation is expected to be paid by the National Housing Authority on or about January 12, 2004.

Mrs. Persad-Bissessar: Could the hon. Minister be kind enough to identify the criteria being used to pay the compensation? The crop count gives us the quantity, but what are the criteria?

Hon. Dr. K. Rowley: I presume that the crop should be identified according to species.

Mrs. Persad-Bissessar: What are the criteria that would be used to compensate a farmer?

Hon. Dr. K. Rowley: Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, the crops would be identified according to species, and they would be counted and the total of what is counted, a value is applied to that and that determines the compensation due.

I am afraid I cannot assist beyond that.

National Lotteries Control Board (Cost of Advertisements)

28. Dr. Roodal Moonilal (*Oropouche*) asked the hon. Minister of Finance:

Could the Minister indicate to the House the cost incurred by the National Lotteries Control Board (NLCB) and any other State agency for all advertisements placed in the daily and weekly newspapers in the month of September 2003 to commemorate the historic courtesy call paid by the distinguished Junior Minister of Finance, Sen. The Hon. Conrad Enill, to the head office of the NLCB?

The Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Sen. The Hon. Conrad Enill): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the cost of all advertisements placed in the newspapers to commemorate the visit to the National Lotteries Control Board by the line minister is as follows:

Layout and design done by Advantage Advertising, \$3,439.65.

Placement of Advertisement in the *Express* on September 10, 2003, \$4,307.90.

Placement of Advertisement in the *Newsday* on the same day, September 10, 2003, \$2,737.00

Placement of Advertisement in the *Trinidad Guardian* on September 09, 2003, \$4,148.00. A total, therefore, of \$14,632.55.

The purpose of the hon. Minister's visit was to highlight and profile the work of the Board with its agents and staff, a function that was sadly neglected for too long in the past.

Dr. Moonilal: Could the hon. Minister confirm that earlier when former Minister, Sen. The Hon. Brian Kuei Tung first visited the NLCB in February 1996, there was no such obscene and repulsive waste of taxpayers' money?

Sen. The Hon. C. Enill: I am unable to confirm that.

**Sugar Manufacturing Company Limited
(Contracts to Harvest and Supply Canes)**

40. Mr. Nizam Baksh (*Naparima*) asked the hon. Minister of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources:

- (a) Would the Minister inform this House of the names of contractors/associations/individuals who have been authorized by the Sugar Manufacturing Company Limited (SMCL) to harvest and supply canes that are owned by Caroni (1975) Limited?
- (b) Could the hon. Minister inform this House what criteria were used in the selection and award of contracts for the harvesting and supply of canes to organizations/associations/individuals?
- (c) Could the Minister provide this House with the names of the individuals/bodies who were responsible for awarding the contracts and what were the criteria used?
- (d) Would the Minister state the acreage and location of lands owned by Caroni (1975) Limited, which have been distributed to contractors/associations/individuals for the purpose of harvesting of canes?

The Minister of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources (Hon. Jarrette Narine): In respect to (a) of the question, the names of Farmers contractors/associations/individuals who have been authorized by the Sugar Manufacturing Company Limited to harvest and supply cane owned by Caroni (1975) Limited are:

Sookhai's Diesel Services

Trinidad Agro Supplies Limited

Trinidad Islandwide Cane Farmers Association

Direct Delivery Farmers Association.

(b) The criteria used in the selection and award of contracts for harvesting and supply of canes to organizations/associations/individuals are as follows:

In the case of the mechanical harvesting of canes, customary engagement by Caroni (1975) Limited for the mechanical harvesting of sugar canes on lands which are usually harvested by harvesters; and in the case of other modes of harvesting canes, discussions were held with the major cane farmers' groups to participate in the programme of harvesting and supplying sugar cane to the Sugar Manufacturing Company Limited in 2004.

With respect to (c) the Sugar Manufacturing Company Limited (SMCL) was responsible for awarding the contracts. The criteria used for awarding the contracts are as detailed in (b) above.

(c) The acreage and location of lands owned by Caroni (1975) Limited which have been distributed to contractors/associations/individuals for the purpose of harvesting are listed hereunder:

Location:	Acreage
Orange Grove	200
Caroni	1,295
Jerningham Junction	350
Felicity	590
Edinburgh	350
Waterloo	430
Exchange	600
Montserrat	530
Esperanza	425
Reform	545
Cedar Hill	750
Petit Morne	600
Bronte	325
Picton	330
La Fortune	720
Williamsville	400

Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Baksh: I am tempted to asked the hon. Minister what is customary engagement by Caroni (1975) Limited but I would not.

Could the hon. Minister give us the names of the persons or organizations where you have the list under question (d) of this sheet?

Hon. J. Narine: Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is another question. We answered what was on the Order Paper. Any further questions, I am willing to answer. Thank you.

Medical Equipment (Financial Arrangements)

43. Dr. Hamza Rafeeq (*Caroni Central*) asked the hon. Minister of Health:

- (a) Would the Minister give details as to the financing arrangements for the \$55 million medical equipment for the public health sector promised over a year ago?
- (b) Would the Minister inform the House as to when the equipment in (a) will be installed in the nation's health facilities?

The Minister of Health (Hon. John Rahael): Mr. Deputy Speaker, details of the financing arrangements for the diagnostic imaging equipment for the public health institutions are as follows:

Issuer:	South West Regional Health Authority
Arranger:	Citicorp Merchant Bank Limited.
Facility Amount:	TT \$55,000,000
Facility Type:	Medium Term Note
Purpose:	To purchase Diagnostic Imaging Equipment
Tenure:	Seven (7) Years
Interest Rate:	5.35 per cent—fixed
Structuring Fee:	0.65 per cent flat payable on disbursement
Repayment:	Prepayment allowed in full on the 3 rd anniversary after disbursement with a 1% per cent penalty on principal outstanding.
Principal payments:	14 equal semi-annual payments commencing six months from issue calculated on 30/360-day basis.

Security:	Unconditional Guarantee from the Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago to be established within a period of three (3) months from drawdown. A letter of comfort from the Minister of Finance to be issued initially.
Representations and Warranties:	As are customary and appropriate for transactions of the nature contemplated herein.
Events of Default:	As are customary and appropriate for transactions of the nature contemplated herein.
Expenses:	All out of pocket and other legal expenses incurred in preparing and registering documentation and executing this transaction are for the account of the borrower whether or not this transaction is successfully consummated.
Additional Services:	Paying agency fees are estimated at approximately TT \$10,000 per annum and Trustee and Registrar Fees are estimated at TT \$20,000.00 per annum to be negotiated between Issuer and Trustee to be determined by Issuer.
Regulatory Fees:	These fees are associated with the filing of issue with the Trinidad and Tobago Stock Exchange Commission and are estimated at TT\$15,000 for the account of the Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago.
Governing Law:	The laws of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago will govern the documentation.

Installation of equipment would begin in the nation's health facility as of February 2004—that was when the Note was prepared. I am just pleased to inform the honourable House, as you may be aware, installation of the equipment has already begun.

I thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Dr. Rafeeq: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. Minister could tell us when was the agreement between the South West Regional Health Authority and Citicorp signed?

Hon. J. Rahael: I do not have that information off hand.

Dr. Rafeeq: Do you know then when would the first instalment be due?

Hon. J. Rahael: I do not have the date but, as indicated in my response, it would commence six months from the issue calculated of the 30 days over 360 days per annum.

Dr. Khan: Could the hon. Minister indicate who were the local suppliers of these equipment?

Hon. J. Rahael: The equipment was purchased from Simons from Germany. I think the local suppliers are Caribbean Industrial Company. I am not sure of it, but I know there is a local company.

Dr. Khan: Could the hon. Minister indicate if he has the knowledge who was on the committee to select this supplier?

Hon. J. Rahael: I am not in a position to respond to that question now.

Dr. Khan: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the hon. Minister finds out, could he indicate to this honourable House whether there was any close association with any member of the committee and the supplier?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Maybe that could be the subject of another question.

Dr. Rafeeq: Could the hon. Minister tell us from the \$55 million—I know that you have received some equipment already—whether the equipment to the tune of \$55 million has been ordered already and when do you expect to get possession of all of them?

Hon. J. Rahael: We have begun receiving the equipment, as I indicated, from January and we would be receiving additional equipment from now every month until April 2004.

**Ambulances for 2004
(Financing and Purchasing of)**

44. Dr. Hamza Rafeeq asked the hon. Minister of Health:

- (a) Would the Minister give details as to the financing arrangements for the purchase of the new ambulances promised in the 2004 budget?
- (b) Would the Minister inform this House as to whether advertisements were placed in the media for the purchase of the ambulances?

The Minister of Health (Hon. John Rahael): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the fleet of 40 outfitted ambulances would be funded from the Ministry of Health's Estimates of Recurrent Expenditure for the financial year ending September 30, 2004 under the following vote:

Head	28	Ministry of Health
Sub-Head	04	Current Transfers and subsidies
Item	009	Other transfers
Sub-Item	01	Regional Health Authority Emergency Ambulance Service—\$18.5 million

Advertisements were not placed in the media for the purchase of the ambulances. The procurement of the ambulances, through the services of the United Nations Development Programme, was approved by Cabinet on September 19, 2003 and publicly announced on that same day.

Dr. Rafeeq: Mr. Deputy Speaker, bearing in mind that no advertisements were placed in the national newspapers, could the hon. Minister give the national community the assurance that the prices being paid for these ambulances are the best available?

Hon. J. Rahael: The purchase was through the United Nations Development Programme, and they have given us the assurance and we are satisfied their assurance was good enough that it was the best price.

Mr. S. Panday: Did the UNDP receive a commission for this procurement?

Hon. J. Rahael: I would assume so but I do not have that figure. I do not know.

Dr. Rafeeq: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. Minister could tell us something of the maintenance arrangement for these ambulances?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Member, that is not a proper supplemental question. In any event, it is now 2.15 p.m. and question time has ended.

Question No. 45 has been deferred for one week and question No. 47 would be set down for the next sitting.

Mrs. Persad-Bissessar: Mr. Deputy Speaker, with your leave, on the Order Paper, there are over 14 questions, all of which were due in the month of December for written replies. We have received only one reply and we crave your indulgence in terms of getting some idea as to when because these are now over due.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Member, questions for written answers are on the appendix to the Order Paper. These responses should be passed to the Clerk for circulation. I have seen some but the Clerk would see about circulating them.

The following question stood on the Order Paper:

**Trinidad and Tobago Police Service
(Promotional Examinations)**

- 47.** With respect to the results of the promotional examinations, conducted in August 2002 for promotion to the ranks of Corporal and Sergeant in the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service:
- (a) Would the Minister of National Security state whether these results are available or unavailable as at November 30, 2003;
 - (b) If the answer to (a) is “unavailable”, could the Minister give the reasons for this and state whether or not any examination scripts have been lost?
 - (c) If scripts have indeed been lost, could the Minister state the name of the person who lost the scripts, indicate whether this was reported to the police and what action has been taken to recover the scripts? *[Dr. R. Moonilal]*

Question, time having expired, question No. 47 was not dealt with.

WRITTEN ANSWER TO QUESTION

The following question was asked by Mr. Ganga Singh (Caroni East):

**Airports Authority of Trinidad and Tobago
(Employment Status)**

- 6.** Could the hon. Minister of Works and Transport provide this House with a list of all persons employed by the Airports Authority of Trinidad and Tobago indicating:
- (i) the capacity in which they are employed;
 - (ii) the salaries which they receive;
 - (iii) their starting date of employment?

Vide end of sitting for written answer.

DEFINITE URGENT MATTER**Sugar Industry Crisis**

Mr. Nizam Baksh (*Naparima*): Mr. Deputy Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 12, I hereby seek your leave to raise the following definite matter of urgent public importance namely, the failure by Government to deal with the current crisis in the sugar industry.

The matter is definite because following the closure of Caroni (1975) Limited, the Government has failed in its peaceful restructuring efforts to introduce alternative mechanisms to ensure that the canes produced by farmers are purchased in an orderly and timely basis. The matter is urgent because the harvesting is due to commence in two days' time and the implementation and management resources have not been identified and articulated to the farmers. More than 6,000 cane farmers who rely solely on the proceeds of sale of cane and who have been heavily indebted over the past six months would be affected. All stakeholders in the industry would be also adversely affected because of the un-preparedness and uncertainty due to the lack of real and tangible actions by the Government.

The matter is of public importance as the economic effects are not only associated with the loss in the much needed foreign exchange, but also the adverse rippling and multiplying effects it would have on local industries which rely on income generated from the sugar industry. It is also certain that mass confusion would be created when farmers seek to use the services of the scales, which could well fan the flames of hostility and instability in the sugar industry. Thank you.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Member, I have considered the request made under Standing Order 12, and the approval which you seek has not been granted. However, the suggestion is that this matter be brought under Standing Order 11.

INSURANCE (AMDT.) BILL

Order for Second Reading read.

The Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Sen. The Hon. Conrad Enill): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move,

That a Bill to amend the Insurance Act and for matters related thereto be now read a second time.

As you are aware, strengthening of the regulatory framework governing institutions in the financial services sector is a matter of primary importance for the continued development of sound, orderly capital markets in Trinidad and Tobago. The role of strong regulations in engendering investor confidence both locally and internationally in our financial sector is recognized as being integral to this process.

Insurance (Amdt.) Bill
[SEN. THE HON. C. ENILL]

Friday, January 09, 2004

The report of the committee appointed by the Cabinet to review the financial sector of Trinidad and Tobago emphasized in its vision for the financial sector that the stability of the sector depends and must be supported by the highest supervisory and regulatory standards. It is in this context, therefore, that we introduce for debate in this honourable House the Insurance (Amdt.) Bill 2003, which represents a significant element of the comprehensive plan for enhancement of the regulatory framework for the financial sector.

The importance of the Bill before this honourable House is that it seeks to integrate under the authority of a single regulatory body, the supervision of insurance companies, insurance intermediaries and pension plans administered under the Insurance Act, Chap. 84.01 with other licensed financial institutions registered under the Financial Institutions Act, 1993.

The Bill seeks to transfer the supervisory authority from the Supervisor of Insurance to the Central Bank of Trinidad and Tobago by way of short-term legislative changes to the Insurance Act, Chap. 84.01 and consequential amendments to the Financial Institutions Act, 1993, the Central Bank Act, Chap. 79.02 and the Trinidad and Tobago Free Zones Act, No. 19 of 1988.

I should point out that the Bill does not represent the required comprehensive amendments to the Insurance Act, which are necessary to bring the legislation in line with international standards and best practices. Save and except for the proposed amendment to section 205 of the Insurance Act and the transfer of supervisory authority in a manner consistent with the Financial Institutions Act, there would be no fundamental changes to the Act at this stage.

At a later stage and after dialogue with the industry, a more comprehensive review of the Insurance Act would be undertaken, taking into consideration the peculiar environment that make up Trinidad and Tobago.

The idea of integrated supervision in the financial sector has had a lengthy gestation period. It has been engaging the attention of supervisory authorities worldwide for a number of years. In the last decade many developed as well as developing countries have moved towards integrated supervision in varying degrees. These countries include: Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom, the Netherland Antilles and our CARICOM neighbour Jamaica.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to emphasize that the experiences of these countries have shown that integrated supervision involves a complex process, and in many cases they were protracted. In fact, the United Kingdom, perhaps the forerunner on this subject, has not yet fully completed the process. In considering the approach to be taken in Trinidad and Tobago, the Central Bank in early 1999, commissioned a diagnostic study to explore the possibility of integrating the

supervision of financial institutions in Trinidad and Tobago. This study found that developments in the domestic financial system were replicating those of more sophisticated markets. One such example was the growing affiliation between banks and insurance companies.

Under the current structure of the domestic financial system, insurance companies and pension plans are supervised by the Supervisor of Insurance in the Ministry of Finance while banks and other deposit-taking institutions are supervised by the Inspector of Banks in the Central Bank. The securities industry is under the supervision of the Trinidad and Tobago Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commissioner for Cooperative Development supervises credit unions.

The study recommended that integrated supervision should be implemented in Trinidad and Tobago on a phased basis. The merging of the supervision of insurance companies and pension plans with that of banking institutions under the Inspector of Banks in the Central Bank was seen as a first step in the approach to achieve the ultimate goal of integrated supervision of financial institutions.

The insurance industry is a fundamental cornerstone of our financial system as well as our economic and social existence. The industry provides a unique service in risk transference and in doing so is a major repository of our national savings and, consequently has a critical role in capital accumulation. The latest figures indicate that the total assets of the insurance and pension sectors exceed \$25 billion at December 31, 2002. It is therefore vital that this industry is appropriately supervised to ensure that policy holders' expectations are met and that the industry continues to develop and maintain long-term viability.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the insurance industry has also experienced phenomenal changes in corporate structures as well as the nature and scope of the products and services offered to clients. Growth and expansion along with alliances and partnerships within the sector emerged as the chosen approach for many companies to preserve and increase their presence in the industry and to ensure long term viability and success. This resulted in ongoing consolidation both within and across financial sub-sectors. Consolidation affords these institutions an opportunity to benefit from economies of scale and compete from an enhanced position of strength. Most of the larger life companies operate as part of a corporate group and many have significant transactions with related corporate entities.

Along with changes in the corporate structures and scale of operations, there has also been ongoing innovation in the range and complexity of products and

Insurance (Amdt.) Bill
[SEN. THE HON. C. ENILL]

Friday, January 09, 2004

services offered. Corporate groups in the banking and insurance industries are moving towards the one-stop shop concept for financial services. Instead of being restricted to banking or insurance or mutual funds, our institutions have emerged as entities that offer a diversified package of insurance, investment and saving instruments.

While this can provide the competitive edge as our financial institutions seek to meet the expectations of today's more informed investors, this also requires a regulatory apparatus that has the appropriate structure and resources to provide effective supervision. In the past, the different sectors of the financial services industry developed in distinct fashions under different regulatory regimes. It has nevertheless become increasingly difficult for any sector to be properly supervised by any one regulator.

2.30 p.m.

As the banking and insurance industries integrate at the corporate and market levels, effective regulation of both industries require that the supervisory mechanism be similarly integrated. Integrated supervision has therefore become necessary if regulators are to fully meet the challenges of meaningful supervision of the financial conglomerates that have emerged in our financial landscape.

Industry-specific regulators will continue to experience significant difficulties in obtaining critical information in measuring the risk of these institutions under supervision. Accordingly, separate supervisory agencies operating in an uncoordinated manner provide opportunities for regulatory arbitrage which could lead to the impairment of the financial institutions. The integrated approach to the supervision is therefore expected to facilitate coordinated and comprehensive oversight of the broader financial services industry in the interest of promoting orderly markets.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as previously stated, the consultants recommended, and the Government has agreed, that the merging of the supervision of insurance companies and pension plans with that of banking institutions under the Financial Institutions Act, in regulation of the sector, be seen as a first step in the integrated approach.

The Office of the Supervisor of Insurance has, for several years, been plagued with difficulties that have had a significant negative effect on its ability to properly supervise the industry within the scope of the Insurance Act. The salary scales of supervisory personnel were constrained by public service salary structures and the compensation packages of the staff relative to their counterparts

in the financial services sector were unattractive. This has made it impossible to attract and to retain suitably trained and experienced persons to function within the Office of the Supervisor of Insurance. Accordingly, it was not possible to develop a cadre of officers with the appropriate training and unique skills required for this function.

Further, the Office of the Supervisor of Insurance has had to contend with the many competing interests within the Ministry of Finance itself and the wider public service and was unable to receive the prominence it demands in order to supervise the industry efficiently and effectively. The lack of adequate material resources furnished in a timely manner has also impacted negatively on the office's ability to readily respond to the supervisory needs of the sector.

The Central Bank is independent of the compensation constraints of the public service and is better positioned to acquire and retain persons with the requisite competencies to regulate the insurance and pension plan industry. Furthermore, the Central Bank already has an effective supervisory infrastructure in place for banking. This infrastructure has been expanded and suitably modified to accommodate its intended additional supervisory responsibilities for insurance and pensions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in recognition of the differences in the forms of the supervisory authorities, the supervisor on the one hand being an individual and the Central Bank being a statutory corporation, it is proposed to amend the Insurance Act as far as possible, to procure some level of consistency between the Financial Institutions Act and the Insurance Act. To this end:

- Registration of all insurance companies and insurance intermediaries would be done by the Central Bank;
- The cancellation of the registration of insurance companies would be made by the Board of the Central Bank;
- All payments currently made to the supervisor would now be made to the Central Bank;
- All payments currently made to the Comptroller of Accounts would be made to the Central Bank and credited to the Consolidated Fund in terms similar to section 41(3) of the Financial Institutions Act;
- All payments currently made to the Comptroller for the account of the supervisor would also now be made to the Central Bank;

For example, the existing regulations 5 of the Insurance (Pension Fund Plans Registration Fees) Regulations require the payment of a fee of \$50 to the Comptroller for the account of the Supervisor of Insurance in respect of the

registration of any plan; and a fee of \$10 for registration of amendments to the rules of the registered plans or correction of that register. All these payments previously made to the Supervisor would now be made to the Central Bank.

- Regulations made by the Minister would be made in terms similar to the Financial Institutions Act, that is, on the recommendations of the Central Bank;
- The duties of the Inspector of Banks and the examination and inspection functions of the Supervisor of Insurance will reside in one position called the Inspector of Financial Institutions. The Inspector would be the functionary responsible for the examination and inspection of insurance companies and pension funds in much the same way as his or her inspection functions under the financial institutions are now done;
- Wherever the term “Inspector of Banks” appears in any legislation it would be repealed and replaced by the term “Inspector of Financial Institutions”. The Insurance Act, the Financial Institutions Act, the Central Bank Act and the Trinidad and Tobago Free Zones Act have therefore been amended to reflect this name change;
- All acts and things done prior to the commencement of the Insurance (Amdt.) Act, for and on behalf of the Supervisor of Insurance pursuant to the Insurance Act shall have effect as if done by the Central Bank;
- All legal proceedings commenced prior to the coming into operation of the Bill by or against the Supervisor of Insurance shall have effect as if done by the Central Bank;
- All documents and information relating to insurance companies and pension funds, held by the Supervisor of Insurance shall be transferred to the Central Bank;
- The appeal provisions under section 205 of the Insurance Act have been amended to allow for consistency with the Financial Institutions Act, 1993. Under section 53 of the Financial Institutions Act, orders, decisions and directions given by the Central Bank will continue in force pending the outcome of an appeal brought by an aggrieved person unless, on an inter parte application or an ex parte application where notice is given to the Central Bank, the court is of the view that exceptional circumstances exist that warrant the grant of a stay of any further action by the Central Bank.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, at a later stage, I would be suggesting further amendments to the proposed section 205 in order to bring the provisions of this section in line with current civil practice and procedure in Trinidad and Tobago.

In keeping with the current civil procedure, I would be further proposing that the injunction granted in favour of an insurance provider be made on such terms and conditions as the Court may direct and that such injunction should continue to have effect until further ordered by the Court. This proposal is consistent with the procedures laid down in the Orders and Rules of the Supreme Court of Judicature of Trinidad and Tobago.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in closing, I wish to reaffirm that the objectives of this Bill are germane to this Government's commitment to promoting sound financial markets by establishing good macroeconomic conditions and by building institutions. In particular, the Trinidad and Tobago Securities and Exchange Commission, the Trinidad and Tobago Stock Exchange, the Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Trinidad and Tobago Unit Trust Corporation all provide a high degree of comfort and confidence for our savers and investors.

The process of reforming the financial sector to ensure that it meets the needs of a diversified and modernized Trinidad and Tobago as envisaged in our Vision 2020, is an essential public policy objective. We are now evaluating the comments from the national community on the recently issued Green Paper called the *Final Report on the Financial Sector of Trinidad and Tobago*.

We intend to proceed urgently to put in place international best practice codes and standards covering the financial services sector, in particular the areas related to the banking and insurance supervision as well as the regulation of the securities industry.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Government wishes to establish a financial sector that is well regulated, well supervised and is able to respond to crises promptly and effectively. By shifting the supervision of insurance companies from the Office of the Supervisor of Insurance in the Ministry of Finance to the Central Bank of Trinidad and Tobago, we would enhance our ability to deal with the current reality of universal banking where banks, non-banks and insurance companies are all part of the same group of corporate entities. As we proceed with the phased approach to integration of financial supervision, we are confident that oversight efficiency will be improved.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move.

Question proposed.

Mr. Gerald Yetming (*St. Joseph*): Mr. Deputy Speaker, everything that the Minister has said in piloting this Bill, we agree with. The principle of a super regulator, if you wish—an integrated regulator—is one which we have articulated and, in fact, the study that started it was initiated by the government of the United National Congress.

It is accepted and for the sake of brevity and to avoid repetition, I fully endorse everything the Minister has said, by and large, and the question of this measure being one element of an action to strengthen the financial sector is acknowledged. What the Minister failed to tell us during his presentation is what the Government intends to do about the other elements. He spoke about strengthening the financial sector and the regulatory framework and of this being one element, the first measure, which is short-term. He acknowledges that the Insurance Act itself requires almost wholesale reform, but he never gave an indication of when it is likely—and he also spoke about consultation with the industry.

Measures to improve the legal management of the insurance sector have been discussed for the past 10 years. In fact, one question I would ask is whether the opportunity ought not to have been taken to put in one or two other measures in this Bill to give further strengthening to this new regulator. It is fine and we believe that changing the regulator from the Supervisor of Insurance to the Inspector of Financial Institutions would go a long way in improving the regulation of the insurance sector. We believe there are measures within the existing Act that this new Inspector of Financial Institutions would be able to better administer than the previous practice under the Supervisor of Insurance. I also think this has been widely acknowledged, and that there are many other measures that ought to take place. I am questioning whether, in fact, we should have waited or we should wait until a wholesale reform of this Insurance Act takes place and whether some additional measures ought not to have been built into the amendment we have before us.

In his Budget Statement 2003/2004, the Minister of Finance did talk about the financial sector being a major area for reform that was going to have the attention of the Government. He did speak of the importance of a strong and well-regulated financial sector. But we have a question of credibility here. On one hand they speak of a strong and well-regulated financial sector—they come with a measure here today to do that—and on the other hand they say and do things that could be very damaging to the very financial sector they are seeking to protect.

The example I can give is with respect to the Trinidad and Tobago Unit Trust Corporation, but I would come back to that. I intend to deal with this Bill in the

context of the soundness and stability of the entire financial sector because the Minister, in piloting this Bill, in his own words, spoke of this being one element.

When we talk about credibility—within the same financial sector, in 2002, immediately after this Government assumed office—we had the minister piloting the bill, saying there was an investigation in the Hindu Credit Union and one day later the Minister of Labour and Cooperatives at the time, saying there were two investigations and as a result of unprecedented protest action by the financial institution outside Balisier House, the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance came out and said there were no investigations. Up to now I do not think it is clear to anyone in the country whether there were investigations or not.

Within more recent times we had the Minister of Energy and Energy Industries calling a press conference to talk about conditional approval being given to British Gas with respect to the sale of LNG from Trains 1 and 2 to a British Gas subsidiary and then to be told two days later by the Prime Minister that no approval had been given. Up to now this country does not know which it is. Was there a conditional licence or not?

Now we are hearing today that approval is being sought from the Chief State Solicitor to have a certain sum of money written off with respect to the amount owing by the Prime Minister to the Government. I really do not know what message that is going to send to the national community. When people owe money, or the court has ruled that you owe money, is it right or proper that now that you are in government you seek to amend rules to lay down guidelines to establish new criteria for establishing court costs and for establishing write-off policy? When the little man in the street owes money to banks, NEDCO and so on, what signals are we sending?

Mrs. Robinson-Regis: Thank you very much for giving way.

Dr. Khan: What is the Standing Order?

Mrs. Robinson-Regis: I did not rise on a Standing Order. [*Interruption*] Thank you very much for giving way, colleague.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, just to make the point that, as I said in answer to the question, there were no guidelines. The guidelines that were outlined are proposed guidelines set by the UNC administration in the year 2000. They have not yet been accepted or rejected. The policy is now being formulated. The policy is being formulated based on those guidelines that were set by the UNC administration. So, I am sorry that the Member for St. Joseph is not remembering exactly what was said.

Mr. G. Yetming: Mr. Deputy Speaker, my question is: What signals do we send when a prime minister owing money to the State would now, after the fact and in Government, seek to establish guidelines—whether you copied guidelines or are willing to consider guidelines from 1999, 2000, 2003 or whatever is not material. The material question is: What signal is being sent by a prime minister writing to the Chief State Solicitor asking for a waiver of a debt? What signals are we sending to the thousands of people who owe money to NEDCO? [*Desk thumping*] It is the very way that the entire community has questioned the actions of the Prime Minister in meeting community leaders. Now with the rampant crime, what is being drawn from that is that anybody could appear to do anything, consider themselves a community leader and have the ear of the Prime Minister. It is the same thing I am saying. This is going to lead to a further breakdown in the society.

I would not want to make reference to the more recent case of the well-respected Reginald Dumas appearing on television this morning severely criticizing the actions of the Prime Minister with respect to his acceptance of private jet transport from a private sector firm doing business in this country. It is a question of credibility; it is a question of the actions by the person holding the highest office of this land. So, in the context of this Bill, when they talk of strengthening the financial sector and then do things and say things about the same financial sector—as in the case of the Unit Trust Corporation—to damage it, the whole question of the credibility of the Government is what I am expressing concern about.

With respect to the Bill before us, I would hope that the Minister, in closing the debate on this Bill, would give us a better idea of the Government's plan with respect to the overall legislative requirement for the strengthening of the financial sector, because in the Prime Minister's Budget Statement 2003/2004, he made reference to a number of things. He made reference to the Insurance Act, the Financial Institutions Act, the Securities Industry Act, the Cooperative Societies Act, and he also made reference to the fact that mutual funds legislation would be presented in the new year, meaning in 2004. What the Minister ought to give us is a better time frame for the wider reform required to the Insurance Act to give further teeth, so to speak, to the new regulator in dealing with the new developments in this industry.

I think the Minister recognized that the financial industry is changing rapidly, the lines between insurance and banks are becoming blurred and now credit unions are seeking to provide services that have traditionally been the business of banks. So that what we would expect would be some indication of a time frame.

One of the concerns that drove the UNC to begin this entire reform process was what was happening with respect to the damages done to countries with the failures of their financial sectors worldwide. It was happening worldwide. We do not have to go too far for examples of it. Jamaica: The people of Jamaica are paying a heavy price for the failure of their financial sector that took place in the 1990s. They are paying a heavy price today and they would probably pay a heavy price for many years to come.

One of the reasons for the failure in Jamaica is exactly what this Bill is intended to correct. The insurance industry in Jamaica was supervised by a supervisor of insurance within the ministry of finance and they had the same problem that we had. The ministry of finance could not engage the quality of staff because of salaries and all kinds of other considerations and they were not able to supervise the industry properly. Mind you, because of the failure, institutions in Trinidad have benefited in Jamaica. Banks have been acquired in Jamaica and insurance companies have been acquired in Jamaica by Trinidad and Tobago institutions.

This is why, when I spoke in the budget debate, I warned that the Government was taking us down one of the five roads to instability in this country by the manner in which it dealt with the Unit Trust Corporation issue. It does not take long for confidence to be damaged in the financial sector and for the entire sector to collapse overnight. The Governor of the Central Bank, Mr. Williams, in an address he made some time ago, spoke of a conversation he had with the chairman of Financial Sector Adjustment Company Limited (FINSAC) in Jamaica. FINSAC was an institution formed by the government of Jamaica to help reverse the damaged financial sector. The chairman of FINSAC's words were—I am repeating these words because there is some relevance—that in addition to the problems of the Ministry of Finance and the supervisor of insurance and so on, he pointed to the country's indigenous financial sector entrepreneurs, and that part of the problem of the financial sector in Jamaica was these entrepreneurs. He said that they were too eager to get rich. They were too bullish in risking other people's money. They were too eager to start at the top. They were too competitive with one another in demonstrating the trappings of success which was reflected in the rush to form larger and more complex groups and they were too prone to bend prudential norms and regulations.

The reason I say this is that we have Jamaicans coming here to invest in our financial sector. One of the things in the financial sector in Trinidad and Tobago is that our indigenous financial industry—both banks and insurance companies—by and large we had conservative people at the top unlike Jamaica as warned

Insurance (Amdt.) Bill
[MR. YETMING]

Friday, January 09, 2004

by the chairman of FINSAC in Jamaica. I simply say that to caution the Minister of Finance and the Central Bank that with the influx of Jamaicans wanting to come into the financial sector in Trinidad and Tobago they should be warned about these risk tendencies and so on. It is just as well that we are strengthening our regulatory framework.

So that this Bill is important but the wider reform or changes to the Insurance Act in the words of the Governor of the Central Bank are urgent. This is why I made the suggestion earlier that I thought that some consideration would have been given to putting into the amendments we have before us today one or two measures, dealing with intervention and so on, that could have strengthened the hand of the Inspector of Financial Institutions.

During the committee stage of this Bill I want to raise a number of issues and so that the Minister could have a sense on what my thinking is, it is in three areas. The first one is where provision has been made for actions by the board of the Central Bank, it might be consistent with what might be in the FIA, but I think we need to revisit that provision, particularly in the context of what I consider to be the politicization of the board of the Central Bank. I make specific reference to the appointment of Prof. Selwyn Cudjoe to the board.

3.00 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if they are now going to have a politicized board, I question whether we could continue to have the practice whereby actions to be taken by the Central Bank, particularly with respect to the revocation of licences, should be taken by the board and not the Central Bank and not the governor. While one might argue that a board would have different considerations to the decision, I feel that any self-respecting governor would be very careful to act fairly and independently in making a decision, particularly with respect to revocation and so on, rather than a politicized board. At the end of the day, we are dealing with financial institutions and I really do not see the role of a board in matters such as this.

The second issue I want to raise—it might be an error on the part of the legal people drafting this Bill—is that the existing Bill makes reference to the Minister taking certain action. That Minister taking action in a couple of cases was appropriate where the supervisor was a person in the Ministry of Finance. So where we had the Supervisor of Insurance wanting to take action, she had to have the Minister do it; but in the context of the Central Bank, is it appropriate still to have the Minister take that action rather than the Governor? When we come to committee stage, we will deal with that section by section.

The third point I want to make is with respect to insurance companies doing business overseas. I am not too sure—I am not a legal person—whether provision has been made for the interim period to allow the insurance companies to apply to the Central Bank and to the Inspector of Financial Institutions to do business overseas. Like I said, at committee stage, we will deal with that.

In the context of the stability of the financial system and of legislation that has been promised to deal comprehensively with the matter, the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance made reference to the Cooperative Societies Act. I recall in some debate, I raised the question of the credit unions being brought under the Supervisor of Financial Institutions and the response from the Minister of Finance was that it was intended, but there has been little or no articulation by the Government on whether it will be so or not.

I come back to the Hindu Credit Union because the Governor of the Central Bank, in an article in the *Business Express* on January 07—two days ago—when asked about updated legislation for credit unions, spoke about the activities of one in particular. He said that, based on newspaper reports, this credit union has been able to mobilize large amounts of revenue. His comment was:

“My only observation, is that their scale is so large, that in the absence of strict regulation, potentially there are a lot of risks.”

To me the Governor of the Central Bank was expressing deep concern about the activities of a particular credit union. He did not name it, but we have had the spectacle, as I term it, of the Hindu Credit Union, in 2002, with their protest action outside Balisier House, when it was reported that an investigation was taking place. More recently, in December 2003, a newspaper was reporting about the stability of this particular credit union, which again resulted in protest action, unprecedented, with the burning of papers and with a major religious body in Trinidad and Tobago, the Maha Sabha, distancing itself from this particular organization and calling for forensic audit.

The reason I raise this is that in the absence of a proper regulator for the credit union sector, in the absence of something the public can hold on to, this continued attack on this credit union, warranted or otherwise, I am cautioning, could be very, very damaging to the financial sector. There is going to be panic sooner rather than later. I urge that the Government and the Minister, in outlining the Government's agenda for the comprehensive reform of the financial sector, also tell us what it intends to do about the supervision of the credit unions. I want to believe that it is going to be done—that it is Government's intention to put it under the very same Inspector of Financial Institutions.

Insurance (Amdt.) Bill
[MR. YETMING]

Friday, January 09, 2004

The IMF, in its Article IV Report in May 2003 said:

“The banking system appears sound but early action is required to strengthen supervision of the non-bank financial sector which remains less effectively regulated.”

They go on to recommend that the credit unions also be brought under the supervision of the Central Bank at an early date, especially given their growth in recent years.

I come to the contradictory actions by the Government relative to this sector. I made reference to it in the earlier part of my contribution. While we support the Bill before us—with the exception of what might come out in committee; and we support, in principle, all the further actions to strengthen the sector once they have been outlined to us—we continue to have deep concerns about the contradictory actions of the Government; its continued actions and utterances on the Unit Trust Corporation of Trinidad and Tobago, and in particular the Prime Minister’s, with respect to the same financial sector.

The Prime Minister made a statement recently to the effect that the structure of the board of the Unit Trust Corporation is something that they have had reservations about for some time. I really would like to know the reservations of the Government with respect to the structure of the board of the Unit Trust Corporation. When the Unit Trust Corporation was formed by the Government many years ago, it configured the first subscribers in such a fashion so as to give it some degree of independence from the Government, with the National Insurance Board and with banks and insurance companies. As a result of this, the composition of the board was configured and put into law in accord with the initial contributors.

I would be bold to say that it is the presence of the private sector members on that board, representing banks and insurance companies, which gave the Unit Trust Corporation credibility and confidence and which gave the public confidence in the Unit Trust Corporation to take away from this government organization image. It is because of the presence on the board of these people from the banks and insurance companies, which I am sure, lent a lot with respect to governance issues, prudential issues and investment issues. It is because of that, among other things, that the Unit Trust Corporation was able to grow phenomenally; to the point where now they have assets, I believe, in excess of \$11 billion.

What could be wrong with the people on the board that today the Government should have reservations about them? I think that having made the statement, the

Government through the Minister of Finance owes us some explanation. I would not want to believe that it is Government's intention to come with piecemeal legislation to change the composition of the board in the absence of any wider legislation to deal with the Unit Trust Corporation. In an organization in which they have no interest, they act and speak as if the Unit Trust Corporation is a state enterprise.

They had some conflict with the Chairman of the Board, Mr. Alleyne, and he was fired almost immediately. At about noon, in my contribution during the budget debate, I cautioned the Prime Minister that if he were contemplating firing Mr. Alleyne, that he defer his action. By 4 o'clock he was fired with the assistance of the Acting President at the time. This points to a growing concern in this country about the dictatorial tendencies of this Prime Minister; not only within the country, but also within his party. I dare his senior colleagues to get up to defend him. I know what is being said. I hear what is being said privately.

What could have prompted Mr. Michael Williams to write an article in the newspaper just a couple of days ago and use language like “constitutional dictator”? More and more the commentators out there are talking about this galloping dictatorship.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Get back to the Bill, please!

Mr. G. Yetming: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want you to allow me a little time because I am dealing with this in the context of a sound and stable financial sector of which this Bill is only “one element”—the very words used by the Minister piloting the Bill.

In the *Daily Express* dated Thursday, January 08—just yesterday—in an article written by Reginald Dumas, respected commentator, intellectual and scholar, he talked about the “unremitting political assault on our institutions designed...to bring them under the hegemony of the Cabinet”. He goes on to talk about the Marlene Coudray issue; of the undermining of our institutions by political interference; and in her case, by intimidation. This is what this country under this Prime Minister is coming to. So, whether it has to do with the decision to remove Parliament; whether it has to do with the threat to amend the Treason Act because some little organization in San Juan writes a letter about the FTAA headquarters in Trinidad and Tobago—the country was threatened that if they spoke a little out of turn; maybe the remedy for that is an amendment to the Treason Act, which all of us know is a non-bailable offence punishable by death.

What about the Snaggs issue—the handing over of the letter? I am coming to the point.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Member, deal with the bill, please!

Mr. G. Yetming: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the financial sector is built on confidence. If people believe that a dictatorship is creeping into this country, do you believe that people would leave their moneys in the banks of Trinidad and Tobago? It is all going to go. So, what I am cautioning is not irrelevant. I am simply making the point so that the Prime Minister, as I asked in the budget debate, would listen. It is not only the Opposition speaking, it is also public independent commentators; it is people within his own ranks who are saying the same thing outside this House.

Whether it is victimization of Marlene Coudray or what have you, these are all signs and if we are not careful—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Member, you have done it once; you have done it twice. The matter relating to the Chief Executive Officer of the San Fernando City Corporation is sub judice. Would you please not refer to it!

Mr. G. Yetming: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I have made my point.

I want to read from the budget statement made on Monday, October 21, 2002 by the hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance. He said:

“We plan to restructure the Trinidad and Tobago Unit Trust Corporation into a public liability company by passing in Parliament the Trinidad and Tobago Unit Trust Corporation Vesting Bill, 2002...This will allow for an initial public offering by the newly reconstructed Unit Trust Corporation. This public offering is essential, not only for providing greater opportunities for wealth creation within the national community, but also for developing and strengthening the domestic financial and capital markets, thereby leading to faster economic growth.”

This is a statement made in October 2002, to bring to this Parliament the Trinidad and Tobago Unit Trust Corporation Vesting Bill to create a public company. I do not think that we have heard anything from the Government since then about this and I would expect that the Minister in closing the debate would tell us Government's plan in this respect. We have a deep concern for the statements that continue to be made by the Government relative to this Unit Trust Corporation, which did no significant damage the last time around with the merger talk. I do not know whether there is the feeling that we could take it a step further and there would be no additional damage.

I know that there was a run, not a significant run in relative terms, but there was a run on the Unit Trust Corporation in the days of the merger talk—where

ordinary men and women were expressing concerns. Now, we are giving them further reason to express concern, with the recent statement on the change of the board.

There is an emerging problem of governance within the Unit Trust Corporation. We have had Mr. Nickie being dismissed. We had the chairman being dismissed. We have Mr. Benn, whose six-month extension expires next month—if he should stay until next month. The current chairman has been given a one-year contract, rather than a five-year term. I would seriously question, in today's scenario, whether that gentleman would stay for his year. So, within the next month, there would be a serious problem within the leadership of the Unit Trust Corporation.

We also have, Mr. Speaker, a situation where the Chairman of the Unit Trust Corporation, Mr. Hubert Alleyne, was dismissed as chairman, but he still continues to be chairman of seven subsidiaries of the Unit Trust Corporation. The question that I am sure must be occupying the minds of the Government is how to remove Mr. Alleyne as chairman of these seven subsidiaries. I really do not know how these seven subsidiaries are going to conduct their business. I would like the Minister, in closing the debate on this Bill, to tell us something about it because I think that the population ought to know.

But, you see Mr. Deputy Speaker, Government's plan for the Unit Trust Corporation is unclear to the wider population. I want to tell this House that the plan of the Government, notwithstanding the fact that they know and everybody in the country knows that the Unit Trust Corporation is not a state enterprise; that the Government has no financial interest in the Unit Trust Corporation and that the only thing they ought to do is to bring that Unit Trust Corporation Vesting Bill before us to allow for privatization with whatever safeguards relative to the configuration of share ownership, if they want to protect the Unit Trust Corporation from getting into one hand or the wrong hands.

In a document prepared by the Government on the restructuring of the Unit Trust Corporation, it is talking about having a golden share. In their own words in that document, they believe they have a right to a continued say in the governance of that corporation. I think they want to continue to have a say in the governance of that corporation. I think they want to remove the private sector representatives from the board because they want to have total control of the Unit Trust Corporation. I would explain why.

My information is that the idea to merge the Unit Trust Corporation and First Citizens Bank did not originate in Trinidad and Tobago.

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

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

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. G. Yetming: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker and hon. Members for giving me additional time.

I was making the point that Government's intention, by virtue of its plan to privatize the Unit Trust Corporation, is to hold a golden share with certain rights. Its plan to remove the private sector representatives from the banks and insurance companies from the board is to retain total and absolute control of the Unit Trust Corporation and control of the public's \$11 billion in deposits. My information is that the idea for the merging of the Unit Trust Corporation with First Citizens Bank was not born in Trinidad and Tobago. The idea was born in Jamaica. The idea came from an individual in Jamaica with wide mutual funds and banking holdings, and it is no coincidence, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that immediately after that merger talk started in Trinidad and Tobago, the very Jamaican gentleman appeared in Trinidad and Tobago seeking to develop business in this country.

Mr. Ken Gordon was simply a conduit for that idea because of his Jamaican connection. My information is that Mr. Lee Chin of the AIC Group and Mr. Gordon have met on a number of occasions and by virtue of the idea being passed on to the Prime Minister and by virtue of other discussions that have taken place, there is now a plan to have 20 per cent of First Citizens Bank sold to Mr. Lee Chin and his AIC Group.

My information is that a certain sum of money has been paid to a minister of government. The people giving that information are speculating that it is a bribe. I do not know. It could be a first payment or a deposit on the payment of the 20 per cent. It is up to the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance to check that. The truth will come out when we hear of Government's real intention with respect to the Unit Trust Corporation. The truth will come out when we hear of Government's real intention with respect to the First Citizens Bank.

3.30 p.m.

I will really ask the Member for Diego Martin Central to stay out of this, for his own good.

Mr. Valley: Mr. Deputy Speaker, let him state clearly what he is saying. Let him be extremely clear in what he is saying. Let us not have any doubt as to what

he is saying. Let him say exactly what he is saying. He has privilege in this House, say it. He has privilege, he must say it!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Member for St. Joseph please, you are skirting very closely. Please be careful of your references. [*Interruption*] Please, I am not interested in what you are saying. If you have to make a point, when I sit you can get up and ask. Please, Member for St. Joseph, do not appear—you are coming close to casting aspersions.

Mr. G. Yetming: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was only suggesting to my colleague from Diego Martin Central that he should be very careful if he wishes to get up to respond, because my information is that he is not involved in this. Therefore, before he makes the mistake of getting up to defend it—he may not be aware of all that is happening with respect to the matter I have raised here—I want to caution him that he should just stay out of it.

I want to caution the Government that in their further actions with respect to the Unit Trust Corporation, the First Citizens Bank (FCB) and the nation that they be very careful in whatever they do. I am cautioning the Parliament and the nation that my information is that there is a plan afoot, already hatched, to sell 20 per cent of FCB merged or unmerged with the UTC; preferably merged, to Mr. Lee Chin or the AIC Group. I am suggesting that unless their actions are done with utmost transparency, the whole issue—that is why after two years in government, the latest Transparency International Report will suggest that on the corruption index, we are getting worse. It is the same businessmen out there who are talking about this payment for the 20 per cent of FCB. They almost know it as fact. It is those very businessmen who are going to respond to questionnaires from Transparency International to make a determination on how well we stand on the corruption index. The Government could shout all they want about what they want to do about corruption and what have you, but their actions are not consistent with that. I am not casting any aspersions on everybody on the other side. I have said many times before, not everybody on the other side is an angel as they make themselves out to be, which is why I cautioned my friend from Diego Martin Central to stay out of that, because there are those among them who are engaged in activities that will embarrass him.

How could we, in the context of integrity, respond to the fact that the Director of Public Prosecutions, Mr. Mohammed, quite sometime ago wrote to the police to investigate matters in the LABIDCO affair and we cannot hear a word about it? Why is it that this Bickram gentleman has come out publicly and said that there was a conspiracy between senior police officers and senior members of the party,

Insurance (Amdt.) Bill
[MR. YETMING]

Friday, January 09, 2004

relative to him making false allegations on voter padding on the UNC? He has now come out and said that it was all a conspiracy. We have not heard a word from the Government or the police on a matter like that. It is good for them at one time and not good at another time.

I come back to the Bill before us simply to say that the provisions, by and large except for what will be raised by the committee, will have the support of this side. We eagerly anticipate their statements, relative to the broader legislative framework, specifically with respect to further amendments to the Insurance Act and particularly with reference to their plan for the supervision of the credit unions and to caution the Government to tread very carefully with respect to their actions on the Unit Trust Corporation and the First Citizens Bank.

The Minister of Trade and Industry and Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Hon. Kenneth Valley): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am hard-headed so I am getting in. I want to really start simply by showing the contradictions implied in the Member's contribution. The Member was at pains to argue that the State has no interest in the Unit Trust Corporation, but in the same breath he was talking about bringing the Vesting Bill to the Parliament so that we privatize the Unit Trust Corporation. Why do you privatize something? Is it not to move it from the public to the private? He said the State fired the chairman. The State has no interest in the Unit Trust Corporation but it could fire the chairman. He says we want a golden share to retain total and absolute control of the Unit Trust Corporation, the same Unit Trust Corporation in which we have no interest. When you consider the Member's own contradiction then you see clearly you can discard his total contribution. The fact situation is that the Government has within its possession an opinion from eminent London counsel stating that in fact the Government is the true owner of the Unit Trust Corporation. The Unit Trust Corporation and the Governor of the Central Bank has it. That is the reality. Everybody knows that. If one considers the formation of the Unit Trust Corporation, the role the Central Bank played and the guarantee that the Central Bank provided, which allowed the Unit Trust Corporation to develop, one sees clearly what is happening. I do not know what the hullabaloo is about. I must say that because Dale and Tony cannot hear, but that is another issue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me deal with this whole Unit Trust Corporation issue and then move on to some other things. As a fact, when I had the portfolio of investments, the Unit Trust Corporation's Executive Director, in the company of the Marketing Director, Mr. Nickie, came to my office suggesting that the Unit Trust Corporation buys into the FCB. The Unit Trust Corporation proposed that

then. It is no magic that for some time now in Trinidad and Tobago the Unit Trust Corporation was speaking about getting involved; buying into the FCB. One did not have to wait for Ken Gordon or Lee Chin. Mr. Lee Chin is the 18th richest person in Canada. There was a magazine the other day that stated that he is the 18th richest person in Canada. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Mr. Lee Chin was my schoolmate. I know him as “Chigro”. When he “start talking he talk, he must talk he talk”. I am not frightened. “Yuh must talk yuh talk. I ent get frightehed. Ah want yuh to talk yuh talk!”

Mr. Deputy Speaker, understand their contradictions: the Member speaks about the banks and insurance companies going into Jamaica and buying companies in Jamaica, but here he is trying to counsel us that we must not let the Jamaicans come in to buy equity in Trinidad. [*Interruption*] He may not have said it in words but it was clearly implied. One has to ask oneself the question: who is he speaking for? When you listen to the whole tone of his contribution, the question at the back of your mind must be: whose brief is he carrying this afternoon? If the Standing Orders do not speak about it May’s talks about it. He should read May’s. The Member cannot come here representing other people’s interest. Let them fight their own battle.

Dr. Khan: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, Standing Order 36(5), the Member is imputing improper motives.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have examined the relevant Standing Order and I do not think that he has reached there yet.

Hon. K. Valley: I have no intentions of imputing improper motives. It is only improper if he took money for it. I do not know if he took money for it. Perhaps he is just protecting old friends. Mr. Deputy Speaker, we all have old friends. What you need to see, colleague from St. Joseph, is that competition is good for the market. There might be a little shake up but more people would get employed. Do not worry.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I continue to argue that in Trinidad and Tobago we are so happy, we have nothing to talk about so that every little thing that happens we try to blow it up. Perhaps it is the frustration of the Opposition. Here we have an important piece of legislation that should really be passed in half of an hour. The whole restructuring of the financial sector was started by the PNM during the period 1991—1995 and continued during the period 1995—2001. We are now finishing because we left for six years and things are still there. We now have to come and complete it, no problem. The Member has no argument whatsoever on

Insurance (Amdt.) Bill
[HON. K. VALLEY]

Friday, January 09, 2004

the legislation, so he goes off on side issues, talking about all types of things that just do not matter. The Member spoke about Reginald Dumas. I do not like to interfere with individuals who are not Members of the House, but I tell the Prime Minister from time to time, if he had done certain things, Reginald Dumas would have been singing praises now. I leave that alone.

The Prime Minister was not on private business. Government paid for him to travel first class on a particular course. An opportunity arose which required a change in plan. I do not know really what the fuss is about. Take the other one; for months, the town was going up and down about the Prime Minister preventing the appointment of the Commissioner of Police. Now the Prime Minister hands the Commissioner his appointment, everybody is saying that he should not do that, he had no right to do it and that he cannot appoint. Now they know that he cannot appoint. For the last two months they were saying that he was stopping the appointment. It is the joke of the town. What is the reality? Since July—[*Interruption*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Members, and I speak in particular to the Members for Oropouche, Siparia and Chaguanas, you will all have an opportunity to speak. Please allow the Member for Diego Martin Central to continue.

Hon. K. Valley: Since July the commissioner has been acting. It was only in November the Senior Superintendent wrote the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister was travelling at the end of November and he informed him that he would deal with that as soon as he came back. The Opposition—the gentleman “now reach” the Senate in his maiden contribution said that the Prime Minister must appoint the Commissioner of Police. The Prime Minister must appoint, but now everybody knows the Prime Minister does not appoint. It is a joke. [*Interruption*] The Members opposite did not know that before? This town too nice. We have one problem in this town, that is the crime issue. We need to deal with the crime issue and move the country forward. Let us concentrate on that. Let us not waste time on all the “ol’ talk”.

He raised the issue that the Prime Minister was asking for a waiver of the court fees. What is the history of this thing? If we go back to the record of Friday, July 23, 1999 I posed the question in this House. I want to read the question I posed to the Attorney General on that day.

- “(a) Would the Attorney General identify the constitutional cases won by the State since the enactment of the Republican Constitution?
- (b) Would the Attorney General also identify whether costs were awarded to the State and if so, whether costs were paid in any of the situations identified?”

Mr. Deputy Speaker, here is the answer to the question. Since the—
[*Interruption*] Wait, you are too previous.

“...since the enactment of the Republican Constitution in 1976 shows that the state has been successful in some 148 matters.

In 41 of those...matters the court did not make an order for costs...

In this regard,...payment of costs...in the case of *Endell Thomas vs. Attorney General*,...”

The sum of approximately \$11,000 out of approximately \$200,000 was paid. In another case of TTUTA and Candice Chin Choy, they paid the tax. Remember out of the 148 cases, costs were not awarded in 41 of those cases. In 107 cases, of those one paid \$11,000 out of \$200,000 and the other one paid only tax. The Prime Minister at that time had entered into an agreement to make payment.

I will say something else because the records are here. There is a case in which an unsuccessful applicant made a request of the State for it to waive costs. That was the case of Patrick Manning vs. the Attorney General. When the Member gets up this afternoon and starts talking about using your office to apply to waive costs, you see the misrepresentation. The request to waive costs occurred in 1998/9, when Mr. Manning was Leader of the Opposition, against a background when there were 107 cases and only two persons had paid a small part of the costs. Whereas the Member for Arouca South said this afternoon, there were no rules with respect to the payments of cost, as one saw, that was after this issue that that government attempted to write rules with respect to the payment of costs.

We were asking the fundamental question: whether a citizen who wants to exercise his right by challenging the Constitution—remember we talked about the Constitution that guarantees rights in sections 4 and 5. If a citizen wants to go to court to protect his rights and were to lose, the question is should he then have to pay costs? If the State says when you are challenging your rights under the Constitution—rights guaranteed by the Constitution—and you lose after we take you to the Privy Council—the State has taxpayers’ money, they can take you to the Privy Council—then you have to pay costs. It means that you really do not have those rights. If you do not have an environment—we argued at the time—obviously that was the thinking that informed the State that although cost was awarded, cost was never demanded. That is clear.

You listen to Members on the other side and one wonders why are we not concentrating on what is important for us here in Trinidad and Tobago. We are

Insurance (Amdt.) Bill
[HON. K. VALLEY]

Friday, January 09, 2004

extremely important. [*Interruption*] The Member should tell his leader that if he knows that. I know that, but he should tell his leader that. One wonders about him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Members, please.

Hon. K. Valley: One wonders about the creditability of the Member for St. Joseph because as it is said: “birds of a feather flock together”.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, just a bit on the legislation. The Member wondered whether we should not have waited and dealt with the total reform of the Insurance Act before coming to the Parliament.

Mr. Yetming: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I never made that suggestion.

Hon. K. Valley: I am sorry. The first point I noted was: “why not wait”. The Member made two points. Later on he asked why we did not put some of the intervention measures in. Early in his contribution he wondered—[*Interruption*] I am glad he did not make that point. I wanted to say quite simply that this is to provide a structure so that one can go forward. Other than that he said nothing on the legislation.

He spoke about the need for the wider reform. The Member mentioned that in the budget statement the Government outlined a package of financial legislation that is to come to the Parliament. I can inform the House that the Green Paper on Financial Sector Reform, which the Government put out for public comment some time ago, is to be converted into a White Paper and that ought to be completed by Carnival. It is the portfolio which I hold at present at the Ministry of Finance; looking at the financial sector reform and pension reform agenda. We have committees looking at that and it would be coming to the Parliament very soon. I would leave the rest for the—[*Interruption*] That is the investment portfolio, where I was before. Minister Sahadeo is now dealing with that. I am dealing with the reform agenda.

Hon. Members: For now.

Hon. K. Valley: Mr. Deputy Speaker, my good friend from Siparia, as she said in the House—may I quote her—“It is the Prime Minister’s privilege to give or to take.” “Ent”? She knows.

Let me just make one other point before I take my seat. With respect to the Transparency Index, I want to, again, advise the Member for St. Joseph that the report on the Transparency Index said quite clearly that it referred to the year 2001, when his government was still in office. He just has to read the article. It stated quite clearly that it referred to the year 2001.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can add nothing more. This legislation is, as we said, a piece of the financial infrastructure. One should also note that it is not only the financial infrastructure that one is putting in place as we move towards our Vision 2020. In fact, as the Minister of Finance said in his budget statement, one is putting in place the supporting infrastructure so as to move the economy along that path. With respect to that, there is the reform that is to take place with respect to CARIRI, the Customs and Excise Division, the VAT Administration, the Bureau of Standards and all these institutions because it is clear to the Government that what one needs to concentrate on is the correct environment and then allow the market to play, whether they are Jamaicans—very shortly—Costa Ricans or from the Dominican Republic because we are moving towards openness, making sure however that the environment is right for the players to have their play.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank you.

4.00 p.m.

Mrs. Kamla Persad-Bissessar (*Siparia*): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure you will permit me to congratulate the Member for Diego Martin Central—the only Member on that side who took up the challenge issued by the Member for St. Joseph—for getting up to defend the comments made about the Member for San Fernando East. I want to commend him. [*Desk thumping*]

I remember Mr. Mervyn Assam, the then Member for St. Joseph, talking in this Chamber about the long ago gramophone records, and he would talk about his master's voice. [*Desk thumping*] [*Laughter*] When the Member for Diego Martin Central was speaking I could not help but hear the echo. [*Laughter*] But, you know, the Member for Diego Martin Central has a good heart—I am sure he does—and he is very well intentioned. I do not know if I could believe all the things the Member said today in defence of the Member for San Fernando East.

I recall not too long ago when the Member tendered his resignation as Deputy Political Leader to the Member for San Fernando East. I think it happened one afternoon, and by the next day he withdrew that resignation. I do not know if by tomorrow—remember the Member said that it is yours to give and it is yours to take—when it is all taken, we may see something totally different happening. I know the Member is very well intentioned. I do want to point out to the Member that because everyone else is jumping into the sea, it does not mean that the Prime Minister must also jump into the sea.

The Member attempted to justify the application made for the waiver of the costs in the court case by reading from the *Hansard*—I think it was a response

Insurance (Amdt.) Bill
[MRS. PERSAD-BISSESSAR]

Friday, January 09, 2004

given by the then Attorney General to a question that was raised in Parliament about the State's policy with respect to costs awarded against litigants in matters involving the State—to justify that no one else had paid costs—except for Endell Thomas—and, therefore, it was quite all right for the Prime Minister to apply to waive his costs. I think the Member for St. Joseph made the point and I am going to repeat it. The point was made that here it is the Prime Minister of the country owes the State money, so it is an application from himself to himself to waive the costs that he owes.

Mr. Valley: Mr. Deputy Speaker, will the Member please—

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar: I am not giving way. If it is a point of order but I am not giving way at this moment in time. [*Interruption*] So, I am saying that because this has happened with others it does not preclude the Prime Minister; it does not exempt the Prime Minister and it does not exonerate the Prime Minister. And as the Member for St. Joseph said: what example is the Prime Minister setting for other persons who owe the State?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. Member for San Fernando East raised the price of gas, which affected every person in this country. The increase in the cost of living is affecting everyone.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Member, we are dealing with a Bill—

Mr. Ramnath: The Member is trying to develop her point.

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar: I could handle it, thank you. Let the Deputy Speaker speak.

Mr. Ramnath: You are not even allowing the Member to make her point.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Member for Couva South, I am on my feet and I do not expect you to be trying to address me while I am on my feet. Let me speak to the Member for Siparia. Hon. Member for Siparia, I agree that you are trying to respond, but you are taking this debate outside the realms of what is a reasonable response. Will you please get back to the debate? [*Interruption*]

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am guided by your comments. As a representative of the persons who elected me here, I have a duty to respond to the comments made by the Member for Diego Martin Central. So, I will stay within the purview of the debate. In this debate the Member for Diego Martin Central has clearly raised the issue of a justification of the costs that are to be waived. [*Desk thumping*] The Member spent a long time on this matter. I am

saying that here it is the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance came to this Parliament and increased the price of gas without any reason whatsoever.

Mr. Ramnath: That was a slip of the mind.

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar: Perhaps, a slip of the mind and a non-issue for him, but this is an issue for the people of this country. The price of rice, which is a basic staple in this country—after the price of flour already went up—is to be raised. The Member is now saying that he is not going to pay the costs that were incurred and he is applying for a waiver. What was very interesting is when I asked the Member for Arouca South what was the date of the application—

Mr. Manning: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank the Member for Siparia for giving way. I wonder if the Member would be kind enough to let us know: when did the Prime Minister apply for a waiver of his liability?

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar: You know, I asked that very question as a supplemental question. The Members have that within their purview, I do not. That is with the Chief State Solicitor.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Member, are you saying something differently?

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar: I am not saying anything different. I am saying that when I raised the question as to when was the application for the waiver made, the Member told us she did not have the information. I totally understand that because the Member for Arouca South is merely acting in that position. Perhaps, the Member was given a brief, so I understand her position today.

The Member for Diego Martin Central indicated in his response that the application for the waiver would have been made some time ago. There are two things that could happen. If it is true that the application for the waiver was made when the Member was the Leader of the Opposition—if nothing happened—the application for the waiver is pending. This application is now before the Chief State Solicitor or the Solicitor General, and the Member is now the head of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago. Do you want me to give way? Go ahead. You know, I try to be gracious with you.

Mr. Manning: Mr. Deputy Speaker, again, I thank the Member for Siparia for giving way. Something did happen because guidelines were set by the Attorney General of which you were a part, and no action was taken on the matter. In other words, it is not true to say that subsequent to the application of 1999 that nothing happened. Something did happen but the process was not completed. That is the fact.

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar: I am saying that two things could have happened. It happened whilst the Member was the Leader of the Opposition and nothing was done, but the Member became the Prime Minister of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago—by fair means or foul, the Member became the Prime Minister of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago. Therefore, the example that is being set is that if the Member owes the State—and he is now the head of the Government—it is quite okay for him to apply to himself for a waiver. The Member will be setting a very dangerous precedent and a very bad example for persons who owe the State in every sector of the society. Two things could happen and one is that the application for the waiver should be withdrawn. If it is that the Member wants to have a policy position, it is not for the Chief State Solicitor or for the Solicitor General to make policy with respect to matters set in the courts, and that policy should become part of the law of this country so that the courts will honour it.

If the Member is saying that there are cases where costs should not be awarded in matters against the State then that is a decision for the court. In the first instance, the court gave the decision that costs should be awarded. The Member should not come now and ask the Chief State Solicitor or the Solicitor General to waive the costs when the Member is applying to himself. The Member should withdraw the application. [*Desk thumping*] That is one way of doing it.

The second way of doing it—I have seen it in other countries—is where matters are pending where a head of government is involved these matters are suspended. In other words, the application for the waiver, in my respectful view, should not be pursued at all. It should be withdrawn. So, the example that is being set is an example that we do not need. Does it then mean that the costs of all those other matters in the court would be waived? What will happen in the matter now where the gentleman from the Unit Trust Corporation (UTC) has sued the hon. Member for San Fernando East? Should costs be awarded there—I do not know which way the case will go—would it be waived again? What is the precedent? There is also the case with the San Fernando City Corporation Town Clerk. We did not intend to go into this matter, but the Member for Diego Martin Central attempted to justify it in every single way. There is not a single way in which that matter could be justified. The application for the waiver should be withdrawn. [*Desk thumping*] That is my respectful view.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know you would like to hear me say a few words about this Bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I was waiting patiently.

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar: I want to agree with my colleague and, therefore, will not go further into those aspects. In principle, we do not have any difficulty with the Bill. The hon. Minister who piloted the Bill was very academic and erudite in his presentation. In principle, we do not have any difficulty with what is happening. However, my difficulty has to do with the fact that this Bill takes you one step that is still too far away from everything that is needed to bring the insurance sector into grip and into control. It is too far away.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I looked at this Bill it contains 144 clauses. We are in the Twelfth Sitting, Second Session of the Eight Parliament, and we have complained over and over again that there appears to be no legislative agenda, and what comes to us is nothing of substance; nothing that will really make any fundamental changes to what is taking place in this country. When one looks at the Order Paper there is the Insurance (Amdt.) Bill together with the Sentencing Commission Bill—which my colleague for Pointe-a-Pierre will deal with when that comes up. Again, just to make the point, that is a rehash of an amendment Bill that was prepared by the United National Congress (UNC), but what the Government has done now instead is just to repeal and replace the whole thing. Since we have been here there is nothing of substance on this Order Paper. Nothing whatsoever! We come back months later and there is nothing of substance on this Order Paper.

In fact, yesterday, I read an article in the business section of the *Newsday* newspaper with some very exciting comments coming from the present Inspector of Banks. Let me say, first of all, I have absolutely every confidence in the integrity of the person who holds that office at this point in time. The excitement is there and one could see that for the years that we have taken dealing with insurance matters, the insurance sector needs the reform.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what have we done? There are 144 clauses in the Bill. Before this sitting, the Member for St. Joseph, the hon. Minister and myself were looking at one Bill and that Bill appears to be a smaller version than what we found today on our desks. We asked the Minister if he added anything to the Bill and he said no, perhaps it is the paper, but it is the same Bill. Maybe it is a different texture of paper so the Bill looks very thick and substantial.

When one goes through the Bill only one thing was done, and that one thing that was done in the Bill was repeated throughout the Bill. Perhaps that could have been done in two or three pages. I do not know who drafted the Bill. I know the drafters tried and they did their best and the final responsibility would have rested in the hands of the hon. Attorney General. All they did in the Bill was

Insurance (Amdt.) Bill
[MRS. PERSAD-BISSESSAR]

Friday, January 09, 2004

deleted the word “supervisor” and substituted it with the words “Central Bank”. This is in every single one of these 144 clauses—I will not say every single one of these clauses, but I will say 99.9 per cent of the clauses. In 144 clauses they kept doing that. Maybe that is one way of doing it, but another way would have been to say in sections 1, 2, 3, 4 and so on, wherever the word “supervisor” appears delete it and substitute it with the words “Central Bank” but no, it was repeated in every single clause, so we think we have something of substance.

In principle, there is nothing wrong with that, but having changed nothing else in the parent Act what difference is it going to make? What real difference is it going to make if they had just said instead of the supervisor of insurance, the Central Bank is now carrying out these functions. Perhaps the hon. Minister could tell us what is the difference. If nothing else was changed in the Bill and the Minister is saying that the parent law was deficient and as a result he is making these changes, then other things should have been changed.

My colleague mentioned that there are some other matters to be raised at the committee stage. For example, the paid-up share capital of insurance companies should be changed. Everything else was amended. Why was section 13 not amended to make that what it should be? Why not? Do you know why I make that point? I make that point because every single recommendation that has ever been made—this matter started from way back in 1987—there is one common golden thread running through it, and that is to increase the paid-up share capital that insurance companies are required to have and the All Trinidad and Tobago Insurance Companies (ATTIC) has said this repeatedly. In fact, I have a document that ATTIC presented to the hon. Minister saying that the paid-up share capital should be \$10 million.

The UNC draft Insurance (Amdt.) Bill—the last one that we left there for them—said that the paid up share capital should be \$10 million. So whilst the Government is saying that they are talking to everyone in the industry and so on, they should look at the history of this Bill. This Bill reminds me of the Occupational Safety and Health Bill. When Mr. Panday spoke on this Bill it was like a marathon. This Bill took 27 years. The history of reform to the insurance industry and insurance law goes way back. There are things that were repeated in each set of recommendations and Members who are sitting in this Chamber will know that. These are things that could be done now, and not just simply change “supervisor” to the words “Central Bank”.

What was very interesting in the Bill is when the Minister said that the inspector of banks would now be called the Inspector of Financial Institutions,

and they would have certain powers and duties. When I looked at this matter there are only three or four clauses where the inspector is actually involved, everything else is the bank, and in a few clauses it is the Board of the Central Bank. So whilst there is that excitement and energy from persons in the insurance sector looking forward for the Inspector of Financial Institutions to carry through this regulatory kind of monitoring supervision, the powers that are given to that inspector are very minimal because everything else has been left up to the bank. Now, what is “the bank”? Every time the word “the bank” appears, what is “the bank”?

When I looked at the Central Bank Act it tells me that “the bank” is the Central Bank established under so and so section of the law and “the bank” would be set up with a governor, a deputy governor and a board of directors. That is “the bank”. It is a body corporate. I would like the Minister to tell us: how will this operate? When the Minister says “the bank”—as my colleague said—is it Cudjoe who will be doing this work? With respect to the problem with the supervisor of insurance, there was no problem with the supervisor of insurance, but there was a problem with the staffing and the support mechanisms within that Ministry. Are we going to give the bank that kind of support? This would mean that the bank is not going to be able to hire persons. When I read the Central Bank Act it says that the bank could hire persons and train them and so on. Who is going to be doing the hiring? Is it the board with Mr. Cudjoe on it? How is this hiring going to be done? For the bank to carry out the administration of this Act—as this amendment now says—a whole staffing together with support staff has to be in place. Are we going to see another example of the College of Science Technology and Applied Arts of Trinidad and Tobago (COSTAATT) policy that was enunciated in this House and supported by Cudjoe?

With respect to the paid-up share capital—which is a matter that affects every single citizen of this country—the Minister spoke about the importance of the insurance sector and the insurance industry to the economy. Let me speak about the importance of the insurance sector with respect to the individual, the ordinary man and woman in the street. What is life insurance when the company says that it promises to pay after you have paid all these premiums for all these years for a certain event or contingency such as ill health, accident or death? What happens when they do not have that money to pay? What is happening in the insurance industry now is that the ordinary man and woman out there in the streets cannot recover, whether it is motor or property insurance; they cannot recover. What measures are being put in place to protect policyholders? I would have liked to see—as is happening in other countries such as the United Kingdom and the United States of America and so—policyholders’ protection being put in here;

Insurance (Amdt.) Bill
[MRS. PERSAD-BISSESSAR]

Friday, January 09, 2004

policyholders' protection saying that because a certain company did not monitor its business properly and did not do what it was supposed to do, and where a company cannot now meet its commitment after someone has paid all their premiums on life savings and at the end of it that person cannot get back a cent. The Government should provide that protection to policyholders. So whilst this law is given a regulatory framework, there is absolutely no protection for policyholders where a company fails.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the moment, especially with motor vehicle insurance—it also happens with life and property insurance—look at what is happening there. Persons are tied up in the court with small matters. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will recall from your own practice in the courthouse that the majority of cases in the High Court are running down actions. The majority of these cases are clogging up the courthouse because insurance companies do not want to pay. They cannot pay so they take people through the mill, and these cases are heard 10 and 12 years later.

I must say, in my former days as an attorney, I had a very lucrative practice in running down actions for personal injury and property damage. [*Interruption*] I am not sure I could handle the kind of cases the Member for Diego Martin West would want to offer. [*Laughter*] [*Interruption*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Members, it would appear that Members would like the sitting to be suspended early because at this time there is such joviality in the House.

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am speaking about motor vehicle claims. A second provision I would have liked to see and which has been repeated has to do with the protection of those persons. There has been talk since 1988 for an insurance ombudsman who would assist in the settlement of claims so that the courthouse and peoples' lives would not be tied up in litigation indefinitely—an insurance ombudsman who would assist in the settlement of disputes—and to avoid that kind of constant trauma. So that within this Bill there is so much that could be done to protect the ordinary man and woman out there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if one looks at the history of this legislation, the Member for St. Augustine was part of a team that was set up in 1987. One would recall that at that time an issue arose with respect to how the State was awarding brokerage services to supply government and state enterprises with insurance. This matter arose when a certain brokerage firm was given the contract to supply the Mount Hope Medical Sciences Complex insurance, and there was a big furore about how that could have happened.

The National Alliance for Reconstruction (NAR) government initiated the entire review and reform of the insurance industry and insurance legislation. At that time it was the then minister Dookeran and minister Selby Wilson and so on, who sat on an inter-ministerial committee to review the insurance industry, but only with respect to how should the government award brokerage contracts to supply state enterprises. It was a massive amount of money. The issue arises up to today as to which brokerage firm should be given the contracts for state enterprises and for the government sector.

There was always the talk about transparency and integrity and so on and that committee was given that mandate. The committee was expanded to include a review of the entire insurance industry. That was since 1988 and from that we have had draft amendment Bills almost every year or every two years. We have seen these Bills go through the then NAR government; it went through the PNM government of the Member for San Fernando East in his first incarnation; and it also went through the UNC government in its years. When we left office there was a Bill that went through all the processes. We had contracted Coopers and Lybrand to assist. I believe another company by the name of Savage also made recommendations. ATTIC had given us a series of amendments that could certainly be dealt with now. These amendments were repeated in all the drafts throughout the years and these amendments could have been included in this Bill.

My friends on the other side came and said you know, we have been there and we need a honeymoon period, but 24 months later we are yet to see something of substance come to this Parliament. This is the year 2004. In this 12-month period—perhaps with the new Attorney General we may see some legislation of more substance, but thus far we wait with bated breath. Whilst in principle we support this Bill, there is still too much to be done. At the committee stage of this Bill my colleagues and I will be making recommendations for simple matters to be inserted.

I remember the former Attorney General came to this Parliament—the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre would recall—with the Summary Courts (Amdt.) Bill and she kept insisting that there was no need to amend section 72 of that Bill. Every day she said: “Well, I am coming with this now and I will come back later, tomorrow, next week and next year and so on with it.” Of course, we are still waiting a year later and it never happened. Well, she has gone completely. It is the same thing. Why should the Government put off what can be done today for tomorrow? There is a comprehensive set of amendments that could be included. I want to hear from the Minister about legislation for policyholders’ protection. The

Insurance (Amdt.) Bill
[MRS. PERSAD-BISSESSAR]

Friday, January 09, 2004

Minister does not have to reinvent the wheel; it already exists and we just need to take these amendments and put them together.

With respect to the Motor Insurance Bureau, we had done much work to protect persons who are involved in car accidents. We raised the issue with respect to PH drivers. If a person is in a car and it is a PH driver, the passengers are not insured. If someone suffers serious injuries insurance companies avoid paying out any moneys in compensation, because the car should not have been carrying passengers. The Motor Insurance Bureau is to protect persons who would suffer damage in that manner. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think you are very aware of it from your own experiences. So the Motor Insurance Bureau would provide a fund for persons who are injured in vehicles that are not covered by insurance companies. These persons would be able to get some compensation through that motor insurance bureau. Much work was done with respect to the motor insurance bureau. We would also like to see something done with respect to the motor insurance ombudsman. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will like to continue thereafter. I see you are looking at your time, but I will continue later on. [*Desk thumping*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Members, the sitting of this House is suspended and we will reconvene at 5.05 p.m.

4.30 p.m.: *Sitting suspended.*

5.05 p.m.: *Sitting resumed:*

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would not detain this honourable House for much longer except to repeat the point. I have had some conversations with my colleague from Diego Martin West, which supports clearly the point that the policy protection legislation is essential. And I was just being told of a case where two vehicles collided; the other party was totally wrong, but the person left the country. You cannot find them; you cannot serve; and yet you have an open-shut case. The car is damaged and there might have been personal injuries. There must be some kind of protection for persons in that kind of situation; otherwise, we will continue to face the trauma, the pain and the suffering which result especially from motor vehicle accidents. Something must be done. And the proposal was for this motor insurance bureau. I am saying to the hon. Minister that a lot of work had been done and he may want to speak to the Attorney General's Department. Let them pull the files out to see what is there and let us try to get that out very quickly.

At what point do you regulate the whole industry? The supervisor is doing all the jobs properly; you are monitoring; they are running guns and making money.

They are viable. The supervisors of financial institutions will be checking the books and looking at all the various kinds of ratios of the companies to see that they are viable and have the moneys to pay. That is one issue.

The second issue is to find who has to pay, and to ensure that they do make the payment. I mentioned the case, for example, of the PH drivers, of persons in vehicles that are not insured and those insurance companies avoid the policies, but there are persons who had been injured, damaged and property damaged. For example, let us take the case that was mentioned to me by the Member for Diego Martin West where the other party who caused the damage is out of the country. Therefore, that is your expense.

Yes, it is fine to regulate it in terms of a strong financial sector, a strong insurance industry sector, but we must always be cognizant of, and always be willing to assist the ordinary man and woman in the street. That is what insurance coverage is about. Why do we have that? The ordinary man is suffering in terms of getting the moneys back from the companies. I think we need to go there very quickly. I had mentioned that my colleague from St. Augustine was one of the very first when a committee was set up during the NAR term. All this started there and that is far too long for us to leave it. So, hon. Minister, the ball is in your court. We would be willing to give you some amendments that we suggest, and we ask that you give them due consideration.

I thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

ARRANGEMENT OF BUSINESS

The Minister of Trade and Industry and Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Hon. Kenneth Valley): Mr. Deputy Speaker, by agreement, we want to postpone further debate on this matter for the next sitting or thereafter, and we would like to move to the next matter that we plan to do today, and that is the Extradition (Commonwealth and Foreign Territories) (Amdt.) (No. 2) Bill, 2003.

EXTRADITION (COMMONWEALTH AND FOREIGN TERRITORIES) (AMDT.) (NO. 2) BILL 2003

Order for second reading read.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs (Sen. The Hon. Knowlson Gift): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move,

That a Bill to amend the Extradition (Commonwealth and Foreign Territories) Act, 1985, be read a second time.

The Bill before this honourable House is entitled the Extradition (Commonwealth and Foreign Territories) (Amdt.) (No. 2) Bill, 2003. The intent

Extradition (Amdt.) (No. 2) Bill
[SEN. THE HON. K. GIFT]

Friday, January 09, 2004

of the Bill is to amend the Extradition (Commonwealth and Foreign Territories) Act, 1985, Act No. 36 of 1985, hereinafter referred to as “the Act”. The amendments aim to modify and simplify the Act, to provide against new forms of criminal activity and cater for increasing international obligations being assumed by Trinidad and Tobago while preserving the fundamental rights of the alleged fugitive offenders.

Specifically, the Bill is intended to:

- (a) provide for extradition even in cases where the jurisdiction of the requesting State is extra-territorial;
- (b) establish that an extraditable offence would be determined not by a reference to a list of scheduled offences as in the 1985 Act, but by new criteria that refer to the severity of the penalty for the offence in question;
- (c) make any conduct over which Trinidad and Tobago is obliged to establish jurisdiction for the purposes of an international Convention an extraditable offence, once this country has made the conduct of an offence attracting the requisite penalty under its domestic legislation;
- (d) make it clear that the discharge of a person under the Act would not preclude further proceedings, whether or not they are based on the same conduct, with a view to the extradition of the person unless the High Court is of the opinion that such proceedings would be an abuse of process;
- (e) prevent an accused person’s return to the requesting State if it is determined that the request for his return is based on his sex, gender or sexual preference; and
- (f) ensure that persons accused or convicted of an offence against the life of a Head of Government, a Minister of Government or of certain offences such as murder, manslaughter and kidnapping, would not be able to object to their extradition on the ground that the offence is of a political character.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the objective of this Bill is to improve the existing legislative framework set out in Act No. 36 of 1985, so as to allow Trinidad and Tobago to better discharge its international obligations, and to co-operate with other States in criminal proceedings, investigations and prosecutions.

What is the intent of Act No. 36 of 1985? The Extradition (Commonwealth and Foreign Territories) Act, 1985 establishes the legislative framework for the extradition to and from Trinidad and Tobago of accused persons. The Act outlines

the legal rules governing extradition and empowers the Attorney General to make an Order subject to negative resolution of Parliament declaring that a Commonwealth territory other than Trinidad and Tobago or a foreign territory is a Commonwealth territory or a foreign territory as the case may be to which the Act applies.

For example, in relation to extradition from Trinidad and Tobago, the Act makes provision for matters such as: Persons Liable to be Returned—section 5; Extraditable Offences in declared Commonwealth and foreign territories—sections 6 and 7; General Restrictions on return—section 8; Request for Return—section 9; Arrest for Purposes of Committal—section 10; Consent order for return—section 11; Proceedings for committal or discharge—section 12; Application for habeas corpus—section 13; Review by High Court—section 14; Appeal to Court of Appeal—section 15; Order for return—section 16; Discharge in case of delay in returning—section 17; Custody—section 18; Evidence—section 19; Regulations—section 20.

In relation to extradition to Trinidad and Tobago, the Act makes provision for matters: Restriction upon proceedings for other offences; section 21, and Restoration of persons not tried or acquitted—section 22.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this brings me to the case for international co-operation in combating cross-border crime. As a Government we are charged with ensuring that the laws of Trinidad and Tobago are enforced and, consequently, with preserving and protecting the security, safety and health of ordinary men, women and children, and also the integrity of the society at large. It is incumbent upon us, therefore, to seek to co-operate with like-minded States to assist each other to combat crime in all its manifestations. Cooperation between countries in the area of extradition, in fact, reflects the collective responsibility and concrete interest of all international actors that have a stake in ensuring that the society we live in, the places we inhabit, the countries we call home are as free as we can make them of crime. We all know that crime, if not arrested, has the potential to threaten socio-economic development, political stability and the personal security of individuals, and in so doing to reduce the quality of life. This Government is determined to utilize all the tools at its disposal to arrest, contain and reverse current criminal activities.

Cross-border criminal activity is evident in the traffic in illegal drugs, illegal trade in firearms and the laundering of money generated by these nefarious activities. To arrest, contain and reverse these trends in criminality would require, at the global, regional, sub-regional and national levels, awareness, commitment and action.

We touch now on the elements of co-operation. It is in this context that we view the potential of multilateral arrangements and bilateral treaties to facilitate

Extradition (Amdt.) (No. 2) Bill
[SEN. THE HON. K. GIFT]

Friday, January 09, 2004

co-operation between countries in matters pertaining to extradition of fugitive offenders. Through such arrangements, countries can now assist each other in a meaningful way in the prosecution of criminal matters by facilitating the extradition of accused persons. These initiatives can only redound to the strengthening of the criminal justice system and the development of the administration of justice in the affected countries.

Criminals do not recognize international borders and they are in no way restrained by the existence of different legal jurisdictions. It is therefore incumbent on countries which acknowledge the need for international co-operation in crime prevention, investigations and prosecutions, to formulate instruments, standards and norms to facilitate the achievement of this objective.

The challenge for us in Trinidad and Tobago is to fashion cooperative arrangements with like-minded regional and extra-regional States to combat crime, whether domestic or cross-border. The Act, together with the amendments we are considering today, is intended to operationalize one element of our commitment to such cooperative action.

The new Government in Trinidad and Tobago, fully cognizant of the danger posed by the criminally inclined, has risen to the challenge. We are moving aggressively, with the assistance of friendly, like-minded States, to put in place the required institutional, legislative and regulatory framework, to source needed equipment and to provide the necessary training to deal with the problem.

In respect of Commonwealth countries, the Commonwealth Scheme for the Rendition of Fugitive Offenders governs the extradition of accused persons. In respect of non-Commonwealth countries, extradition treaties have been concluded with the United States of America on March 04, 2003, and the Kingdom of the Netherlands, February 02, 2003. Negotiations are ongoing with Venezuela for the conclusion of an extradition treaty between the two countries. Increasingly, multi-lateral treaties such as the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988 and the Inter-American Convention against Terrorism of 2002 contain provisions for the extradition of persons accused of committing offences under those Conventions.

The Government of Trinidad and Tobago has always attached its high priority to cooperation at the bilateral, regional and international levels. At the regional and international levels, its commitment to cooperative action has been in evidence in its participation in the Caribbean Financial Action Task Force, the Commonwealth Scheme for Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters, the Commonwealth Scheme for

the Rendition of Fugitive Offenders, the United Nations Drug Control Programme and its status as a contracting party to the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988, as well as the Inter-American Convention against Terrorism of 2002.

Why is this Bill necessary? In the ongoing effort to improve the administration of the Act, the authorities have discovered that certain refinements are needed to correct particular problems that have been encountered in the implementation of the Act, and to enable Trinidad and Tobago to better discharge its international obligations to those States with which it wishes to cooperate to combat crime in all its manifestations. Today, the amendment Bill before this honourable House seeks to provide for some matters that were not adequately addressed in the original Act, to make adjustments that take account of new developments in extradition law. For example, increasing tendency to locate the basis of jurisdiction in multilateral instruments as opposed to bilateral treaties.

The Bill, which this honourable House is being asked to consider, addresses, in addition to the major elements referred to earlier:

- (a) the requirement that a record of the case be furnished with any request for extradition;
- (b) the authorization to the Attorney General to receive supplementary evidence, to re-issue authority to proceed at any time before the extradition hearing begins, to amend the authority to proceed during the hearing on the basis of new evidence and to withdraw the authority to proceed at any time if it was illegally issued;
- (c) the requirement that the magistrate must, before ordering the extradition of a person, be satisfied that the person is the person sought by the requesting State;
- (d) the right of a person committed to custody to await extradition to waive, in writing, his right not to be extradited before the expiration of 15 days from the day on which the order for his committal is made;
- (e) the requirement that the hearing of applications for judicial review or *habeas corpus* in extradition matters be held at an early date, whether or not the date is in or out of the sessions of the High Court, and similarly in respect of appeals to the Court of Appeal;
- (f) the authorization to the Attorney General to stipulate conditions for the eventual return to Trinidad and Tobago of persons who are being

extradited but who were either serving a sentence of imprisonment or were charged with an offence in Trinidad and Tobago;

- (g) the definition of “document” to include photographs and copies of documents; and
- (h) the admission, in addition to evidence otherwise admissible under the laws of Trinidad and Tobago, of certain evidence which would not otherwise be admissible under the laws of Trinidad and Tobago. Such evidence would include the contents of documents contained in the record of the case or in supplementary evidence, where a judicial, prosecuting or penal authority of the requesting State certifies that the evidence in the record of the case or in the supplementary evidence is available for trial, but is sufficient to justify prosecution, was gathered according to the law of the requesting State and is accurate.

The main provisions of the Bill are outlined as follows: Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill would provide for preliminary matters, such as the short title and interpretation provisions.

Clause 3 would amend the definition of “extraditable offence” in section 2 of the Act by deleting the reference to section 7, which is to be repealed and substituted.

Clause 4 would amend section 5 of the Act by clarifying that persons can be extradited whether or not the conduct complained of occurred in territory over which the requesting State has jurisdiction.

Clause 5 would repeal and replace section 6 of the Act. The list of extraditable offences in the First Schedule would be abolished and the new section 6 would provide new criteria to be applied in determining what is an extraditable offence. An offence would be an extraditable offence—

- (a) if it is an offence in the requesting State punishable by death or imprisonment for not less than 12 months; and
- (b) if the conduct constituting the offence would be, under Trinidad and Tobago law, an offence punishable by death or imprisonment for not less than 12 months if committed in Trinidad and Tobago, or, in the case of an extra-territorial offence, if committed in corresponding circumstances outside of Trinidad and Tobago.

In the case of a declared foreign country, the extradition treaty between Trinidad and Tobago and that territory must also provide for the extradition of persons for the offence in question.

The new section 6(4) would provide a modern framework for the implementation of this country's multilateral obligations. It would make any conduct over which Trinidad and Tobago is obliged to establish jurisdiction for the purposes of an international convention an extraditable offence, once this country has made the conduct an offence under its domestic legislation.

Clause 6 would repeal and replace section 7 of the Act to make it clear that the discharge of a person under the Act would not preclude further proceedings, whether or not they are based on the same conduct, with a view to the extradition of the person unless the High Court is of the opinion that such proceedings would be an abuse of process.

Clause 7 would amend section 8 of the Act to prevent an accused person's return to a declared Commonwealth territory or declared foreign territory if it is determined that the request for his return is based on his sex, gender or sexual preference. This section would also be amended to provide that persons accused or convicted of an offence against the life or person of a head of Government or of a Minister of Government or of certain offences such as murder, manslaughter and kidnapping, would not be able to object to their extradition on the ground that the offence is of a political character.

Clause 8 would amend section 9 of the Act to provide at subsection (2) for a record of the case to be furnished with any request for extradition. The record of the case should include evidence that under the laws of the requesting territory a person who is returned will only be dealt with for the offence in respect of which he was extradited or a lesser offence. Further, in the case of a request in favour of a person accused of an extraditable offence there should be provided a document summarizing the evidence available to the requesting territory for use in the prosecution of the case against that person.

Clause 8 would also amend section 9 of the Act to permit the Attorney General to receive supplementary evidence, to re-issue an authority to proceed at any time before the extradition hearing begins, to amend the authority to proceed during the hearing on the basis of new evidence and to withdraw the authority to proceed at any time if it was illegally issued.

Clause 9 would amend section 12 of the Act to provide that the magistrate must, before ordering the extradition of a person, be satisfied that the person is the person sought by the requesting State. Also, where the person is alleged to be unlawfully at large after conviction of an offence, provision is made for the conviction to be in respect of conduct that corresponds to the offence set out in the authority to proceed.

Extradition (Amdt.) (No. 2) Bill
[SEN. THE HON. K. GIFT]

Friday, January 09, 2004

Clause 10 would amend section 13(2)(a) of the Act to enable a person committed to custody to await extradition to waive, in writing, his right not to be extradited before the expiration of 15 days from the day on which the order for his committal is made.

Clause 11 would amend section 14 of the Act by inserting a new subsection (7), which would require the hearing of applications for judicial review or *habeas corpus* in extradition matters to be held at an early date, whether or not the date is in or out of the sessions of the High Court.

Clause 12 would amend section 15 of the Act by inserting a new subsection (7) requiring the hearing of appeals to the Court of Appeal in extradition matters to be held at an early date, whether or not the date is in or out of the sessions of the Court of Appeal.

Clause 13 would amend section 16 of the Act by repealing and substituting subsection (2) with a provision which would allow the Attorney General to stipulate conditions for the eventual return to Trinidad and Tobago of persons who are being extradited but who were either serving a sentence of imprisonment or were charged with an offence in Trinidad and Tobago.

Clause 14 would repeal section 19 of the Act and substitute new sections 19, 19A, 19B and 19C. The new section 19 would define “document” as used in the new sections 19A, 19B and 19C to include photographs and copies of documents.

The new section 19A would admit, in addition to evidence otherwise admissible under the laws of Trinidad and Tobago, certain evidence which would not otherwise be admissible under the laws of Trinidad and Tobago. Such evidence would include the contents of documents contained in the record of the case or in supplementary evidence, where a judicial, prosecuting or penal authority of the requesting territory certifies that the evidence in the record of the case or in the supplementary evidence is available for trial sufficient to justify prosecution, was gathered according to the law of the requesting territory and is accurate. In addition to the certification, each document in the record of the case or in the supplementary evidence must also bear the signature of the certifying official.

Also, under proposed section 19B a translation of a document into English will be admitted only where it is certified by a judicial, prosecuting or penal authority, or a public officer, of a declared Commonwealth or foreign territory, without proof of the signature or official character of the person appearing to have signed it.

The proposed section 19C would provide criteria for proving that the person before the court is the person sought by the requesting State.

Clause 15 would repeal the First Schedule to the Act.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to inform this honourable House that the views and comments of the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions on this Bill have been incorporated in it.

What is the rationale for the changes being proposed to the Act? The importance of effective mutual legal assistance as a mechanism to fight international crimes cannot be overstated. When the case has been made the courts have not hesitated to extradite fugitive offenders. The Extradition (Commonwealth and Foreign Territories) (Amdt.) (No. 2) Bill, 2003, improves and builds upon the existing legal framework. Trinidad and Tobago has much to gain from enhanced international co-operation in extradition and in mutual legal assistance in criminal matters in general. This would suffice to commend this Bill to the favourable consideration of the hon. Members present.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I now turn to the benefit to Trinidad and Tobago of improved legislation dealing with extradition.

Approval of this Bill will allow Trinidad and Tobago, as a faithful member of the family of nations, to fulfil obligations freely entered into by both the previous and current administrations in the matter of extradition of fugitive offenders. Domestic legislation that strengthens the municipal legal framework for international cooperation in extradition will redound to the benefit of Trinidad and Tobago and other like-minded States in the international community.

Act No. 36 of 1985 represented a significant development in the capacity of this jurisdiction to co-operate with other jurisdictions in the prosecution of crimes.

The amendments contained in the Bill before this honourable House aim to modernize and simplify the Act to provide against new forms of criminal activity and to cater for increasing international obligations, while preserving the fundamental rights of the alleged fugitive offenders. Any measure that strengthens the capacity of the Government, both to request extradition and to respond to requests for extradition, whilst seeking to protect the fundamental rights of the individuals involved will undoubtedly redound to the advantage of Trinidad and Tobago as a whole, and is therefore worthy of the support by all Members of this honourable House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move.

Question proposed.

5.35 p.m.

Miss Gillian Lucky (*Pointe-a-Pierre*): [*Desk thumping*] You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am almost hesitant to rise because I recognize that everything dealing with this Bill this afternoon tends to have some attachment of embarrassment, in that, when it was announced that we would now move on, the hon. Member for Diego Martin Central made a wonderful announcement and proclamation and when the lights came on for centre stage, the star player was missing.

Mr. S. Panday: Up to now.

Miss G. Lucky: What was even more embarrassing, and I come to the immediate defence of the hon. Minister who made the presentation, is the very worrying trend which I hope will stop as of today, that those who prepare the briefs for their respective hon. ministers to present to this honourable House would not merely regurgitate that which is already stated in the Explanatory Note because it makes us on this side really not want to listen to the presentation because it does nothing more than regurgitate, without hopefully breaching any rules of copyright, what is already stated before us. As if that was not enough, Mr. Deputy Speaker—and I say this in the spirit of, you know, we have all had our little embarrassing moments—when you too, Mr. Deputy Speaker rose, well, we know what happened. I can only say that I am certainly not putting myself out of the category but I hope during my contribution nothing embarrassing happens. I really hope that I might be able to lift this whole debate. [*Crosstalk*] [*Desk thumping*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am not embarrassed because I do not profess to be perfect.

Miss G. Lucky: Of course! You see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are, in fact, on the same wavelength and that is why I feel so happy that we share frequencies, [*Laughter*] because that is exactly the point I am making. [*Desk thumping*] If I felt that one was infallible, then I would not be as generous as I was in my opening.

Now you see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are two objectives that the hon. Minister said will be achieved by the passage of this Bill. The first objective stated was that, with the passage of this Bill, there would be greater opportunity for the Government to implement and enforce the legislation which would now be amended by this Bill that deals with extradition proceedings. The second objective the hon. Minister alluded to was the fact that, with the passage of this Bill, Trinidad and Tobago will now be better able to fulfil its international obligations with respect to extradition. Mr. Deputy Speaker, however honourable the intentions of the hon. Minister, the reality is that, as long as this Government

gives lip service to the administration of justice in Trinidad and Tobago, we will continue to be an international embarrassment when it comes to fulfilling our obligations. [*Desk thumping*]

I speak from a platform of knowledge because I was one of the young prosecutors involved in the second extradition proceeding in Trinidad and Tobago involving a Valsayn woman by the name of Lolita Saroop. We did not, in the office of the DPP to which I was then attached, profess to have all knowledge on the issue. In fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would openly admit it was by doing that particular case where mistakes were made, and a very fundamental mistake that was made—because we were dealing with old legislation where we had to refer to a very old Order in Council—was when we had to determine what was the office equivalent to the Secretary of State. It was thought that it was the Minister of Foreign Affairs, only to recognize that it ought to have been the President of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago. The simple point being made, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that we have to be aware that we are going to make mistakes but what we also have to be aware of is that when we come with this kind of legislation and boasts are made by the Government about all that it will achieve when the institutions that have to enable this kind of achievement of the objective are neglected, we will continue to have a problem in this country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, what do I mean? Let me put it very simply. When one is dealing with extradition, you are dealing with various institutions involved in the administration of law. You are dealing with the police service, those officers who will be involved in investigating and at least locating where these fugitives are hiding; you are dealing with the courts, more specifically the Magistrates' Courts; you are dealing with the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions in terms of assessing whether in fact a case is made out; you are dealing with the central authority which I know comes within the portfolio of the Attorney General or the Office of the Attorney General, and you are also dealing with the prisons because, while the matter is in the Magistrates' Court, the fugitive or the accused or the convicted persons have to be housed somewhere.

So, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we speak of extradition, let us not worry about our ability to get the persons out. It is very easy in this country to have persons board aircraft or other vessels and get out. We have had instances in which one person was able to get out using a vehicle, not only out of Trinidad and Tobago but to find himself visiting all sorts of European territories. What we have to recognize also is that we must make sure that our local institutions that are responsible for the administration of justice will be able to bear the weight of the responsibility and additional burden given to them by this kind of legislation.

Extradition (Amdt.) (No. 2) Bill
[MISS LUCKY]

Friday, January 09, 2004

What is the present scenario, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with our police service? We have police officers who are running away from and are complaining of the dilapidated conditions of police stations. We have prosecutors who, in fact, are saying that they would prefer to take some kind of action rather than go to courtrooms because they recognize they are continuing to get very low remuneration packages and the issue is not being addressed by the Government of the day. We have, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a report in today's newspaper indicating that prison officers attached to the Golden Grove Prison are contemplating strike action because they are no longer going to tolerate a situation in which at least 14 dormitories at that prison are in a deplorable state.

We have the attorneys who belong to the Assembly of Southern Lawyers, one of them of course being the hon. Member for Princes Town, deciding that they have no other choice but to take strike action because this Government refuses to provide proper facilities for persons who have to operate within the Magistrates' Courts. So immediately, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the national and local picture of those institutions that will have to carry the burden of responsibility that is placed upon them because of this piece of legislation as proposed, we recognize that the picture is a very worrying one because what this Government is continuing to fail to do is to pump the necessary resources into these institutions so that they can operate effectively and efficiently.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, do you know how embarrassing it is that we have to wait for the United States to tell us that we should be upgrading our ports, to literally threaten us before, all of a sudden, millions of dollars can be located to do the necessary improvements so we do not find ourselves in the embarrassing situation of not being able to trade freely with the United States as we would like? Why do we always have to wait for an embarrassing situation, or for some kind of threat, or for some kind of eruption to take place before we do what we are supposed to? The reason we constantly find ourselves lagging behind is because we have a Government that has no vision. The only vision they can talk about is 2020 and 2020 to this Government is simply talking about numbers. It is not talking about taking Trinidad and Tobago forward. [*Desk thumping*] As long as we live in that dream the belief is that everything is A-OK, everything is hunky-dory and we are not going to get anywhere. So standing and indicating that this legislation is going to solve the problems is very inaccurate, because, perhaps the Members on the other side have never really spent a day in the Magistrates' Courts, experiencing the kind of pedantic approach that still has to be used in those courts because they promised to provide CAT reporters and taped recordings of proceedings—it has not happened.

This morning, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was in the Arima Magistrates' Court and it is pathetic to see what the poor man who comes there for justice has to face; what attorneys have to face when they are not—there are no bathroom facilities so you are literally begging the staff to use the little that they have. You ask yourself, when you see persons standing from half past 8.00 in the morning until one o'clock when you are leaving the court hustling to come to Parliament, is this a Government that really cares, to have persons waiting in the hot sun, who cannot be accommodated in the courtroom because it is too small?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, understand that extradition proceedings are heard in magistrates' courts. You already have situations where magistrates cannot deal with the burden placed on them with their lists. While it is commendable to be fulfilling international obligations, what this Government ought to be doing, is looking at the various institutions and pumping the necessary resources into them so that when we have to star on the international stage we will not only be able to show them our legislation but we will be able to show them the results. You see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Government does not want to accept that "ol' talk" and "gun talk" and slip of the tongue are not enough. Performance beats "ol' talk" and it is time this Government starts to perform. That is what they are being called upon to do and that is what they constantly refuse to do and now you are hearing excuses—it is a non-issue. Everything that is contentious, everything that is in the national interest, anything that shows the Government's lack of transparency and integrity, is now being deemed a non-issue. All I can say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that if the Government of the day wants to embarrass itself, let it do so, but let it not allow its actions to continue to embarrass us on the international sphere.

The hon. Minister talked about mutual assistance. All the legislation dealing with mutual assistance and proceeds of crime was part of a comprehensive package of legislation that was passed under the United National Congress regime and all this Government really has to do is take the ball and roll it a little further than where the United National Congress had already taken it. We do not expect the Government to be taking us backwards. Mr. Deputy Speaker, even in the presentation, when you bring this kind of legislation, people want to hear how you are going to achieve what you are setting out in your legislation. How are you going to give the police the expertise they need? Yes, it is easy to say you will give them training, but, when it really comes down to the crunch, the police officers are in need of training but how many police officers are really trained in this issue of extradition? How many prosecutors have specialty of training in extradition? How many magistrates are able really to understand extradition to the

Extradition (Amdt.) (No. 2) Bill
[MISS LUCKY]

Friday, January 09, 2004

extent that they ought to? You cannot blame these persons because they are being given more and more to do with less and less resources.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, even if those on the other side want to suggest, “Well, with this legislation forget it. It is all about the political rhetoric” as they may call it, speaking about dilapidated court conditions and speaking about not treating state counsel fairly and talking about police officers who are lacking resources, let us go to this legislation. If one looks, for example, at clause 7 of the legislation, what that clause seeks to do is really to make a certain amendment to section 8 of the Act. In the list of offences in clause 7 that will now be inserted in the Act to be amended, certain offences are stated: murder, manslaughter and inflicting serious bodily harm, and then there is the use of this phrase, “sexual assault”.

Has the Government or those who advised them gone to the statute books to see that sexual assault is defined in the Sexual Offences Act, No. 27 of 1986? Sexual assault, according to section 5(1) of that Act is when a husband has sexual intercourse with his wife without her consent. So that what you really want in this piece of legislation, hon. Minister—and I ask you, when we make suggestions on this side, not to dismiss them as all your colleagues seem to do but to understand that you have put “sexual assault” when what you should really put is “sexual offences” because what you are trying to do by way of this clause is to ensure that persons who commit these types of offences are not allowed to say they did so as part of some kind of political problem and, as a result, seek some kind of asylum. So “sexual assault” should really be “sexual offences”.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, having said that, can I really live in the hope that those on the other side will, in the year 2004, listen to the voice of reason that comes from the Opposition? [*Desk thumping*]

Hon. Member: No!

Miss G. Lucky: Can I really hope that the hon. Minister will not allow his intellect to be contaminated by his colleagues who hear us making good points on this side but decide, to save political embarrassment, they would not do anything about it? Can I really expect a true gift this afternoon that the hon. Minister will hear what we have to say and do something about it? The challenge is yours, hon. Minister. The time for independence and integrity is now. We cannot keep putting it off.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, take, for example, in that very clause there is mention of kidnapping, abduction, hostage-taking or extortion. There is no mention of a fundamental crime, false imprisonment, because what we keep saying—and I am

saying it through you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but to the hon. Member for San Fernando East—is that when you are drafting this legislation and you go into the level of specificity of saying kidnapping, hostage-taking, extortion and abduction, you are dealing with offences in which you are literally affecting the liberty of a person.

The point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we have been making over and over and over to the Government, is that kidnapping is a serious offence but the other serious offence that usually accompanies it, and carries equal weight in terms of even its sentence, is the offence of false imprisonment. So that when you want to boast about legislation that you will be taking on the international stage and saying, “Look what we in Trinidad and Tobago have done”, show them that we have advanced intellectually, show them that we understand the difference in offences and include in that particular section the offence of false imprisonment. Again, I can only ask, Mr. Deputy Speaker, for a gift this afternoon that we can see this as one of the amendments.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is something that has me very concerned in this piece of legislation when it comes to the very clause 7 with which I am dealing, and it is clause 7(9) which states:

“The Attorney General may, by Order subject to a negative resolution of Parliament, amend the list of offences referred to in subsection (7).”

The first thing that really stares at you when you look at it is, why must the Attorney General—and not in terms of having the power to make the Order—but why must it be subject to a negative resolution? It is always important, when one is doing amendments to legislation, to show that level of consistency and awareness of the parent Act. So you see, what we on this side do in preparation is go to the parent Act and we do not depend on what the clauses tell us in order to explain. If you look at the parent Act, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what you recognize is in section 6(5), which is now going to be repealed, that you see:

“The Attorney General may by Order subject to affirmative resolution of Parliament amend the First Schedule.”

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am sure you are following the point and colleagues are following it. When, in the parent Act, the Attorney General wanted to amend the offences in the First Schedule—which will no longer be relevant if this legislation is passed—but what it was doing basically in the First Schedule was stating the extraditable offences and what the parent Act sought to do was this. In order to ensure that somebody is checking on the Attorney General, the parent Act ensured, by virtue of this subsection in section 6, that if the Attorney General

Extradition (Amdt.) (No. 2) Bill
[MISS LUCKY]

Friday, January 09, 2004

sought to increase in any way or change or vary the First Schedule, the Attorney General would have to make sure Parliament is aware and there would be a live debate on the issue.

In the same vein, therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, even though I am admitting that by virtue of the legislation before us this section 6 of the parent Act is going to be removed, the fact is it is going to be replaced. When you look at clause 7, even though clause 7 is not replacing clause 6, you must have the policy remaining the same, then if the Attorney General is going to get the power to deal with the offences that cannot be relied upon in order to claim political asylum, then it is important, if the Attorney General is getting that power, that somebody is checking him and the place to check him is the Parliament, because the people who will be affected would be members of the public, and not necessarily nationals, but we must always make sure that we know what is happening. That is why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, again I am going to urge the hon. Minister to give us a gift this afternoon and change that phrase “negative resolution” to “affirmative resolution”.

It is in clause 7 paragraph (c), what is subsection (9). I am taking my time because I am seeing the hon. Minister at least paying me the courtesy of the attention and looking for it. I do not want to do like those who have briefed him and merely regurgitate and pick up and seek to embarrass but it should really be the affirmative resolution of Parliament. Let us keep the importance of Parliament; let us keep the supremacy of the Parliament in terms of always ensuring the voice of the people is being heard.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you were to continue with legislation and I am seriously not just going to nit-pick at those clauses for nit-picking sake because I have always been a person who advocated that when legislation is good or it takes us forward, especially if it makes us look good in the international arena, it ought to be commended and supported but we have to make sure we get it right. Take, for example, what is in clause 8(8). This, to me, is just a little worrying and I hope that the hon. Minister will be able to give me some kind of cogent explanation for it. It is actually page 13 of the Bill and I am only taking the liberty to do it this way, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because I am seeing the hon. Minister trying to find it in his own notes and in his own Bill. What that states is as follows:

“Where the Attorney General withdraws an authority to proceed after proceedings under section 12 have begun, the Magistrate shall discharge the person and set aside any order made with respect to the remand of the person in custody or on bail.”

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reason one has to examine these clauses very carefully is that these are new clauses that will now become, if the legislation is passed, part of the parent Act, therefore it is important to look at what is the objective of the particular insertions to make sure that we are not giving entities or offices powers and those powers are going unchecked.

Now, the Attorney General no doubt, or that person holding that office, would of course be the person who would have to sign the Order and, really, the person holding that office deals in a significant way with what is happening or what initiates the extradition process but, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have always had a very great concern and it is this. Extradition is really seen as a quasi, if not full, criminal proceeding and even when the central authority was placed within the ambit of the Attorney General, I very independently said—because I was not in the Parliament at the time, but I was very concerned that the central authority was not made part of the office of the Director of Public Prosecutions, or at least given some level of independence because, whereas from a protocol point of view it would be important to have the Attorney General receiving the request from a requesting state, once the criminal process begins, that is in the Magistrates' court, I think it very important to have that level of withdrawal now from someone who holds what is described as a political office, in that the person is a political appointee and that is why I have always advocated, and I still do, that the central authority ought not to be within the ambit of the Attorney General.

You see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when one takes that kind of thinking and juxtaposes it on what is appearing in this clause, the Attorney General is now getting the power, which he did not have before in the parent Act, to state to a magistrate—and I use the word, “state”—because it says that once the Attorney General decides to withdraw the authority to proceed, even though the proceeding may have begun, the magistrate shall have no right other than to discharge the person and set aside the Order made with respect to such a person.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the greatest respect, I find that quite worrying because without personalizing the issue—because legislation is not supposed to be made for persons, it is really supposed to be made for the future and you have to cater that anybody could be holding a particular office—what if, for some reason, an Attorney General decided that he or she would withdraw the authority to proceed? To whom would that Attorney General be accounting? In other words, this is a case in which a proceeding has already started in the Magistrates' Court. [*Interruption*] The Member for Princes Town is saying it, which is the exact point I am making. Once the proceeding begins, it should be the Director of

Extradition (Amdt.) (No. 2) Bill
[MISS LUCKY]

Friday, January 09, 2004

Public Prosecutions who at least should be consulted, and that should be in the statute, because at the end of the day, according to section 90 of our Constitution, it is the DPP and the DPP alone that has the power to institute, stay, *nolle pros* and discontinue criminal proceedings, and what is being done by virtue of this particular clause is a discontinuance and that is why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that power ought not to be given to the Attorney General.

From the time the proceeding begins, one has to now adopt a severance approach which is, the proceeding is in the Magistrates' Court, a magistrate who has a discretion, who is already being told in the parent Act and in this legislation that the Order cannot be made, that is the Order for extradition cannot be made unless there is a *prima facie* case made out, and if the magistrate has that discretion and the DPP, under section 90 has that power to deal with all criminal matters as he sees fit, the Attorney General can make the recommendation but that is the highest I think we should allow it, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Once again I am going to ask the hon. Minister to at least consider it, and, if the submission is not accepted, to at least address the issue and indicate why it ought not to be done and to give an explanation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, more than saying, "Well, it is the Attorney General who receives the Order, and it is the Attorney General who initiates the Order, and therefore it should be for him to stop it". I have already dealt with that by saying that, yes, it is the Office of the Attorney General that receives it, but it is very much like the Office of the Attorney General that may receive a complaint about an alleged criminal act; but it is not for the Attorney General's office to investigate it; it is not for the Attorney General's office to call police officers and ask them to go out and do something about it.

Maybe the precedent being set is the worrying one that people now think is the norm. That is not the way it is supposed to be. The information can be received but it must be sent to the relevant authorities who are given that mandate to perform that function. It is only with independence and integrity we can move forward. With the greatest respect to the other side, they have compromised all independence; they continue to compromise all integrity, Mr. Deputy Speaker. So once again it is important that at least with that particular section one looks at what the role of the Attorney General is and when his role ought to stop and let the DPP receive some kind of correspondence from the Attorney General, let him receive a recommendation from the Attorney General but let the power to discontinue be in the hands of the DPP or the magistrate who may decide, at the end of the proceeding, having heard all the evidence before him or her, "Well listen, there is not sufficient evidence to substantiate an Order being made."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, but for these points really—and I have gone to the legislation right away—what is also apparent in the legislation is the fact that our High Courts and our Court of Appeal are also being given an additional burden in that what is made clear is that if a proceeding has to go to the High Court by way of some kind of appeal or hearing and also the Court of Appeal, even though those relevant courts may be out of session or on vacation, the legislation says that they will have to conform themselves to hear the matter and, with the greatest respect, I do not think anything is wrong with that. In fact, I am one of the strongest advocates for the fact that our courts should never be going on recess and our courts must operate 12 months per year.

That is why, when the former holder of the Office of the Attorney General brought piecemeal legislation, which she was accustomed doing in terms of bringing a piece here and bringing a piece there and then running away before all the pieces were put together [*Interruption*] the fact remains—yes I must call her senior counsel, and I would love to know the criteria now so I would know whether I should put in my application—when the legislation was brought to increase the complement of judges from 20 to 23, on this side we made very strenuous calls for the government of the day to at least listen to us, and, instead of going from 20 to 23 take it from 20 to 28, because, even with 23, two of the positions are already absorbed because we had at that time two acting judges and I think now we just have one acting judge, Justice of the High Court.

You see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the other side would just sometimes sit back and listen to common sense—bearing in mind that is the criterion that the hon. Member for San Fernando East set to be in his Cabinet, common sense and a level head, and we have lots of that on this side—the fact is, when the legislation was brought, we made the point, take the complement of judges to 28 because that is what the Chief Justice had indicated he needed and, when the funding was required, if you did not have it immediately, at least the law would be there. Instead, you have legislation now, giving additional responsibility to the High Court and the Court of Appeal also saying, “Listen, you all will have to form yourselves into a quorum or a panel to hear these matters, even if you are out of session,” and there is nothing done simultaneously or commensurate with to ensure that the institutions responsible for enforcing and implementing this legislation have the resources that they need.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not going to take any more time except to say that I have pointed out specifically to the hon. Minister what ought to be addressed in the Bill. It is now a challenge for the hon. Minister to decide whether he would

Extradition (Amdt.) (No. 2) Bill
[MISS LUCKY]

Friday, January 09, 2004

get the correct advice on the point or whether he would allow himself simply to be briefed by basically quoting everything from the Explanatory Note. I have explained the position and on this side we are saying, yes we have to take extradition forward; yes we need to make amends; but in making those amendments let us make sure that, when the amendments are made, we do not have to come back here and face any kind of embarrassment, political or otherwise.

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

The Minister of Foreign Affairs (Sen. The Hon. Knowlson Gift): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Member did make some cogent observations but I wonder whether they are all pertinent in terms of comparing what we have on the record in respect of the parent Bill, seeing that a lot of what is reproduced in this new Bill is excerpted and extracted from the Bill. When we look, for example, at Part II of the parent Act we see here the heading “Territories To Which Act Applies”, we begin by 3(1):

“The Attorney General may, by Order subject to negative resolution...”

I see that phrase recurring on a number of occasions throughout the body of the parent Bill. In other words, it would seem to me that there has been some acceptability in the past in the phrasing of that sentence, namely, phrasing it in the negative rather than in the affirmative. I made this observation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because the other side had, in the past, brought before this honourable House a number of amendments which formed part of the parent Bill and I was wondering whether their awareness of the wording may have escaped them at that time.

Miss Lucky: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. Minister has kindly decided to give way and I thank him very much for it. The hon. Minister is quite correct that in the parent Act there are instances in which “negative resolution” is used. However, those instances in which it is used are ones in which the rights of persons are not affected, but in any instance—for example, that is why section 6 of the parent Act was referred to. In any instance in which there was going to be some kind of expansion, alteration, correction or amendment to an issue that dealt with, for example, increasing or decreasing the offences that would be deemed extraditable offences, an affirmative resolution of Parliament was required.

However, in terms of section 3 where “negative resolution” is used, that is in terms of declaring whether in fact a territory would be a declared Commonwealth territory, and because there would already be a check and balance because the Attorney General would not just be able to declare a Commonwealth territory or

any new territory as a Commonwealth territory because already there would be a check and balance with respect to the necessary arms of the state, the Executive more so, there was no need for the affirmative resolution, but once one is interfering with the rights affecting persons and their liberty, you will see affirmative resolution. I thank the hon. Minister again for giving way, though.
[*Desk thumping*]

Sen. The Hon. K. Gift: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In the same vein, it seems to me that the powers of the Attorney General, which the Member seems to be challenging, are also contained in the original Bill and, indeed, while the Member may be expressing a preference for the authority to be vested in the magistrate, it would seem to me that in the old Bill the Attorney General also enjoyed a certain authority. If we look, for example, on page 13, we see here:

“Where the return of any person is requested under this Part...”

This is the old Bill I am quoting from:

“by a declared Commonwealth territory or a declared foreign territory and such person is arrested in pursuance...may request the Attorney General to order his return without any proceedings before a Magistrate under section 12.”

So that indeed a certain authority seems to be vested in the Attorney General in the former Bill which this new amendment seeks to replace. It goes on:

“Where the Attorney General consents...”

Et cetera, et cetera. So it would seem to me that indeed there is a role there for the Attorney General vis-à-vis the magistrate in terms of the authority to proceed, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move. [*Desk thumping*]

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 to 15 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

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

House resumed.

Bill reported, without amendment, read the third time and passed.

Adjournment

Friday, January 09, 2004

ADJOURNMENT

The Minister of Trade and Industry and Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Hon. Kenneth Valley): Mr. Deputy Speaker, in moving the adjournment, by agreement, there is a matter on the adjournment which was deferred from the last sitting, but we would want to have that deferred further to the next sitting of the Parliament. I think the Member is not here. [*Interruption*]

Mr. Singh: He is here. The Minister is not here.

Hon. K. Valley: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House be adjourned to Friday, January 16, 2004 at 1.30 p.m. and I wish to inform Members that on that day the Government would wish to debate the Motion under “Government Business”, that is, Senate amendments to the Firearms (Amdt.) Bill, to be followed by debate on a Bill entitled an Act to repeal and replace the Sentencing Commission Act, 2000, and also a Bill entitled an Act relating to Family Proceedings, that is, Bills Nos. 2 and 4 on today’s Order Paper, in that order. [*Interruption*] Hardly next week; it might be the following week. I have to be guided by the Minister. I thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Question put and agreed to.

House adjourned accordingly.

Adjourned at 6.22 p.m.

WRITTEN ANSWER TO QUESTION

The following question was asked by Mr. Ganga Singh (Caroni East):

**Airports Authority of Trinidad and Tobago
(Employment Status)**

6. Could the Minister provide this House with a list of all persons employed by the Airports Authority of Trinidad and Tobago indicating:
- (i) the capacity in which they are employed;
 - (ii) the salaries which they receive;
 - (iii) their starting date of employment?

The following reply was circulate to Members of the House:

The Minister of Works and Transport (Hon. Jarrette Narine): The answer to question No. 6 is as follows:

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

AATT EMPLOYEE INFORMATION
Security Crown Point (Permanent & Contract)

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
7627	15	Baptiste	Ann-Marie	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7628	15	Beckles	Avion	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7629	15	Bedlow	Dwain	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7630	15	Belton	Patrina	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7631	15	Bramble	Cherilyn	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7632	15	Campbell	Willis	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7633	15	Campbell	Keston	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7634	15	Caruth	Coryse	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7635	15	Charles	Sherma	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7636	15	Clarke	Nina	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7637	15	Cox	Vivena	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7638	15	Cox	Simone	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7639	15	Craig	Candis	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7640	15	Daniel	Jeremy	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7641	15	Daniel	Yolande	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7642	15	Davidson	Adriana	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7643	15	Davidson	Keven	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR. #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
7644	15	Davis	Maxine	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7645	15	Fraser	Nanjala	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7646	15	Gibson	Kareem	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7647	15	Henry	Merlisa	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7648	15	Henry	Anna Marie	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7649	15	Henry	Dameon	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7650	15	Jack	Carolyn	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7651	15	James	Natasha	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7652	15	James-Daniel	Alfonso	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7653	15	Jerry	Kerry	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7654	15	Joefield	Kelly	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7655	15	Jordan Washington	Pearl	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7656	15	Julien	Lisanne	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7657	15	Lovell	Donald	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7658	15	Mc Millan	Carlton	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7659	15	Mc Pherson	Nicole	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7660	15	Phillips	Cherry-Anne	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7661	15	Phillips McKenzie	Shermin	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7662	15	Ramcharan	Lisa Marie	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR. #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
7663	15	Roberts	Kemba	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7664	15	Solomon	Gabbi	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7665	15	Thomas	Tackecia	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7666	15	Timothy	Marsha	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7667	15	Waldron	Kieron	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7668	15	Wallace	Candice	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7669	15	Wilson	Alicia	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7670	15	Wright	Janelle	EC	2,867	Contract	08-Sep-03
7512	15	Browne	Jeanette	EC	3,708	Permanent	02-Mar-98
7510	15	Cromarty	Bethlyn	EC	3,708	Permanent	02-Mar-98
7509	15	Denoon	Marvin	EC	3,708	Permanent	02-Mar-98
7507	15	Duke	Ronald	EC	3,708	Permanent	02-Mar-98
7511	15	Jack	Arlene	EC	3,708	Permanent	02-Mar-98
7513	15	Muir	Selwyn	EC	3,708	Permanent	02-Mar-98
7508	15	O'neil	Dean	EC	3,708	Permanent	02-Mar-98
7505	15	Troiman	Hayden	EC	3,708	Permanent	02-Mar-98
7504	15	Wilson	Dianna	EC	3,708	Permanent	02-Mar-98
7481	15	Browne	Curtis	EC	3,953	Permanent	03-Apr-95
7476	15	Chance	Julian	EC	3,953	Permanent	03-Apr-95

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR. #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
7480	15	Samuel	Matthew	EC	3,953	Permanent	03-Apr-95
7424	15	Shepherd	Colin	EC	4,339	Permanent	12-Aug-91
7413	15	Browne	Carla	W/EC	4,339	Permanent	09-Jun-91
7408	15	Campbell-Sylvester	Joy	EC	4,339	Permanent	09-Jun-91
7414	15	Davidson	Rhonda	EC	4,339	Permanent	09-Jun-91
7411	15	Horsford Redman	Lindy Ann	W/EC	4,339	Permanent	09-Jun-91
7415	15	Joseph	Curtis	EC	4,339	Permanent	09-Jun-91
7416	15	Parks-James	Gemma	EC	4,339	Permanent	09-Jun-91
7407	15	Daniel	Derrick	EC	4,339	Permanent	13-May-91
7484	15	James	Marlon	EC	3,953	Permanent	18-May-87
7305	15	Dennis	Garth	EC	4,579	Permanent	24-Mar-86
7307	15	Henry	Anslm	EC	4,579	Permanent	24-Mar-86
7304	15	James	Allister	EC	4,579	Permanent	24-Mar-86
7306	15	Marcelle	Irving	EC	4,579	Permanent	24-Mar-86
7198	15	Daly	Robert	EC	4,579	Permanent	10-Nov-83
7218	15	Alleyn	Jacqueline	EC	4,579	Permanent	10-Jan-83
7213	15	Benjamin	Patricia	EC	4,579	Permanent	10-Jan-83
7214	15	Clarke	Grace	EC	4,579	Permanent	10-Jan-83
7206	15	Cowan	Andre	EC	4,579	Permanent	10-Jan-83

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR. #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
7221	15	Cupid	Dian ne	EC	4,579	Permanent	10-Jan-83
7215	15	Melville	Deborah	EC	4,579	Permanent	10-Jan-83
7223	15	Nedd Crooks	Earlene	EC	4,579	Permanent	10-Jan-83
7217	15	Ortley-Gordon	Angela	EC	4,579	Permanent	10-Jan-83
7200	15	Ross	Owen	EC	5,729	Permanent	10-Jan-83
7203	15	Shanghie	Glenroy	EC	4,579	Permanent	10-Jan-83
7220	15	Trim-Mcleod	Dotisie	EC	4,579	Permanent	10-Jan-83
7216	15	Wells	Elsa	EC	4,579	Permanent	10-Jan-83
7158	15	George	Mary	Corporal	5,729	Permanent	01-Jun-82
7093	15	Griffith-Leslie	Joyce	Corporal	4,579	Permanent	15-Apr-82
7087	15	Daly-Brassey	Avril	Sargeant	5,729	Permanent	15-Apr-82
7027	15	Bernard	Thaddeus	Corporal	5,729	Permanent	01-Mar-82
7036	15	Graham	Glenford	Corporal	4,579	Permanent	01-Mar-82

AATT EMPLOYEE INFORMATION
Crown Point (Permanent)

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
1967	13	Alexander	Roland	Facilities Technician	3,083	Permanent	05-Nov-03
3087	10	Mckellar	Gideon	Dep. Tax Asst.	2,855	Permanent	25-Aug-03

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
3085	10	Bacchus	Chenelle	Dep. Tax Clerk	2,855	Permanent	17-Jul-03
3081	10	Williams	Carla	Dep. Tax Asst.	2,855	Permanent	17-Jun-03
3080	10	Dillon	Dayne	Dep. Tax Asst.	2,946	Permanent	16-Aug-01
3079	13	Bapiste	Marlon	Facilities Technician	3,574	Permanent	11-Jun-01
3078	13	Boyce	Clarence	Facilities Technician	3,574	Permanent	11-Jun-01
3062	13	Balfour	Delroy	Facilities Technician	3,932	Permanent	03-Aug-98
3067	13	Forbes	William	Facilities Technician	3,932	Permanent	03-Aug-98
3065	13	George	Albert	Facilities Technician	3,932	Permanent	03-Aug-98
3060	13	Gillman	Garnet	Facilities Technician	3,932	Permanent	03-Aug-98
3069	13	Glasgow	Wayne	Structural Supervisor	3,932	Permanent	03-Aug-98
3066	13	Jack	Victor	Facilities Technician	3,932	Permanent	03-Aug-98
3063	13	Joseph	Philbert	Facilities Technician	3,932	Permanent	03-Aug-98
3061	13	Roberts	Martin	Facilities Technician	3,932	Permanent	03-Aug-98
3064	13	Rolllocks	Neville	Facilities Technician	3,932	Permanent	03-Aug-98
3056	12	Gibson	Aldric	Attendant 1	3,219	Permanent	01-Jun-98
3039	11	Bapiste	Elizabeth	Secretary 11	4,178	Permanent	14-Aug-96
3530	12	John	Derek	Attendant 1	3,788	Permanent	20-Mar-90
3533	12	Romeo	Andy	Attendant 1	3,788	Permanent	19-Mar-90
1372	11	Thomas	Patricia	DM	7,090	Permanent	09-Nov-89

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
3526	12	Melville	Witfred	Driver	4,061	Permanent	13-Apr-87
3524	10	Ramsden	Lyn don	Stores Clerk	3,788	Permanent	16-Sep-85
7009	11	Charles	Leslie	DM	6,585	Permanent	14-Jan-85
3513	13	Phillip	Andrew	Structural Supervisor	6,037	Permanent	21-Feb-84
3016	11	Bernard	Glenna	Manager Airport Ops. (Ag)	7,090	Permanent	11-Apr-83
3014	12	Jackson-Winchester	Lyn	Attendant 11	4,302	Permanent	01-Apr-83
1114	11	Gooding	Melvin	DM	7,090	Permanent	01-Dec-82
3506	12	Phillips-Benoit	Joicey	Facilities Att.	3,788	Permanent	15-Jan-82
3008	12	London	Allan	Attendant 11	4,544	Permanent	07-Jul-81
3004	11	James	Terrence	DM	7,090	Permanent	14-Apr-80
3504	12	Taylor	Arthur	Attendant 11	4,302	Permanent	01-Feb-80

**AATT EMPLOYEE INFORMATION
Contract**

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
3090	24	Paul	Lorraine	Clerk I	2,855	Contract	01-Dec-03
3088	24	Samuel	Gail-Ann	Clerk I	2,855	Contract	12-Nov-03
1970	24	De Four	Kiellann- Leigh	Departure Tax Assistant	2,855	Contract	04-Nov-03
424	24	Castor	Keith	Mgr. Safety Health & Env.	10,768	Contract	01-Nov-03

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
1969	24	Cumberbatch	Venetia	Departure Tax Assistant	2,855	Contract	28-Oct-03
1968	24	Guerra	Keisha King	Departure Tax Assistant	2,855	Contract	21-Oct-03
1966	24	Jules	Marcia	Departure Tax Assistant	2,855	Contract	14-Oct-03
1960	24	Fletcher	Tameika	Clerk 1	2,855	Contract	13-Oct-03
1963	24	Gill	Karen	Clerk 1	2,855	Contract	13-Oct-03
1962	24	Alexander	Kelly Ann	Clerk 1	2,855	Contract	13-Oct-03
1961	24	Baksh	Allyson	Clerk 1	2,855	Contract	13-Oct-03
1965	24	Baptiste	Melissa	Clerk 1	2,855	Contract	13-Oct-03
1964	24	Cuffie	Amy	Clerk 1	2,855	Contract	13-Oct-03
423	24	Williams	Judy	Admin. Specialist	9,500	Contract	06-Oct-03
421	24	Greene	Rita	Project Administrator	14,000	Contract	15-Sep-03
420	24	Modeste	Kathleen	HRO	6,914	Contract	01-Sep-03
1754	24	Jadoonanan	Ronald	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	28-Aug-03
1404	24	Mottley	Michael	Elec./Electro. Specialist	9,500	Contract	11-Aug-03
1846	24	Duff	Sherrill	Facilitation Officer	4,554	Contract	01-Aug-03
1956	24	Cumberbatch	Jessie Ann	Clerk 1	2,855	Contract	18-Jul-03
1951	24	Daniel	Tewelde	Maintenance Asst.	2,855	Contract	09-Jun-03
1915	24	James	Liesel	Clerk 1	2,855	Contract	17-Mar-03
1913	24	Mcewen	Derwin	Clerk 1	2,855	Contract	17-Mar-03

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
1914	24	Melville	Naomi	Clerk 1	2,855	Contract	17-Mar-03
1937	24	Farrell	Renissa	Engineering Asst.	5,798	Contract	14-Mar-03
1931	24	Cedeno	Wade	Messenger	2,638	Contract	12-Mar-03
1934	24	O'brien	Jenelle	Clerk 1	2,855	Contract	11-Mar-03
1935	24	Lopez	Leida	Clerk 1	2,855	Contract	10-Mar-03
1929	24	Abdul	Shazard	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	06-Mar-03
1930	24	Neils	Giselle	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	06-Mar-03
1927	24	Ragbir	Seeraj	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Mar-03
1919	24	Herbert	Janelle	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Mar-03
1928	24	Seelal	Hamewaite	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Mar-03
1923	24	Dookie	Yamuna	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Mar-03
1917	24	Edwards	Marla	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Mar-03
1924	24	Edwards	Ann Marie	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Mar-03
1921	24	Griffith	Marsha	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Mar-03
1925	24	Anoop	Ghansham	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Mar-03
1922	24	Mohammed	Reavie	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Mar-03
1926	24	Moses	Glen	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Mar-03
1912	24	Tyson	Alicia	Clerk 1	2,855	Contract	25-Feb-03
1911	24	Modeste	Avril	Clerk 1	2,855	Contract	24-Feb-03

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
1884	24	Richardson	Eugene	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1888	24	Guerra-Simms	Kerl-Ann	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1899	24	Harris	Debra	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1901	24	Hunte	Peter	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1882	24	Hutchins	Cheryl Ann	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1891	24	Jankie	Bassiran	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1879	24	Joseph-Charles	Nickesha	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1896	24	De La Rosa	Debra	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1893	24	Emmons	Adrian	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1898	24	Forgenie	Leslie Ann	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1880	24	Fullerton	Gary	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1877	24	Jules	Lawrence	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1883	24	Griffith	Gail	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1874	24	Balfour	Maud	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1887	24	Branche	Sherwyn	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1881	24	Brown	Kevin	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1886	24	Charles	Sandra	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1892	24	Daniel	Michelle	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1897	24	Kelly	Ricky	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
1876	24	Krishnanan	Satrohan	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1890	24	Leacock	Shirley	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1889	24	Nesbit	Janelle	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1895	24	Nottin gham	Olive	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1894	24	O'neil	Ricardo	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1904	24	Parris-Ramlogan	Cathy	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1885	24	Paul	Lesley Ann	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Feb-03
1861	24	Veosen	Francis	Maintenance Asst.	2,855	Contract	01-Feb-03
1869	24	Narine	Inshan	Driver	3,215	Contract	20-Jan-03
	24	Felice	Ingrid	Human Resource Coordinator	10,768	Contract	01-Nov-02
1949	24	Solomon	Jewell	Clerk 1	2,855	Contract	26-Sep-02
410	9	Stater	Rawle	Engineering Asst.	7,000	Contract	26-Sep-02
1948	24	Cazoe-James	Ayana	Clerk 1	2,855	Contract	26-Sep-02
1939	24	Harvey	Aba	Clerk 1	2,855	Contract	09-Sep-02
1762	24	Giroux	Rhona	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	28-Aug-02
409	24	Terrance	Miller	Facilities Maintenance Coordinator	7,000	Contract	03-Jun-02
408	24	Loy	Lyons	Project Architect	15,000	Contract	16-May-02
411	24	Rose	Janniere	Executive Asst.	9,500	Contract	06-May-02
1863	24	Hackshaw	Michael	Facilities Att.	3,456	Contract	07-Feb-02

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
1862	24	Singh	Prendath	Facilities Att.	3,456	Contract	07-Feb-02
1865	24	Mohammed	Azard	Facilities Att.	3,456	Contract	07-Feb-02
1849	24	Bachan	Rudra	Facilities Att.	3,456	Contract	02-Jan-02
	24	Ramnasibsingh	Adia	Corp. Communications Officer	6,914	Contract	04-Dec-01
1825	24	Ramlogan	Gohan	Maintenance Asst.	2,855	Contract	01-Dec-01
1828	24	Singh	Kamraj	Maintenance Asst.	2,855	Contract	01-Dec-01
1829	24	Diparine	Shiva	Maintenance Asst.	2,855	Contract	01-Dec-01
1826	24	Dookie	Bachan	Maintenance Asst.	2,855	Contract	01-Dec-01
1821	24	Douglas	Stephen	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Dec-01
1820	24	Jules	Donna	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Dec-01
1817	24	Ali	Jarett	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Dec-01
1831	24	Augustine	Kerwin	Maintenance Asst.	2,855	Contract	01-Dec-01
1830	24	Bally	Ronnie	Maintenance Asst.	2,855	Contract	01-Dec-01
1824	24	Christopher	Peter	Maintenance Asst.	2,855	Contract	01-Dec-01
1815	24	Marchand Robinson	Sharon	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	01-Dec-01
1827	24	Mohammed	Nolan	Maintenance Asst.	2,855	Contract	01-Dec-01
1823	24	Monroe	Sherwin	Facilities Att.	3,456	Contract	01-Dec-01
1860	24	Dookram	Sona	Maintenance Asst.	2,855	Contract	19-Nov-01
1868	24	Olliviera	Lynette	Protocol Asst.	4,500	Contract	09-Sep-01

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
1791	24	Ramkisson	Jeewan	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	07-Sep-01
1786	24	Bachan	Roshan	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	07-Sep-01
1789	24	Khan	Shawn	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	07-Sep-01
1788	24	Lutchman	Himraj	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	07-Sep-01
1793	24	Marcano	Lesley-Ann	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	07-Sep-01
1779	24	Sarjeant	Kathy-Ann	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	05-Sep-01
1783	24	Rose	Asha	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	05-Sep-01
1775	24	Ramadeen	Ako	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	03-Sep-01
1769	24	Guy-John	Lexann	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	03-Sep-01
1776	24	Snaggs	Joanne	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	03-Sep-01
1774	24	Wharton	David	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	03-Sep-01
1773	24	Williams	Holmes	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	03-Sep-01
1761	24	John	Natasha	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	28-Aug-01
1758	24	Garjew-Hernandez	Donna	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	28-Aug-01
1752	24	Collins	Jacqueline	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	28-Aug-01
1766	24	Yorkshire	Keisha	Facilities Att.	2,500	Contract	28-Aug-01
1709	24	Khan	Javed	Legal Counsel	9,800	Contract	28-Nov-00
1867	24	Thompson	Della	PR Asst.	4,500	Contract	23-Nov-00
1694	24	Robinson	Michelle	Commercial MGMT (Maid)	2,515	Contract	17-Feb-99

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
1672	24	Reece	Jannette	Commercial MGMT	4,047	Contract	20-Oct-98
		Trim	Jose Ann	Clerk I (C.P.)			

AAT EMPLOYEE INFORMATION
Security Piarco (Permanent & Contract)

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
7560	5	Alfonso	Nikita	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7561	5	Alfonso	Ayanna	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7562	5	Arthur	Joey	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7563	5	Augustine	Melicia	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7564	5	Bobb	Destroy	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7565	5	Boopsingh	Diana	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7566	5	Charles	Sheldon	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7567	5	Collymore	Kerwyn	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7569	5	Craig	Stephanie	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7570	5	Cromwell	Gerard	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7571	5	Edwards	Aleisha	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7572	5	Farnum	Tiffani	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7573	5	Ferguson	Marvin	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
7574	5	Forde	Gabriel	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7575	5	Francette	Pamela	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7576	5	Gangerdeen	Ryan	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7578	5	Gosine	Chris	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7579	5	Guevara	Kevin	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7580	5	Hayes	Gary	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7581	5	Henry	Richard	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7582	5	Huggins	Sarah	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7584	5	Iagdeo	Stephen	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7585	5	Jarvis	Paula	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7586	5	Jeffers	Tasha	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7587	5	Johnson	Carolyn	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7588	5	Laltoo	Vijay	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7589	5	Mahadeo	Roger	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7590	5	Maharaj	Ravi	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7591	5	Mann	Nolan	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7592	5	Marcano	Collis	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7593	5	Marshall	Candice	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7594	5	Mc Clatchie	Trudy	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
7595	5	Mohammed	Safrnaz	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7596	5	Moses	Rene`	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7598	5	Nicholas	Charmaine	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7599	5	Nicholson	Kneysa	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7600	5	Pantin	Ellisha	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7601	5	Patterson	Randell	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7602	5	Paul	Shaun	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7603	5	Phillip-Paul	Esther	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7604	5	Pierre	Candice	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7605	5	Pierre-Marcano	Luana	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7606	5	Raju	Elvin	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7607	5	Ramdial	Raj	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7608	5	Ramharack	Sherma	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7609	5	Ramlal	Ryan	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7610	5	Ramlal	Patrick	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7611	5	Ramananan	Avinash	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7612	5	Rampersad	Anthony	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7613	5	Roberts	Andre	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7615	5	Samarine	Hans	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
7616	5	Sookdeo	Colin	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7617	5	Subero	Duane	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7618	5	Telesford	Darryl	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7619	5	Thomas	Gerard	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7620	5	Thomas	Zezellin	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7621	5	Tobias	Brent	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7622	5	Toolisie	Antonio	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7623	5	Waldron	Katela	WEC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7625	5	Williams	Lawrence	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
7626	5	Young	Leslie	EC	2,867	Contract	14-Apr-03
	5	Salandy	Lt. Cl. Wendell	Security Coordinator	10,768	Contract	01-Nov-02
7537	5	Belfonte	Anna-Maria	WEC	2,867	Contract	01-Jan-02
7551	5	Boyke	Albert	EC	2,867	Contract	01-Jan-02
7536	5	Cowie	Deon	EC	2,867	Contract	01-Jan-02
7516	5	Devenish	Kathyann	WEC	2,867	Contract	01-Jan-02
7525	5	Dougan	Vanessa	WEC	2,867	Contract	01-Jan-02
7548	5	Harripaul	Jenai	WEC	2,867	Contract	01-Jan-02
7559	5	Hernandez	Rebecca	WEC	2,867	Contract	01-Jan-02
7517	5	Joseph	Lisa	WEC	2,867	Contract	01-Jan-02

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
7541	5	Lezama	Trevor	EC	2,867	Contract	01-Jan-02
7544	5	Munggal	Joanna	EC	2,862	Contract	01-Jan-02
7543	5	Nanton	Simone	WEC	2,867	Contract	01-Jan-02
7532	5	Ramlal	Lloyd	EC	2,867	Contract	01-Jan-02
7558	5	Seecharan	Sheldon	EC	2,867	Contract	01-Jan-02
7530	5	Seow	Charlene	WEC	2,867	Contract	01-Jan-02
7556	5	Smith	Junior	EC	2,867	Contract	01-Jan-02
7533	5	Wells	Orson	EC	2,867	Contract	01-Jan-02
7514	5	Williams	Natalie	WEC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jan-02
7539	5	Solomon	Ryan	EC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7554	5	Singh	Lisa	WEC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7518	5	Abraham-Eligon	Marsha	WEC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7552	5	Alexander	Stacey	WEC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7550	5	Alexis	Kabisha	WEC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7531	5	Allsop	Sherma	WEC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7535	5	Baldeo	Preamchand	EC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7549	5	Bhagwandeem	Vedesh	EC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7545	5	Chewitt	Rhonda	WEC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7553	5	Coombs	Winford	EC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
7524	5	Cyrus	Michael	EC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7526	5	Deepoo	Ramesh	EC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7547	5	Edwards	Victoria	WEC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7522	5	Fraser	Simmone	WEC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7529	5	Gibbs	Brian	EC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7527	5	Granado-Joseph	Angelina	WEC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7538	5	Headley	Ianine	WEC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7534	5	Henry	Stephanie	WEC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7515	5	Hypolite	Roxanne	WEC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7557	5	Joseph	Kenneth	EC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7519	5	Lewis	Ianine	WEC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7528	5	Martin	Marlon	EC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7540	5	McLeod	Yuri	WEC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7523	5	Mohammed	Melisa	WEC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7555	5	Perkins	Anthony	EC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7520	5	Pierre - Lucas	Lisa	WEC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7546	5	Polo	Bhandat	EC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7521	5	Randhanie	Dharmesh	EC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01
7542	5	Samlal	Rishi	EC	3,101	Permanent	01-Jun-01

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.B
7498	5	Alexis-Waldron	Simone	EC	3,708	Permanent	26-Jan-98
7496	5	Bernard-Shoy	Allison	EC	3,708	Permanent	26-Jan-98
7488	5	Darlington	Kenneth	EC	3,708	Permanent	26-Jan-98
7491	5	Downing	Junette	EC	3,708	Permanent	26-Jan-98
7493	5	Fernandes	Roy	EC	3,708	Permanent	26-Jan-98
7503	5	Forde	Lennard	EC	3,708	Permanent	26-Jan-98
7497	5	Jadoonanan	Vishan	EC	3,708	Permanent	26-Jan-98
7501	5	Leslie	Lance	EC	3,708	Permanent	26-Jan-98
7490	5	Price-Harris	Deanne	EC	3,708	Permanent	26-Jan-98
7492	5	Waldron	Theodore	EC	3,708	Permanent	26-Jan-98
7473	5	Walkins	Orin	EC	4,213	Permanent	28-Jan-96
7450	5	Bleasdel	Nathalia	EC	4,213	Permanent	27-Jul-92
7451	5	Campbell	Kenneth	EC	4,213	Permanent	27-Jul-92
7459	5	Charles-Walcott	Cherry-Ann	EC	4,213	Permanent	27-Jul-92
7454	5	Cyrl	Roger	EC	4,213	Permanent	27-Jul-92
7457	5	Gibbs	Cherry-Ann	EC	4,213	Permanent	27-Jul-92
7463	5	Lyors	Arlene	EC	4,213	Permanent	27-Jul-92
7460	5	Simmons Jacque	Wendy	EC	4,213	Permanent	27-Jul-92
7469	5	Vidale	Kester	EC	4,213	Permanent	27-Jul-92

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
7474	5	Warrick	Wendy	EC	4,213	Permanent	27-Jul-92
7327	5	Teemal	Stanley	EC	4,213	Permanent	15-Feb-92
7446	5	Alexander	Garvin	EC	4,339	Permanent	11-Nov-91
7437	5	Alfred	Joy	EC	4,339	Permanent	11-Nov-91
7449	5	Cupido	Phyllis	EC	4,339	Permanent	11-Nov-91
7440	5	Ford	Courtney	EC	4,339	Permanent	11-Nov-91
7433	5	Gomes	Carl	EC	4,339	Permanent	11-Nov-91
7428	5	Julien-Sinanan	Arlene	EC	4,339	Permanent	11-Nov-91
7441	5	Nicholls	Derek	EC	4,339	Permanent	11-Nov-91
7439	5	Ragoonanan	Devanand	EC	4,339	Permanent	11-Nov-91
7443	5	Wiggins	Kirt	EC	4,339	Permanent	11-Nov-91
7420	5	Clarke	Leonora	EC	4,339	Permanent	12-Aug-91
7423	5	Edwards	Donna	EC	4,339	Permanent	12-Aug-91
7421	5	Harper	Sheldon	EC	4,339	Permanent	12-Aug-91
7427	5	Kanhai	Kumar	EC	4,339	Permanent	12-Aug-91
7419	5	Thomas	Gail	EC	4,339	Permanent	12-Aug-91
7422	5	Vincent-Ramadeen	Laura	EC	4,339	Permanent	12-Aug-91
7396	5	Gilbert	Ashton	EC	4,339	Permanent	28-Jan-91
7397	5	Glynn	Rhonda	EC	4,339	Permanent	28-Jan-91

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.B
7398	5	James-Lai Leung	Camilita	EC	4,339	Permanent	28-Jan-91
7402	5	Philip	Daryl	EC	4,339	Permanent	28-Jan-91
7403	5	Sinanani	Keith	EC	4,339	Permanent	28-Jan-91
7404	5	Singh	Iaikeran	EC	4,339	Permanent	28-Jan-91
7405	5	Valentine	Elizabeth	EC	4,339	Permanent	28-Jan-91
7369	5	Cyrus	Ian	EC	4,458	Permanent	24-Jul-89
7381	5	Fernandez	Linton	EC	4,458	Permanent	24-Jul-89
7372	5	Guevara	Carol	EC	4,458	Permanent	24-Jul-89
7361	5	James	Wayne	EC	4,458	Permanent	24-Jul-89
7375	5	Monroe	Collin	EC	4,458	Permanent	24-Jul-89
7383	5	Nanan	Stephen	EC	4,458	Permanent	24-Jul-89
7364	5	Ramayah	Timothy	EC	4,458	Permanent	24-Jul-89
7386	5	Thomas	Dayle	EC	4,458	Permanent	24-Jul-89
7345	5	Gale	Martin	EC	4,458	Permanent	01-Jun-88
7349	5	Henry	Emmanuel	EC	4,458	Permanent	01-Jun-88
7351	5	Laurence	Stanley	EC	4,458	Permanent	01-Jun-88
7350	5	Lutchman	Dennis	EC	4,458	Permanent	01-Jun-88
7347	5	Phillip	Selwyn	EC	4,458	Permanent	01-Jun-88
7344	5	Salina	Bryan	EC	4,458	Permanent	01-Jun-88

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
7335	5	Philbert	Keith	EC	4,579	Permanent	03-Jun-87
7325	5	Boodoo	Stevenson	EC	4,579	Permanent	18-May-87
7316	5	Daniell	Victor	EC	4,579	Permanent	18-May-87
7314	5	De Suze	Bernard	EC	4,579	Permanent	18-May-87
7326	5	Fortune	Christian	EC	4,579	Permanent	18-May-87
7320	5	Thomas	David	EC	4,579	Permanent	18-May-87
7312	5	Marchan	Trevor	Corporal	5,729	Permanent	10-Apr-86
7300	5	Baptiste	Eyon	EC	4,579	Permanent	24-Mar-86
7301	5	Charles	Albert	EC	4,579	Permanent	24-Mar-86
7309	5	Clement	Phillip	EC	4,579	Permanent	24-Mar-86
7296	5	Craig	Richard	Corporal (ag.)	4,579	Permanent	24-Mar-86
7295	5	Marlowe	Visham	EC	4,579	Permanent	24-Mar-86
7298	5	Granado	Anthony	EC	4,579	Permanent	09-Sep-85
7286	5	Audain	Aldwyn	EC	4,579	Permanent	29-Jul-85
7277	5	Braithwaite	Anthony	EC	4,579	Permanent	29-Jul-85
7278	5	Christopher	Mathew	Corporal (ag.)	4,579	Permanent	29-Jul-85
7280	5	Coa	Saverian	EC	4,579	Permanent	29-Jul-85
7283	5	Dardaine	Andrew	EC	4,579	Permanent	29-Jul-85
7279	5	De Suze	Ian	EC	4,579	Permanent	29-Jul-85

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
7284	5	Lewis	Ricardo	Corporal	5,729	Permanent	29-Jul-85
7288	5	Gaskin	Kenrick	EC	4,579	Permanent	27-Jul-85
1247	5	Griffith-Hamilton	Miriam	Secretary 11	4,330	Permanent	19-Nov-84
7270	5	Alfred	Earl	Sargeant	6,086	Permanent	09-Nov-84
7250	5	Kallian	Stanley	EC	4,579	Permanent	05-Nov-84
7237	5	Charles	Keith	EC	4,579	Permanent	04-Aug-83
7224	5	Smith	Ulidith	EC	4,579	Permanent	10-Jan-83
7188	5	Providence	Earl	Corporal	5,729	Permanent	09-Dec-82
7171	5	Williams	Wayne	Corporal (ag.)	4,579	Permanent	10-Aug-82
7006	5	Reyes	Leo	Ins. Ops. Security	6,650	Permanent	01-Jul-82
7156	5	Narinesingh	Sorooj	Corporal	5,729	Permanent	24-May-82
7146	5	Bernard	Judy	EC	4,579	Permanent	26-Apr-82
7073	5	Alexander	Lester	EC	4,579	Permanent	15-Apr-82
7138	5	Baker	Paisy	EC	4,579	Permanent	15-Apr-82
7079	5	Cadogan	Carolia	WEC	4,579	Permanent	15-Apr-82
7077	5	Clarke	Clarence	EC	4,579	Permanent	15-Apr-82
7141	5	Edwards Byron	Hazel	Corporal (ag.)	4,579	Permanent	15-Apr-82
7094	5	Grannum	Judy	EC	4,579	Permanent	15-Apr-82
7092	5	Griffith-Mussio	Jacqueline	EC	4,579	Permanent	15-Apr-82

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
7135	5	Hercules	Phyllis	Corporal	5,729	Permanent	15-Apr-82
7102	5	Lugo	Angela	Corporal (ag.)	4,579	Permanent	15-Apr-82
7106	5	Mercer	Iules	EC	4,579	Permanent	15-Apr-82
7112	5	Nicholas	Ann Marie	EC	4,579	Permanent	15-Apr-82
7124	5	Quash	Ruffina	Corporal	5,729	Permanent	15-Apr-82
7137	5	Quash	Kenth	Sargeant	6,226	Permanent	15-Apr-82
7118	5	Rupert	Junior	EC	4,579	Permanent	15-Apr-82
7126	5	Stewart	Fausta	Corporal (ag.)	4,579	Permanent	15-Apr-82
7127	5	Thompson	Dona	WEC	4,579	Permanent	15-Apr-82
7131	5	Yorkshire	Wayne	Sargeant	6,226	Permanent	15-Apr-82
7047	5	Abbot	Empress	Corporal	5,729	Permanent	01-Mar-82
7035	5	Bissent	Jennifer	EC	4,579	Permanent	01-Mar-82
7029	5	Games	Linda	WEC	5,729	Permanent	01-Mar-82
7041	5	Johnson	Eugenia	Corporal	5,729	Permanent	01-Mar-82
7058	5	Mykoo	Hemraj	EC	4,579	Permanent	01-Mar-82
7013	5	Walters	Ashton	Ins. Admin.	6,368	Permanent	01-Mar-82
328	5	Kandhai	Yamuna	Clerk 1	3,788	Permanent	04-Jan-82
307	5	Aundain	Paula - Angela	Clerk 11	4,714	Permanent	12-Nov-81

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

AATT EMPLOYEE INFORMATION
Piarco (Permanent)

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
1959	16	Harryram	Zita	Secretary 11	4,521	Permanent	06-Oct-03
0422	9	Joadsingh	Varma	Project Engineer	10,768	Permanent	15-Sep-03
1955	9	John	Jason	Engineering Draughtsman	5,740	Permanent	21-Jul-03
1957	7	Murray	Rion	Clerk 1	2,855	Permanent	18-Jul-03
1954	16	Corneal	Stacey	Audit Asst.	5,202	Permanent	07-Jul-03
1953	16	Rohit	Mahendra	Audit Asst.	5,202	Permanent	07-Jul-03
1950	16	Pustam	Rachael	Audit Asst.	5,202	Permanent	16-Jun-03
0417	4	Perkins	Sandra	DGM Corp. Services (Ag)	10,768	Permanent	14-Apr-03
0419	17	Frederick	Louis	DGM-Planning, Est. & Bus.	10,768	Permanent	14-Apr-03
1910	19	Andrews	Lima	Clerk 1	2,855	Permanent	24-Feb-03
1907	3	Ali	Garnett	Info. Assistant	3,659	Permanent	21-Feb-03
1906	3	Fridy	Joanna	Info. Assistant	3,659	Permanent	21-Feb-03
1908	3	Mohammed	Anneika	Info. Assistant	3,659	Permanent	21-Feb-03
1909	3	Williamson	Juliana	Info. Assistant	3,659	Permanent	21-Feb-03
1870	3	Best	Giselle	Info. Assistant	3,659	Permanent	01-Feb-03
1871	3	Foncette	Hertia	Info. Assistant	3,659	Permanent	01-Feb-03
1780	2	George	Suzanne	Tel. Operator	2,720	Permanent	01-Feb-03

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
1873	3	Smith	La Toya	Info. Assistant	3,659	Permanent	01-Feb-03
1872	3	Telesford	Sasha	Info. Assistant	3,659	Permanent	01-Feb-03
0414	16	Subryan	Robert	Internal Auditor	10,768	Permanent	01-Jan-03
0413	17	Baker	Lydia	Administrative Asst.	5,743	Permanent	08-Oct-02
0412	17	Francis	Pauline	Administrative Asst.	5,743	Permanent	01-Oct-02
0407	7	Phillip	Dane	Commercial Officer	6,914	Permanent	01-Mar-02
1856	19	Rajab	Natasha	Clerk 1	2,855	Permanent	23-Jan-02
1855	19	Shah	Randisen	Clerk 1	2,855	Permanent	17-Jan-02
1850	2	Rampersad	Vijaya	CSR	2,855	Permanent	04-Jan-02
1835	2	Anderson	Cherisse	Clerk	2,855	Permanent	02-Jan-02
1834	2	Archibald	Anesha	Clerk	2,855	Permanent	02-Jan-02
1841	4	John	Brian	Dep. Tax asst.	2,855	Permanent	02-Jan-02
1833	2	Raghnunath	Taramatie	Clerk	2,855	Permanent	02-Jan-02
1839	2	Winston	Denessa	CSR	2,855	Permanent	02-Jan-02
1845	7	Ayoung	Keston	Clerk 1	2,855	Permanent	18-Dec-01
1813	7	Mohammed	Salina	IT Asst.	2,855	Permanent	03-Dec-01
0406	16	Aleem	Qamarah	Financial Accountant	6,914	Permanent	01-Nov-01
1808	16	Ali	Sheliza	Acct. Asst. 111	4,866	Permanent	01-Nov-01
1809	16	Wallace	Carmela	Acct. Asst. 111	4,866	Permanent	01-Nov-01

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
1806	18	Mohammed	Kevin	Fac. Tech. / Sys. ops	3,694	Permanent	16-Oct-01
1805	2	Nebblett	Juliet	Tel. Operator	2,889	Permanent	09-Oct-01
1802	18	Beekham	Davinan	Facilities Technician	3,694	Permanent	01-Oct-01
1812	16	Cooseeal	Rae-Ann	Clerk 1	2,946	Permanent	01-Oct-01
1803	18	Redhead	Noland	Facilities Technician	3,694	Permanent	01-Oct-01
1771	2	Francette	Jennifer	Tel. Operator	2,720	Permanent	03-Sep-01
1705	16	Jagarnath	Shetal	Secretary 1	3,222	Permanent	01-Sep-01
1749	2	Bhola	Ann	Airport Att.	2,946	Permanent	31-May-01
1735	18	Kalloo	Charles	Facilities Technician	3,810	Permanent	22-May-01
1751	19	Badri Maharaj	Rashmi	HRO	6,914	Permanent	21-May-01
1744	19	Samal	Teemaitie	Clerk 1	2,946	Permanent	18-May-01
1733	18	Gokool	Nigel	Facilities Technician	3,810	Permanent	14-May-01
1732	18	Jadoonanan	Niram	Facilities Technician	3,810	Permanent	14-May-01
1731	18	Mahabir	Hasrath	Facilities Technician	3,810	Permanent	14-May-01
1730	18	Mongroo	David	Facilities Technician	3,810	Permanent	14-May-01
1734	18	Ramroop	Denesh	Facilities Technician	3,810	Permanent	14-May-01
1723	3	Kalyan	Alana	Info. Assistant	3,659	Permanent	02-May-01
1725	3	Manrakhan	Anjanie	Info. Assistant	3,659	Permanent	02-May-01
1726	3	Walters	Delecia	Info. Assistant	3,659	Permanent	02-May-01

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
1722	3	Wellington	Andrew	Flight Ops. Asst.	3,659	Permanent	02-May-01
1727	2	Paltoo	Julian	Airport Att. (HR)	2,946	Permanent	01-May-01
1740	20	Rampaul	Dale	Ramp Control Officer	4,635	Permanent	23-Apr-01
1741	20	Mohammed	Genista	Ramp Control Officer	4,635	Permanent	22-Apr-01
1738	20	Griffith-Lewis	Melisa	Ramp Control Officer	4,635	Permanent	21-Apr-01
1737	20	Ferdinand	Cuthbert	Ramp Control Officer	4,635	Permanent	20-Apr-01
1743	20	Eligon	Martin Anderson	Ramp Control Officer	4,635	Permanent	19-Apr-01
1715	4	Balgobin	Aaron	Dep. Tax Clerk	2,946	Permanent	21-Feb-01
1716	3	Garcia	Crystal	Info. Assistant	3,659	Permanent	21-Feb-01
1718	16	Kerry	Kerrica	Clerk 1	2,946	Permanent	21-Feb-01
1714	16	Mohammed	Amanda	Clerk 1	2,946	Permanent	21-Feb-01
1717	4	Shanklin	Sherrina	Dep. Tax Clerk	2,946	Permanent	21-Feb-01
1713	3	Assing	Trisha	Info. Assistant 1	3,659	Permanent	19-Feb-01
1711	4	Maharaj	Sunil	Dep. Tax Clerk	2,946	Permanent	23-Jan-01
1712	4	Roopchand	David	Dep. Tax Clerk	2,946	Permanent	23-Jan-01
1710	2	Sankar	Kimberley	Tel. Operator	2,889	Permanent	08-Dec-00
1706	4	Rampersad	Kris	Dep. Tax Clerk	1,473	Permanent	01-Nov-00
1620	7	Clarke	Elijah	Vault Attd.	2,929	Permanent	11-Jan-00
1536	7	Deosaran	Betty	Clerk 1	3,126	Permanent	20-Dec-99

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
3074	3	Charles	Pearlette	Dep. Tax	3,659	Permanent	23-Aug-99
1383	19	Bhimull	Jagdeesh	Messenger	3,021	Permanent	05-May-99
1603	20	Mohammed	Sheraz	Ramp Control Officer	4,806	Permanent	05-May-99
1697	16	Moonsammy	Kaymatee	Acct. Asst. 111	4,866	Permanent	19-Apr-99
1696	4	Parey	Roma	Dep. Tax Clerk	3,126	Permanent	07-Mar-99
1695	19	Mahase	Rajdaye C.	Maid / Tel. Operator	2,576	Permanent	22-Feb-99
1619	19	Isaac	Don	Messenger	2,868	Permanent	13-Jan-99
1689	16	Ramdehalsingh	Anasha	Dep. Tax Asst.	3,219	Permanent	16-Nov-98
1687	16	Ramsamooj	Melissa	Dep. Tax Asst.	3,219	Permanent	01-Nov-98
1673	16	Dhanessar	Artie	Clerk 1	3,219	Permanent	20-Oct-98
1671	4	Chirkut	Kamla	Dep. Tax asst.	3,219	Permanent	02-Oct-98
1530	3	Ramtahal	Janine	Info. Assistant	3,659	Permanent	11-Sep-98
1668	16	Subrath	Denise	Acct. Asst. 1	3,219	Permanent	25-Aug-98
1666	2	Abdool	Kerry Ann	Clerk 1	3,219	Permanent	24-Aug-98
1669	18	Jugmohan	Dilip	Facilities Technician	3,694	Permanent	14-Aug-98
1665	7	Garcia	Nigel	IT Supervisor	5,290	Permanent	10-Aug-98
1661	19	Sammy	Jerome	Driver	3,456	Permanent	05-Aug-98
1662	3	Garcia-Beaumont	Marsha	Info. Assistant	3,659	Permanent	04-Aug-98
1659	18	Bernard	Garth	Maintenance Asst.	3,219	Permanent	03-Aug-98

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
1654	18	Narine	Sunil	Maintenance Asst.	3,219	Permanent	03-Aug-98
1660	18	Sooknanan	Omesh	Maintenance Asst.	3,219	Permanent	03-Aug-98
1644	18	Joseph	Julien	Facilities Technician	3,932	Permanent	27-Jul-98
1649	18	Palmer	Brent	Facilities Technician	3,932	Permanent	27-Jul-98
1643	18	Roy	Allen	Supervisor	3,932	Permanent	27-Jul-98
1642	18	Sankaran	Krishna	Facilities Technician	3,932	Permanent	27-Jul-98
0395	19	Sahadeo	Dave	IRO 11	7,282	Permanent	01-Apr-98
1523	20	Boodoo	Dexter	Ramp Control Officer	4,806	Permanent	01-Apr-98
1511	20	Demas	Dexter	DM	6,910	Permanent	16-Dec-96
1524	3	St.John	Hazel	Info. Assistant	3,659	Permanent	12-Dec-95
1518	4	Maharaj	Kallawaitie	Acct. Asst. III	4,047	Permanent	26-Jul-95
1513	16	Lal	Sharda	Dep. Tax Asst.	3,312	Permanent	28-Nov-94
1508	17	Khadan	Rajkumarie	Administrative Asst.	5,743	Permanent	01-Jul-93
7452	7	Clarke	Andre Adrian	Health & Safety Off.	4,309	Permanent	27-Jul-92
1466	16	Hansraj	Seeta	Clerk 1	3,607	Permanent	13-Jul-92
1464	18	Marraj	Mahadeo	Facilities Technician	3,932	Permanent	01-Jun-92
7431	3	Derrick	Sean	Info. Assistant	4,047	Permanent	11-Nov-91
1442	19	Chance-Olton	Lydia	Secretary 11	4,521	Permanent	07-Oct-91
7425	20	Maharaj	Rajesh	DM (ag.)	4,635	Permanent	12-Aug-91

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
7409	16	Smith-Frank	Paula	Acct. Asst. 11	4,457	Permanent	09-Jun-91
1401	16	Persad	Marje	Acct. Asst. 111	5,052	Permanent	01-Nov-90
0380	20	Bruce	Oswald	Sup. Airport Ops (ag.)	7,090	Permanent	01-Oct-90
1376	2	Corbin	Veronica	Tel. Operator	3,697	Permanent	20-Jul-90
1375	2	Pierre	Joan	Airport Att.	3,697	Permanent	19-Dec-89
7367	20	Gobin	Richard	Ramp Control Officer	4,806	Permanent	24-Jul-89
7374	3	Victor	Kenneth	Info. Assistant	4,586	Permanent	10-Jul-89
1357	16	Mcdonald	Mava	Acct. Asst. 111	5,052	Permanent	19-Dec-88
1354	16	Abdool	Vidya	Acct. Asst. 111	5,052	Permanent	01-Dec-88
1335	2	Marshall Andrew	Rachael	Tel. Operator	3,607	Permanent	23-Nov-87
1320	2	Pope	Lincoln	Airport Att. 1	3,788	Permanent	14-Jul-87
1306	2	George	Elizabeth	Airport Att.	3,697	Permanent	26-Feb-87
2141	19	Singh	Rudranath	Driver	4,178	Permanent	21-Feb-87
1286	2	Prince	Agnes	Airport Att.	3,788	Permanent	17-Jul-86
1280	3	Modeste	Genevieve	Info. Assistant	4,714	Permanent	18-Jun-86
1272	16	Baksh	Sandra	Acct Asst. 111	5,052	Permanent	11-Nov-85
1251	20	Ranjattan	Clive	DM	7,090	Permanent	16-Jan-85
1248	17	Richards	Sandra	Administrative Asst.	5,895	Permanent	03-Dec-84
7271	20	Rattan	Ronald	Supervisor Ramp Cont.	5,528	Permanent	09-Nov-84

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
1107	2	Morang	Gloria	Airport Att.	3,788	Permanent	18-May-84
7244	2	Walker	Peter	Airport Att.	4,421	Permanent	02-May-84
1226	3	Charles	Roger	Clerk 11	4,330	Permanent	17-Feb-84
1229	20	Dilraj-Gopaul	Sandra	Ramp Control Officer	4,806	Permanent	17-Feb-84
1233	3	Jarvis-Lewis	Rosanna	Clerk 11	4,330	Permanent	17-Feb-84
1230	20	Mohan	Susanne	Ramp Control Officer	4,806	Permanent	17-Feb-84
0369	20	Armstrong-Blades	Lynn	Secretary 11	4,457	Permanent	14-Nov-83
0371	3	Francette Williams	Wendy	Supervisor - Info.	5,528	Permanent	14-Nov-83
1208	20	Bernard	Joan	Clerk / Typist	3,604	Permanent	02-Aug-83
1175	2	Mahase	Heeraram	Attendant II	4,878	Permanent	01-Apr-83
0344	19	Tewarie Baboolal	Jeanette	Plan Administrator	4,879	Permanent	19-Jan-83
0337	20	Robinson	Yvette	Clerk / Typist	3,604	Permanent	11-Jan-83
1115	20	Pierre	Lionel	DGM Operations	10,768	Permanent	01-Dec-82
3511	20	Maingot	Allenton	DM	7,090	Permanent	01-Apr-82
1116	20	D'oliveria	Claude	DM	7,090	Permanent	22-Mar-82
3508	20	Jagai	Dhanraj	DM	7,090	Permanent	22-Mar-82
0332	20	Mayers	Jeanette	DM	6,910	Permanent	15-Mar-82
2040	19	Sankar	Bholan	Driver	4,416	Permanent	25-Jan-82
1103	2	Jules	Dionne	Attendant II	4,544	Permanent	16-Dec-81

Written Answer to Question

Friday, January 09, 2004

PR #	Dept.	Surname	First Name	Position	Salary	Status	D.O.E
1030	2	Ramcharan	Neeranjan	Airport Att. 1 (ag.)	3,788	Permanent	21-Apr-81
1027	2	Cassie	Chamraj	Facilities Att. II (ag.)	3,788	Permanent	20-Feb-81
1003	2	Maughn	Laurel	Airport Att. 1	3,788	Permanent	07-Feb-81
1007	2	Charles	Diane	Airport Att.	4,544	Permanent	21-Aug-79
1078	2	Williams	Joanne	Airport Att.	3,788	Permanent	21-Aug-79
1077	2	Williams-Small	Ann	Airport Att.	3,788	Permanent	21-Aug-79
0305	19	Jagai	Suzette	Clerk 11	4,714	Permanent	29-Jan-79
0313	16	Ramdass	Shanti	Accountant 1	6,037	Permanent	15-Jan-79
0322	9	Antoine	Carlyle	Driver	4,416	Permanent	15-Dec-78
1044	19	Sahadeo	Mohanlal	Supervisor Mail Rm.	5,636	Permanent	20-Nov-78
0329	17	Ramadeen	Rosalind Chinnia	General Manager (A.G)	10,768	Permanent	07-Nov-78
		Ellen	Lewis Adamson	Manager Public Relations			