

*Leave of Absence**Tuesday, July 08, 2003***SENATE***Tuesday, July 08, 2003*

The Senate met at 1.30 p.m.

PRAYERS[MR. VICE-PRESIDENT *in the Chair*]**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Mr. Vice-President: Hon. Senators, I wish to advise that Sen. The Hon. Dr. Linda Baboolal, President of the Senate, will be absent from the Senate for the period July 04, 2003 to July 15, 2003. During that period, the Vice-President will preside over sittings of the Senate and Mrs. Joan Hackshaw-Marslin will act temporarily for the President.

Hon. Senators, I have granted leave of absence to Sen. The Hon. Martin Joseph from today's sitting of the Senate.

**JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE
(APPOINTMENT TO)**

Mr. Vice-President: Hon. Senators, I have received the following correspondence from the hon. Speaker of the House, Hon. Barendra Sinanan:

“Senator Rawle Titus
Vice-President of the Senate
Parliament
Red House.
Dear Mr. Vice-President,

Resolution–Joint Select Committee

Please be informed that at a sitting held on Friday July 04, 2003, the House agreed to the following Resolution which was moved by the Honourable Minister of Health:—

‘BE IT RESOLVED that this House appoint the following members to serve with an equal number from the Senate on the Joint Select Committee established to consider and report on the Bill entitled the Occupational Safety and Health Bill, 2003:—

Mr. Lawrence Achong

Mr. Colm Imbert

Joint Select Committee
[MR. VICE-PRESIDENT]

Tuesday, July 08, 2003

Mr. Hedwige Bereaux

Mr. Harry Partap

Mr. Subhas Panday.'

Accordingly, I respectfully request that you cause this matter to be placed before the Senate at the earliest convenience.

Respectfully,

Mr. Barendra Sinanan, MP."

The Minister of Community Development and Gender Affairs (Sen. The Hon. Joan Yuille-Williams): Mr. Vice-President, I wish to advise that I will furnish you with the names of the Government appointees to that committee a little later in today's proceedings.

SENATOR'S APPOINTMENT

Mr. Vice-President: Hon. Senators, we need to appoint a new Acting Senator today but the instruments are not here. I seek your leave to do that at a later stage in the proceedings.

PHARMACY BOARD (AMDT.) BILL

A Bill to amend the Pharmacy Board Act, Chap 29:52, brought from the House of Representatives [*The Minister of Health*]; read the first time.

PAPERS LAID

1. Reports of the San Juan/Laventille Regional Corporation for the financial years 1999 to 2000, 2000 to 2001 and 2001 to 2002. [*The Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Sen. The Hon. Conrad Enill)*]
2. Reports of the Tunapuna/Piarco Regional Corporation for the financial years October 01, 2000 to September 30, 2001 and October 01, 2001 to September 30, 2002. [*Sen. The Hon. C. Enill*]
3. Report of the Point Fortin Corporation for the financial year October 2001 to September 2002. [*Sen. The Hon. C. Enill*]
4. Report of the Auditor General of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago on the financial statements of the Princes Town Regional Corporation for the year ended December 31, 1996. [*Sen. The Hon. C. Enill*]
5. Report of the Auditor General of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago on the financial statements of the Princes Town Regional Corporation for the year ended December 31, 1997. [*Sen. The Hon. C. Enill*]

6. Report of the Auditor General of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago on the financial statements of the Naparima Bowl Board for the year ended September 30, 2000. [*Sen. The Hon. C. Enill*]
7. Annual Administrative Report – 2000/2001 of the Chaguanas Borough Corporation. [*Sen. The Hon. C. Enill*]
8. Annual Administrative Report 2001/2002 of the Chaguanas Borough Corporation. [*Sen. The Hon. C. Enill*]
9. Annual Administrative Report of the Siparia Regional Corporation for the year October 1999 to September 2000. [*Sen. The Hon. C. Enill*]
10. Annual Administrative Report of the Siparia Regional Corporation for the year October 2000 to September 2001. [*Sen. The Hon. C. Enill*]
11. Annual audited financial statements of Petroleum Company of Trinidad and Tobago Limited for the financial year ended September 30, 2002. [*Sen. The Hon. C. Enill*]
12. Arima Borough Corporation Annual Reports 2000. [*Sen. The Hon. C. Enill*]
13. Third Annual Report of the Police Complaints Authority for the period May 01, 1998 to April 30, 1999. [*The Minister of National Security and Rehabilitation (Sen. The Hon. Howard Chin Lee)*]
14. Fourth Annual Report of the Police Complaints Authority for the period May 01, 1999 to April 30, 2000. [*Sen. The Hon. H. Chin Lee*]
15. Fifth Annual Report of the Police Complaints Authority for the period May 01, 2000 to April 30, 2001. [*Sen. The Hon. H. Chin Lee*]
16. Sixth Annual Report of the Police Complaints Authority for the period May 01, 2001 to April 30, 2002. [*Sen. The Hon. H. Chin Lee*]
17. Annual Report of the Arima Borough Corporation for the year ended 2000. [*Sen. The Hon. C. Enill*]
18. Report of the Port of Spain Corporation for the financial year 2002. [*Sen. The Hon. C. Enill*]
19. Twenty-fifth Annual Report of the Ombudsman of Trinidad and Tobago for the period January 01, 2002 to December 31, 2002. [*The Minister of Community Development and Gender Affairs (Sen. The Hon. Joan Yuille-Williams)*]

20. The Extradition Commonwealth and Foreign Territories (Extraditable Offences) Order, 2003. [*The Attorney General (Sen. The Hon. Glenda Morean)*]
21. Report on Allegations of Impropriety Publicly Directed at Water and Sewerage Authority of Trinidad and Tobago Regarding the “Out of Court” Settlement with Waterfarms Trinidad Limited. [*Sen. The Hon. G. Morean*]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

**Water and Sewerage Authority
(Overpayments)**

34. Sen. Wade Mark asked the hon. Minister of Public Utilities and the Environment:

Could the Minister indicate to this House:

- (i) What steps/measures are being taken, if any, to recover the sums of money which were overpaid to the Chief Executive Officer, General Managers and Deputy General Managers of WASA between the period March 2002 to January 2003?
- (ii) Whether the Minister intends to take any action against the Board of Commissioners of WASA for illegally and unilaterally increasing the salaries, allowances and other perquisites to the Chief Executive Officer, several Managers and Deputy General Managers of WASA during the period March 2002 to January 2003?

The Minister of Public Utilities and the Environment (Sen. The Hon. Rennie Dumas): Mr. Vice-President, question 34 was answered on the last day. We had a promise to ensure that the opinion was given by the Attorney General. That has happened but the Cabinet has not yet considered that opinion. We hope that the hon. Senator would allow us another week to answer that question.

Thank you.

Sen. Mark: I did not quite hear you Senator. Could you clarify it again? One more week for what?

Sen. The Hon. R. Dumas: I think you would remember on the last occasion that the question was asked, my answer pointed out that we had requested a legal opinion.

Sen. Mark: And you have received that. You tabled it in Parliament?

Sen. The Hon. R. Dumas: There is no such requirement, Mr. Vice-President.

Sen. Mark: Mr. Vice-President, this thing is becoming a circus. I do not understand what the hon. Minister is trying to tell us here. We have really extended our patience to the limit with the Minister of Public Utilities and the Environment and he is now saying that the opinion is in. The opinion is in, but it has to go to the Cabinet for some approval? I do not understand.

Sen. The Hon. R. Dumas: Mr. Vice-President, the Senator is pushing against an open door. We indicated when he asked the first time that we are quite willing to answer his question, but what he was asking inferred some things that we did not share with him, and the clarification that he sought required us to consider even before we bring it to anybody else, a legal opinion on the matters. That legal opinion was sought and that legal opinion would therefore guide every other action.

The Attorney General assured him that she had received the request but that given staffing and other issues she would give an opinion in three weeks. Today happens to be the day of exactly three weeks post that. If we received the opinion in three weeks, we could not consider it and take any appropriate action or even inform ourselves what it is, and we are saying we are in that position. From here on in, we will respond to the Senator if he asks another question, but certainly, we had answered the question.

Sen. Mark: Mr. Vice-President, I think that for instance, we are really engaging in a kind of gamesmanship here today. I have a specific question on the Order Paper which was approved. This question has not been answered. What was told to us here is that in order to arrive at the answer to these questions, the Attorney General promised an opinion based on a request. Now we are being told that the opinion has been submitted and he tells us that the question has been answered. Now, I mean to say, that is nonsense and he is trying to mislead this Parliament.

Mr. Vice-President: Hon. Senators, I would allow Sen. Dumas to offer any other further explanation and I would have to make a ruling on this.

Sen. The Hon. R. Dumas: Mr. Vice-President, a question was asked. An answer was provided. The Senator was not satisfied. If we look at the *Hansard* record, the question was asked of myself. I gave an answer. The absence or presence of satisfaction by the goodly Senator is one for himself. We answered the question.

Sen. Mark: Mr. Vice-President, I want to indicate to you and for the record of this Parliament that the hon. Minister of Public Utilities and the Environment is misleading this Parliament. You have the question before you, Sir. You have been here. The Minister has not answered any part of the two-part question that I have put to him. So, he is misleading the Parliament here by saying that he has answered the question. It is dishonest to come and tell this Parliament that he has answered the question when he knows he has not answered the question! Is there a cover up, Mr. Vice-President? What is going on here?

Mr. Vice-President, if he wanted the question to be deferred for a week so that the opinion is submitted by the Attorney General to the Cabinet and for the Cabinet to take some action, I could understand an explanation to that effect, because what the public wants to know is what steps are being taken to recover these moneys. You have not told us that! You come with some stupe—

Sen. Yuille-Williams: Oh, no. Come on. Come on.

Sen. Mark: Look, I am upset because I believe he is misleading the Parliament and he is not providing answers! Then he comes here and says that he has provided answers. He has not done it!

Sen. Morean: Mr. Vice-President, let me just clear the air and let the tempers cool and people retain their rationality, if they have rationality. Now, on the last occasion I indicated that an opinion was sought from the Attorney General on this matter. This opinion was sought through the intervention of Cabinet, so that my response is to the Cabinet.

This is a matter that involves policy so that such an opinion must go to the Cabinet and a decision taken before the hon. Minister can give an answer as to policy that has been asked here. This is the position, that the matter is now before the Cabinet. The last time I had undertaken that the opinion would have been forthcoming in about three weeks and the opinion was, in fact, forthcoming. What the Minister has really asked for is deferment of any further answer to the question. He is saying that he has answered but any further answer to the question be deferred for a period of one week. It is as simple as that.

Sen. R. Montano: Mr. Vice-President, with the greatest of respect—

Sen. Morean: Well let me sit down first, “nuh”. [*Laughter*]

Mr. Vice-President: Hon. Senators, I would rule that this question be deferred for a period of a week for any further answer, because the arguments could go on and on and we will get to the end of question time before we finish the arguments.

One week and any further answer to the question will be provided by the Minister.

Sen. R. Montano: Mr. Vice-President, could I just—

Mr. Vice-President: Question 62, Sen. Mark.

**National Minimum Wage
(Increase of)**

62. Sen. Wade Mark asked the hon. Minister of Labour and Small and Micro Enterprise Development:

- A. Could the Minister state whether the Government has any intention to further increase the level of the national minimum wage?
- B. Could the Minister indicate what steps are being taken to deal with the terms and conditions of employment of specialized groups of workers (such as private security guards as well as non-unionized workers) employed in the energy and energy-related industries?

The Minister of Community Development and Gender Affairs (Sen. The Hon. Joan Yuille-Williams): Mr. Vice-President, I rise to ask the hon. Senator in the absence of the Minister of Labour and Small and Micro Enterprise Development if this question could be deferred for one week please?

Sen. Mark: Mr. Vice-President, if I may, I do not know if the hon. Minister of Labour and Small and Micro Enterprise Development was informed, because the last time I asked the question, I was informed by another Minister that he was not informed. I find it is disrespectful to this Parliament and to you as the Vice-President of this Chamber, if you put a question, the Minister does not appear and the Ministers on the Government Benches look around to see if the Minister is here. They may not have even informed the Minister and then we are being told to defer.

The Government does not have its act together and we are being embarrassed in this Parliament every week because of the incompetence. Just to inform the Minister! They want another week and they know that tomorrow is the last sitting of the Parliament until we come back out in August or September for the budget debate, so they are misleading you by telling you for one week. I am not in support of deferring any question to one week. Tomorrow we are meeting in Parliament. I defer it to tomorrow!

Mr. Vice-President: Sen. Mark, I would like to accede to your request for a one-day deferment, but I cannot agree to it simply because of the fact that you

yourself argued that the Minister may not have been informed. In the absence of the Minister and in the absence of any further information, I am not sure what might have happened.

Sen. R. Montano: Well, division!

Mr. Vice-President: Therefore, I would defer the matter for the next sitting after tomorrow.

Sen. R. Montano: Division!

Sen. Mark: Mr. Vice-President, if I may, I do not know if I have been misled, but I have been informed reliably that tomorrow will be the last sitting of the Parliament and we go into recess until the Government reconvenes the Parliament for the budget debate which is going to be some time in September, so what you are asking us to defer is until some time in September. I am saying to you, if they want the question to be deferred, as Vice-President, you have to put it to the Senate and the Senate has to agree with that deferment or not. I am suggesting to you if instead of deferring it for one week knowing full well that we are coming back in September, whether the Government would like to consider Wednesday instead of next week.

Mr. Vice-President: Hon. Senators, the information about the recess of Parliament is some information that did not reach me as yet.

Question put.

The Senate divided: Ayes 12 Noes 14

AYES

Montano, Hon. D.

Yuille-Williams, Hon. J.

Morean, Hon. G.

Enill, Hon. C.

Gift, Hon. K.

Manning, Hon. H.

Chin Lee, Hon. H.

Dumas, Hon. R.

Abdul-Hamid, Hon. M.

Kangaloo, Hon. C.

Sahadeo, Hon. C.

Ramroop, S.

NOES

Mark, W.

Baksh, S.

Kernahan, Dr. J.

Seepersad-Bachan, Mrs. C.

Smith, A.

Montano, R.

McKenzie, Dr. E.

Ramchand, Prof. K.

Deosaran, Prof. R.

King, Mrs. M.

Quamina, Dr. D.

Thomas, Amb. C.

Anmolsingh-Mahabir, Mrs. P.

Khan, Bro. N.

Question negatived.

Mr. Vice-President: Hon. Senators, question No. 62 will therefore have to be answered tomorrow.

**Secondary Entrance Assessment
(Sufficient School Places)**

65. Sen. Wade Mark asked the hon. Minister of Education:

- A. Could the hon. Minister indicate to this House whether there would be sufficient school places at the secondary school level for all students writing the Secondary Entrance Assessment (SEA) held in April 2003?
- B. If the answer to this question is in the affirmative, could the Minister provide this Senate with the necessary details?

The Minister of Education (Sen. The Hon. Hazel Manning): Thank you very much, Mr. Vice-President. In respect of Part A of question 65, Government wishes to advise that not only are there sufficient places for all students who wrote the Secondary Entrance Assessment Examination held in April 2003, but given the availability of spaces in both public and private schools at the secondary level, there now exists an excess of 1,243 school places nationally.

The necessary details of placement for students are as follows:

Education District—Caroni:

The three-year Junior Secondary Schools: 717 male; 635 female. A total of 1,352 students went to three-year Junior Secondary Schools.

The number going to five and seven-year schools: 636 male, 689 female; 1,325 total.

The number going to Servol Junior Life Centres: 18 male, 17 female; a total of 35.

The number going to Private Secondary Schools: 17 male, 18 female; a total of 35.

The total number in the education district of Caroni: 1,388 male, 1,359 female; a total of 2,747 students.

Northeastern Education District:

Three-year Junior Secondary entrants: 212 male, 213 female; a total of 425 students.

To the five and seven-year schools: 335 male, 311 female; a total of 646.

To the Servol Junior Life Centres: 17 male, 18 female; a total of 35.

To the Private Secondary Schools: 45 male, 44 female; a total of 89.

The total for the Northeastern Education District is 609 male, 586 female; a total of 1,195 students

Education District, Port of Spain and environs:

Three-year Junior Secondary Schools: 665 male, 563 female; a total of 1,228.

Five and seven-year schools: 1,318 male, 1,095 female; a total of 2,413.

Servol Junior Life Centres: 71 male, 25 female; a total of 96.

Private Secondary Schools: 14 male, 185 female; a total of 199.

The total for Port of Spain and environs is 2,068 male, 1,868 female; a total of 3,936.

Education District of St. George East:

Three-year Junior Secondary Schools: 1,191 male, 1,204 female; a total of 2,395.

Five and seven-year schools: 864 male, 1,133 female; a total of 1,997.

Servol Junior Life Centres: 17 male, 18 female; total, 35.

Private Secondary Schools: 380 male, 419 female; 799 total.

The total number going to St. George East Education District, 2,452 male, 2,774 female; 5,226 in total.

St. Patrick Education District:

The three-year Junior Secondary Schools: 575 male, 433 female; 1,008 in all.

Five and seven-year schools: 444 male, 621 female; 1,065 in all.

There are no Servol Life Centres or Private Secondary Schools in that area which received children.

The total figure for St. Patrick Education District is 1,019 male, 1,054 female; a total of 2,073.

Southeastern Education District:

Three-year Junior Secondary Schools: 312 male, 296 female; 608 total.

Five and seven-year schools: 424 male, 422 female; a total of 846.

Prevocational schools: 31 male, 6 female; 37 total.

The total number of children in the Southeastern Education District, 767 male, 724 female; 1,491 total.

Education District—Victoria:

Three-year Junior Secondary Schools: 437 male, 419 female; a total of 856.

Five and seven-year schools: 1,053 male, 1,031 female; 2,084 students total.

Servol Junior Life Centres: 21 male, 14 female; 35 total.

Private Secondary Schools: 57 male, 58 female; 115 total.

The total number of children in Victoria Education District: 1,568 male, 1,522 female; 3,090 total.

In Tobago there are only five and seven-year schools: 442 male, 469 female; a total of 911.

The national total of going to three-year and Junior Secondary Schools: 4,109 male, 3,763 female; total, 7,872.

To five and seven-year schools: 5,516 male, 5,771 female; a total of 11,287.

To Servol Junior Life Centres: 144 male, 92 female; 236 total.

Prevocational: 31 male, 6 female; 37 total.

Private Secondary Schools: 513 male, 724 female; 1,237 total.

National total, 10,313 male, 10,356 female; a total of 20,669.

The summary sheet for district, again by number:

Caroni: 1,388 male intake, 1,359 female intake; a total of 2,747.

Northeastern: 609 male, 586 female; 1,195.

Port of Spain and environs: 2,068 male, 1,868 female; a total of 3,936.

St. George East: 2,452 male, 2,774 female; a total of 5,225.

St. Patrick: 1,019 male, 1,054 female; a total of 2,073.

Southeastern: 767 male, 724 female; 1,491 total.

Victoria: 1,568 male, 1,522 female; a total of 3,090

Tobago: 442 male, 469 female; a total of 911.

The total number of actual intake by district and gender: 10,313 male, 10,356 female; 20,669 total.

The actual intake by district and gender:

The Caroni district:

Vishnu Hindu Boys College: 70 male, 0 female; total of 70.

Cunupia Government High School: 35 male, 35 female; 70 total.

Couva Secondary School: 71 male, 70 female; 141 total.

ASJA Boys College, Charlieville: 177 male, 0 female; 177 total.

ASJA Girls College, Charleville: 0 male, 175 female; 175 total.
Edinburgh Educational Institute: 17 male, 18 female; 35 total.
Holy Faith Convent, Couva: 0 male, 108 female; 108 total
Montserrat Preysal High School: 149 male, 145 female; 294 total.
Presentation College, Chaguanas: 83 male, 0 female, 83 total.
Waterloo Government High School: 34 male, 33 female; 67 total.
Chaguanas Junior Secondary School: 271 male, 274 female; 545 total.
Carapichaima Junior Secondary School: 243 male, 151 female; 394 total.
Couva Junior Secondary School: 203 male, 210 female; 413 total.
Couva Junior Life Centre: 18 male, 17 female; 35 total.
Saraswatee Girls Hindu College: 0 male, 105 female; 105 total.
Miracle Ministries Pentecostal High School: 17 male, 18 female; 35 total.
The total for Caroni: 1,388 male, 1,359 female; a total of 2,747.
District two, Northeastern District:
Bates Memorial High: 30 male, 30 female; a total of 60.
Coryal Government High School: 17 male, 13 female; a total of 30.
Manzanilla Government High School: 30 male, 31 female; a total of 61.
Malabar Composite School: 15 male, 15 female; a total of 30.
Matura Government High School: 30 male, 14 female; a total of 44.
Sangre Grande Business School: 15 male, 14 female; a total of 29.
Northeastern College, Sangre Grande: 74 male, 74 female; a total of 148.
Valencia Government High School: 15 male, 15 female; a total of 30.
Guaico Valencia North Government Secondary School: 51 male, 50 female, a total of 101.
Sangre Grande Junior Secondary School: 212 male, 213 female; a total of 435.
Toco Composite: 44 male, 39 female, a total of 83.
Matelot Community College: 7 male, 8 female; a total of 15.

Sangre Grande Junior Life Centre: 17 male, 18 female; a total of 35.

SWAHA College School: 52 male, 52 female; a total of 104.

So the total intake for Northeastern Education District: 609 male, 586 female; a total of 1,195.

The Port of Spain district:

Abiadama Centre for Lifelong Learning: 14 male, 15 female; a total of 29.

St. Francois Girls College: 0 male, 103 female; 103 total.

Bishop Anstey High School: 0 male, 108 female; 108 total.

Bishop's Centenary School: no male, 50 female; 50 total

Diego Martin Secondary School: 52 male, 54 female; 106 total.

Corpus Christi College: 0 male, 60 female; 60 total.

Fatima College: 143 male, no female; 143 total.

Holy Name Convent: 0 male, 108 female; 108 total.

Queen's Royal College: 107 male, 0 female; 107 total.

St. Anthony's College: 105 male, 0 female; 105 total.

St. Martin's Girls High School: 0 male, 60 female; 60 total.

St. James Secondary: 52 male, 52 female; 104 total.

St. Joseph's Convent, Port of Spain: 0 male, 123 female; 123 total.

St. Mary's College: 180 male, 0 female; 180 total.

Southeast Port of Spain Government Secondary: 55 male, 54 female; 109 total.

Tranquility Government Secondary: 120 male, 123 female; 243 total.

Trinity College, Maraval: 70 male, 0 female; 70 total.

Woodbrook Government Secondary: 55 male, 54 female; 109 total.

Russell Latapy High School: 69 male, 18 female; 87 total.

Belmont Boys Secondary School: 120 male, 0 female; 120 total.

Providence Secondary School: 0 male, 105 female; 105 total.

Belmont Junior Secondary School: 216 male, 173 female; 389 total.

Diego Martin Junior Secondary School: 247 male, 210 female; 457 total.

Morvant/Laventille Secondary: 100 male, 101 female; 201 total.

Mucurapo Junior Secondary School: 202 male, 180 female; 382 total.

Success Laventille Composite: 90 male, 92 female; 182 total.

Beetham Junior Life Centre: 30 male, 6 female; 36 total.

Mr. Vice-President: Hon. Minister, I must enquire as to whether you are near the end, because we have passed the end of question time.

Sen. The Hon. H. Manning: Mr. Vice-President, I have about six more pages to go. I have been asked to give the necessary details and these are the necessary details. [*Laughter*] [*Desk thumping*]

Mr. Vice-President: I would like to ask you to furnish those details in writing please?

Sen. The Hon. H. Manning: Thank you very much, Mr. Vice-President.

Vide end of sitting for written part of answer.

The following questions stood on the Order Paper:

**Kidnappings
(Number of)**

- 80.** A. Could the hon. Minister of National Security and Rehabilitation inform this Senate of the number of kidnappings reported in Trinidad and Tobago on an annual basis from 1990 to 2001?
- B. Could the Minister further inform this Senate of the number of kidnappings which occurred on a monthly basis from January, 2002 to March, 2003? [*Sen. S. Baksh*]

**CEPEP
(Works Carried Out)**

- 84.** Could the hon. Minister of Public Utilities and the Environment kindly provide this House with details of the work carried out on the CEPEP projects during the period October 2002 to April 30, 2003? [*Sen. A. Smith*]

**National Petroleum Marketing Company
(Ex-employees' Engagement)**

- 85.** A. Could the hon. Minister of Energy and Energy Industries indicate if there are any ex-employees of the National Petroleum Marketing Company (NPMC) or any of its subsidiaries who have been engaged as consultants with the company from January 2002 to present?
- B. If the answer to (A) is in the affirmative, could the Minister indicate which of the said ex-employees/consultants (if any) were ever terminated by NPMC or its subsidiaries and the reasons for such terminations?
- C. If the answer to (A) above is in the affirmative would the Minister provide details of the contract between NPMC or any of its subsidiaries with the said consultants inclusive of the scope, cost and duration? [*Sen. C. Seepersad-Bachan*]

**National Gas Company
(Contracts Awarded)**

- 86.** A. Would the hon. Minister of Energy and Energy Industries indicate to this honourable Senate how many contracts the National Gas Company (NGC) awarded to the firm KENESJAY from January 2002 to present?
- B. Would the Minister state:
- (i) Who are the principals of KENESJAY?
- (ii) Whether any of the contracts identified in (A) were awarded based on open and public tendering?
- C. If the answer to (A) is in the affirmative would the Minister state the name and value of each of these contracts inclusive of any incidental costs to be borne by the NGC? [*Sen. C. Seepersad-Bachan*]

**National Housing Authority
(Executive Director Salary Details)**

- 113.** A. Could the hon. Minister of Housing inform this House of the salary, perquisite and the various allowances currently being paid to the new Executive Director/Chairman of the National Housing Authority (NHA)?

- B. Could the Minister also inform the Senate of the salary paid to and the number of years of employment of the former Executive Director with the National Housing Authority (NHA)? [*Sen. S. Baksh*]

**Inter-American Development Bank
(Housing Loan Agreement)**

- 114.** A. Could the hon. Minister of Housing inform this House about the date on which the Government signed the Housing Loan Agreement with the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB)?
- B. Could the Minister state the amount of money received through the loan agreement?
- C. Could the Minister provide a record of the draw down of IADB funds to date?
- D. Could the Minister inform this Senate as to how much standby fees and/or interest have been incurred so far? [*Sen. S. Baksh*]

State Land Policy

- 115.** Could the hon. Minister of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources indicate to the Senate:
- (i) Whether there is a state land policy for Trinidad and Tobago?
- (ii) If the answer to (i) is in the affirmative, could the Minister state what is the current status of the state land policy?
- (iii) Could the Minister further state whether, if at all, this policy will be brought to the Senate for debate? [*Sen. Dr. J. Kernahan*]

**State Owned Agricultural Land
(Development of)**

- 116.** Could the hon. Minister of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources explain the basis on which Government envisages the development of state owned agricultural land? [*Sen. Dr. J. Kernahan*]

**Agricultural Producers
(Status of)**

- 117.** Could the hon. Minister of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources indicate the status of agricultural producers and production with respect to

the sanitary and phytosanitary requirements for agricultural exports from Trinidad and Tobago? [*Sen. Dr. J. Kernahan*]

Natural Gas Reserve

- 123.** Could the hon. Minister of Energy and Energy Industries kindly state:
- A. What is the current proven natural gas reserve in Trinidad and Tobago?
 - B. What has been the increase in the current proven natural gas reserve since January 2001 to present?
 - C. What is the projected daily consumption for natural gas for Atlantic LNG Train 4?
 - D. What is the current R/P ratio for natural gas?
 - E. What will be the projected R/P ratio assuming Atlantic LNG Train 4 comes on stream?
 - F. What is the minimum R/P which financing institutions will consider for projects? [*Sen. C. Seepersad-Bachan*]

Question time having expired, questions Nos. 80, 84, 85, 86, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117 and 123 were not dealt with.

SENATOR'S APPOINTMENT

Mr. Vice-President: Hon. Senators. I have received the following correspondence from His Excellency, the President:

“THE CONSTITUTION OF THE REPUBLIC OF TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

By His Excellency GEORGE MAXWELL RICHARDS,
President and Commander-in-Chief of the Republic
of Trinidad and Tobago.

/s/ G. Richards
President.

TO: MRS. JOAN HACKSHAW-MARSLIN

WHEREAS Senator Dr. Linda Baboolal is incapable of performing her duties as a Senator by reason of her absence from Trinidad and Tobago:

NOW, THEREFORE, I, GEORGE MAXWELL RICHARDS, President as aforesaid, acting in accordance with the advice of the Prime Minister, in

Senator's Appointment

Tuesday, July 08, 2003

exercise of the power vested in me by section 44 of the Constitution of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, do hereby appoint you, JOAN HACKSHAW-MARSLIN, to be temporarily a member of the Senate, with immediate effect and continuing during the absence from Trinidad and Tobago of the said Senator Dr. Linda Baboolal.

Given under my Hand and the Seal of the President of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago at the Office of the President, St. Ann's, this 8th day of July, 2003."

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE

Senator Joan Hackshaw-Marslin took and subscribed the Oath of Allegiance as required by law.

**JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE
(APPOINTMENT TO)**

The Minister of Community Development and Gender Affairs (Sen. The Hon. Joan Yuille-Williams): Mr. Vice-President, I beg to move the following Motion:

Be it resolved that this House appoint the following Members to serve with an equal number of the House of Representatives on a joint select committee established to consider and report on the Bill entitled the Occupational Health and Safety Bill, 2003.

I will give you the names of the Members of the Senate:

Sen. The Hon. Rennie Dumas
Sen. The Hon. Christine Sahadeo
Sen. The Hon. Hazel Manning
Sen. Wade Mark
Sen. Dr. Eastlyn McKenzie

Question put and agreed to.

ARRANGEMENT OF BUSINESS

The Minister of Community Development and Gender Affairs (Sen. The Hon. Joan Yuille-Williams): Mr. Vice-President, I seek leave of the Senate to deal with Private Business instead of Government Business.

Question put and agreed to.

**TELEVISIONING AND BROADCASTING OF DEBATES
(JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE)**

Sen. Prof. Ramesh Deosaran: Mr. Vice-President, I wish to move the Motion which stands in my name and states as follows:

Whereas a healthy democracy depends on a well informed citizenry;

Whereas citizens are entitled to know how Members of Parliament represent them in Parliament;

Whereas there is a need for citizens to have at first hand and, as far as practical, information regarding what transpires in the country's Parliament; and

Whereas the information gap between the proceedings in Parliament and citizens' awareness needs to be closed as far as practical;

Be it resolved that the Government arrange, with appropriate permission, for full debates and the business of both Houses to be transmitted to the public through the electronic media (television and radio) in an equitable and discretely edited form on fixed days of the week and with such transmission to begin before the end of the year 2003.

Mr. Vice-President, there is also an amendment to which I could perhaps refer at this time and which states as follows:

Be it further resolved that a joint select committee of Parliament be appointed to consider and report on this matter so as to facilitate Government's action.

Mr. Vice-President, I am now required to justify the purpose and the implications of this particular Motion.

In the first instance, it should be thought of as yet another step, in my view, a historical step in deepening the democratic nature of this society and the functions of this Parliament as far as its representative nature is concerned and its accountability to the public.

2.30 p.m.

Mr. Vice-President, on April 01 this year, the Leader of Government Business, Sen. The Hon. Dr. Lenny Saith, announced in the Senate that a special unit was to be provided in his ministry to help service the Freedom of Information Act. I was very intrigued on the following days to see that no announcement was made in the press with regard to that particular statement. In other words, the public never heard about that very important statement which was intended to put

the Freedom of Information Act on wheels and get the public to utilize that facility.

In the same vein, during the Constitution Reform Bill, which was moved by my colleague, Sen. Prof. Ramchand, there were so many statements which carried serious implications for the relationship between the State and the citizen and the relationship between different agencies of Government, that I felt bewildered, in a sense, that so very little was carried in the media. I will explain as to why that situation exists.

Mr. Vice-President, I remember Sen. The Hon. Abdul-Hamid making some commentary on the role of the Constitution and the traditions of the Westminster system. I thought that some of those views should have been conveyed to the general public. Sen. Prof. Ramchand, in his introduction as mover of the motion, made some fundamental comments which should have been up for fuller public viewing. I also remember several occasions in this Senate when my friend Sen. Mark, Leader of the UNC Senators' Bench, moving motions on the adjournment of the Senate, which carried very serious implications for the functioning of Government and the need for it to be accountable to the public. I have heard some of the distinguished Senators on these Independent Benches make similar commentaries. I must state, regretfully, Mr. Vice-President, that very little, sometimes nothing at all, of those sentiments get carried to the public.

I am not saying that every time a Senator says something in the Parliament, it should be automatically relayed to the public, but the examples which I cited, and many others I believe, are justifiable and should be given for public consumption, so that people would understand, according to the premise of the Motion, how their representatives function in Parliament, and so create what could be commonly called "a road map" towards a fuller democracy and a better informed citizen.

A few Sundays ago I was in Tobago, and I was surprised to hear so many Tobagonians ask me, "What did Sen. Dumas or Sen. Dr. McKenzie say last week?" It occurred to me that people want to hear what their representatives say, what the Members of Parliament say. I think, as I would elaborate further on, that as parliamentarians, whether we are on the Government or Opposition side or the Independent Benches, we seem to be prisoners of the mass media. The public has a right to know; it is one of the fundamental premises of a democratic society. The right to know must not only be mentioned in the Constitution, there must be mechanisms and vehicles to realize that precious right.

The Motion seeks to heal that breach by bringing Parliament closer to the people, in terms of the information that is presented here and the role of that information in bringing our democracy alive. It is for that reason in the Preamble we speak about well-informed citizenry and closing the information gap between the proceedings in Parliament and what the public hears and trying to expedite the process by the amendment of having a joint select committee.

It is not a simple matter, however, of talk being transmitted. It is a matter that will help the social cohesion of this country. Quite often I hear on the radio, or read in the newspaper, commentaries on what, presumably, happened in Parliament. From these observations, people know very little about what happens in Parliament. Through ignorance they accuse parliamentarians of several things and they criticize even Government ministers and ministries; whereas, if they had more information, such criticisms would arise, but more likely would be based on fact. We need to remove that large veil of ignorance from the public's eyes. If we speak of "Vision 2020", that, to me, is a primary requirement.

Mr. Vice-President, I have before me, just for brief reference, a book entitled *Democracy* by Carl Cohen. Throughout the book it argues that without proper information a democracy cannot prosper. I need say no more, but that, as you would understand, is a long and necessary story to be told at some other time.

I have another book before me by Amaryta Sen, the last Nobel prize winner for economics, entitled *Development As Freedom*; again, it is a long story, but suffice it to say that in this age of economic development it is not a matter of financial support or the acquisition of material goods and services. It is well established in the structures of economics as a science, that human relationships, mutual trust, social cohesion, community solidarity and social character have now become key ingredients in promoting economic development. The converse is true: whatever economic gains a country happens to achieve is quickly dissipated and squandered by the lack of mutual trust, social cohesion and consensus in the different countries of the world. Mr. Vice-President, the evidence is clear. I do not think we should wait anymore to allow Parliament to satisfy that condition of information enrichment for a better and more civilized society. The alternative is, of course, what happens today.

I am quite shocked at the abysmal gap between our Parliament and citizens. For illustration I have just alluded to the commentaries that we read and what we hear on the radio. People make such strong conclusions on the basis of such little fact. As parliamentarians on all sides, not merely Government or UNC Senators or parliamentarians, we remain prisoners of the privately owned media. The media

has its job to do. The major motivation is mainly profit in a competitive marketplace, and that, to some extent, is understandable, but I do not think the work of our Parliament should be squeezed in and subjected so mercilessly to the vagaries of media reporting, which is exactly what I believe is happening today.

I understand that the media has its job to do and should be allowed to do so. The Constitution guarantees that in two particular provisions: freedom of speech and freedom of the press. The press, therefore, has its job to do, which it does, I think, reasonably well, but Parliament also has its job to do. Parliament must look after its business in terms of serving the community and the different constituencies it seeks to represent. The key way in doing this is to get what transpires in Parliament across to the people.

As a preliminary check on what happens in this regard, for a three-month period I asked my staff at the Centre for Criminology to undertake a survey as to how much of what happens in Parliament gets conveyed to the public. It is about 1 per cent. If you want to be more specific, some Members speak for an hour and nothing is reported. As I said, that is editorial judgment and the work of the private media. What you say may not deserve to be termed “news”, but we are here, not about creating news, but about analysis and decision making of the highest type, sobriety, patience, diligence and sometimes putting reason over passion.

Mr. Vice-President, it is a different portfolio; a different set of objectives, and that is why I referred to Sen. The Hon. Abdul-Hamid in his absence, because he did provide a sober analysis of the relationship between the Westminster system and the Constitution we now have. Other people have made similar contributions, which never saw the light of day, and such contributions, I repeat, include those of Sen. Mark. I see him labouring here half past six, six o'clock, with his motions on the adjournment of the Senate on critical issues of accountability. I may not always agree with him, that is not the point; the public may have to judge, but the public does not get a chance to judge, and that undermines the equity that a representative Parliament is supposed to achieve.

Mr. Vice-President, I do not think that we should remain blindfolded, as it were, so dependent and subjected to the vagaries of everyday media reporting. I do not think parliamentarians in a country like this, with a Vision 2020 objective, should allow themselves to be prisoners of the profit motive of the private media. Let me repeat, the media has its job to do, which it does reasonably well, but we, as parliamentarians, also have a job to do, which we must begin to do, in terms of information conveyance, a little more effectively.

I have heard remarks several times on talk shows about my colleagues, Sen. Seetahal and Sen. King. People have views about these Senators which are really not grounded in fact at all; sheer ignorance about whether they are biased on that side or this person. We really ought to heal that breach. Whilst I, myself, do not claim that the words of every Senator should automatically be seen as gems of wisdom, certainly, the public ought to be the final arbiter and judge of what is sensible or what is nonsense coming from its Parliament. This Motion really seeks to fulfil that objective.

We have to refer to the vehicle on which we rely so exclusively, the private media. I think it is unthinkable, when you really look at it seriously, that a taxpayer-funded institution, with people who go up for election, most of them, and get elected, should come here and depend on the private media to keep the public, that they purport to represent, dependent on such a vehicle. The logic is worrisome! Worse than that, you cannot properly get the media to correct what is wrong or ask them to publish what you think is deserving of public consumption; you are asking for trouble, because you are interfering with editorial judgment, and justifiably so, from the media's point of view. It tells you, again, that we really have to get up and get, as a Parliament. I would like to submit, with respect, that this is one of the major objectives of this particular Motion.

The media, in fact, is the only economic product, because it is an economic product which has a political function. It might be called news or whatever, but it is the only economic product I know about that has a political function, such is the media. I would think that we, as parliamentarians, should not be subject to the forces of news competition and market sensationalism which, as the competition increases, you would find our views, positions and roles, as parliamentarians, becoming more and more narrow to make space for other sensational matters which fall into the general rubric of news.

I think the time has come for us to break the chain, somewhat; free up ourselves, as far as the public consumption is concerned. We could still have our news and little sound bytes. I hope Sen. King does not mind my reference to the *Express* newspaper of Tuesday, July 08, 2003 where she was responding to a commentary made over the weekend on her status and performance. In that reply I was impressed by the last line which reads:

“I am concerned about corruption and I raise my voice against this according to the strictures laid down. In doing any of the above, I ensure that it is done professionally and fairly, without the use of sound bytes designed to titillate the media.”

That last line is very significant. It is only when you can sensationalize a position, attack somebody or make a very offensive posture or remark, that it is then very likely you will make the news. There is no quarrel with that; that is how the marketplace is, and the media must thrive on such dimension.

In fact, whilst I am on that particular vein, I must pay some tribute to those who cover our Parliament. There is a gentleman who writes for the *Express*, Richard Lord; he is very agile. He covers Parliament well, in terms of what is a news angle. I have never seen a reporter who could smell a news angle as fast as Richard Lord. If he does not discover one, he invents one very quickly by asking you to comment on what somebody else said; so he keeps the news moving. I am certain we should have nothing against that; it is commendable.

There is another reporter, perhaps, more a columnist, Judy Raymond. She reflects the tradition of the adversarial relationship between the Parliament and the fourth estate that is the media; very skeptical, always questioning things, never easily convinced about the integrity of parliamentarians, more raising questions about our integrity and always very suspicious about what we are doing. That underlines the Westminster tradition, that is, politicians are not to be trusted until they prove otherwise. She writes well in that vein; I have no quarrel with that. It is all part of the fare of good journalism.

Then there is Miss Ria Taitt; I do not think there is another reporter who can combine a fresh angle with a comprehensive report of what she has covered. I think that in each case, each one is a credit to his or her newspaper, and I recognize that. I am here with this Motion to bring a more authentic life into our Parliament; to bring our Parliament closer to the population that it serves. Whilst we cannot tell the media what it can print for broadcast, certainly, we have to see about our own business.

Mr. Vice-President, whilst I am on that vein, since we still have to depend so much on the media, I really wish that a particular committee or agency would improve the facilities for members of the media. What catches my eye, in a very worrisome way, is the stairway that leads to where they sit. I am sorry for the female section of the journalist, primarily. I always watch them going up gingerly, as if the next step would result in a break foot. They must be asking themselves if they have insurance or if, perhaps, they might take Parliament or its respective agency to court for some kind of injury allegation.

I would like to see the whole situation refurbished alongside what we do with this particular Motion, because we could face a potential embarrassment sooner or

later; let us not wait for that. They have a job to do and it is historic that they do it in conjunction with Parliament and they be given proper facilities to do so. Starting, first of all with—I am trying to find a name for that staircase, but they would find a name I am quite sure.

I believe, Mr. Vice-President, that all sides of the Senate should be at one with this particular Motion. Before I proceed, there is something that caught my eye, which was dealt with by Sen. King, and to which I would wish to refer, just briefly, to underline the point of how ignorance could be so misleading. There was a column in the *Guardian* newspaper, which calls itself the “guardian of democracy” and in its advertisement says that it adds value to the readers’ knowledge, but I have never seen so much ignorance packed in one column as that on page 29 of the *Sunday Guardian*. It looks like a “Nancy Story”. It talks about the role of the Independents and accuse us of struggling after Priority Bus Route passes and being in the VIP lounge, because we support the Government side. That is so shocking, because nothing could be further from the truth. Mr. Vice-President, we just witnessed the Independent Benches voting against the Government.

Sen. Seetahal was correct when she responded to what was really a “Nancy Story” from one Anand; it depends on the issue. It should have been “Anand’s Nancy Story”. What he should have put at the beginning was, “Once upon a time” and at the end, “crick crack, monkey break his back”. [*Desk thumping*] The whole thing was a fabrication of what really existed in Parliament! The purpose of my Motion is to heal these breaches. If one suffers today, you will not be spared tomorrow, because this is common practice.

The article says of me, in particular, that I was busy defending Sen. The Hon. Chin Lee, instead of joining the call for his resignation. I have not been busy defending Sen. The Hon. Chin Lee. The irony is remarkable! Mr. Vice-President, I am merely using these instances to show what ignorance does to the integrity of our parliamentary life. Since this is the most recent article, I think it is relevant, because there are so many others, but there is no need to belabour the point. A few days before on Thursday, July 03, 2003 in the *Express* newspaper, another reporter said:

“During his contribution Sen. Prof. Ramesh Deosaran said that crime would decrease only if the Minister of National Security, Howard Chin Lee was removed from office.”

So you have two opposite views from the media. Depending on which newspaper you buy, you would be led by a certain type of ignorance. Here I am sitting in the middle, because that is where the truth exists, somewhere between both sides.

I did not really say that crime would decrease. I think the point I was making for the record, without belabouring all the details, was that in the present circumstances, removing a minister at this time, with those who are visibly available, would make little or no difference. Even if you put a UNC person to act in that ministry, it would make little or no difference, because the structural conditions and the institutional arrangements, with respect to crime fighting and crime reduction, have grown so complex that a minister alone cannot do it. You could put Ken Gordon if you want, it would make little or no difference. You could put another Member of Parliament right now, because there are too many other things we need to do to get to this complex piece called “crime in this country”.

Mr. Vice-President, I think it is important that this Motion be seriously considered, because it is to preserve, not only our own integrity, but to satisfy the public appetite for things that are true and more faithfully reflective of what happens in this Parliament.

There are antecedents. I think we are all at one, because way back in May 1989 there was a Joint Select Committee of Parliament to look at this matter of broadcasting, and a House Paper was presented. One of the members of that Joint Select Committee was the hon. Patrick Manning. Briefly put, without belabouring the point, they were all supportive of broadcasting the proceedings of Parliament, but that lapsed and so we are into a new era, which I hope we would not allow to lapse.

More than that, Mr. Vice-President, there was a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association session in February of this year where a special study group, looking at what happens across the Commonwealth and the need to modernize the society and to enrich the democracies of Commonwealth countries, strongly recommended that the proceedings of Parliament be broadcast to citizens and fuller coverage be given, not only to proceedings of this type, that is, moving a motion or a bill, but even when the select committees are meeting, the media should be invited to sit and report, except where certain extreme circumstances arise, such as libellous statements or very offensive views are expressed.

There are several other consequences on this shortage of information from Parliament to the citizens. There are over 100 chairs in the public gallery, and at no time since I have been here this year, have those chairs been even half filled, except perhaps for the budget. There is a reason for that; the public is not excited about the life of Parliament, and what they read gives them false conclusions. A lot of what they read of Parliament is exaggerated dramatization and a few sound

bytes, a few headlines, like “Wade Mark attacks Independents”. Those types of things would really get media relish, but that is not the whole truth. In fact, that is not part of what happens in Parliament. We need to heal that breach.

If we broadcast the proceedings, somewhere in those proceedings they would know what is coming up next week. The children would know what the laws are, as far as the children’s ordinance is concerned; parents would know what their responsibilities are, when we pass legislation here; the teachers would know what the requirements are, in terms of the Education Act, and so people would be enlightened, not only in terms of their freedom, but in terms of their responsibility.

Mr. Vice-President, it was the UNC Senator, Sen. Mark again, who told us that information is the oxygen of democracy, and that is what this Motion is about: to energize our civil society by the proper provision of parliamentary information. There have been too many lies, innuendoes and falsehoods being said about the Parliament, mainly because we want to condense the information into sharpened news paradigm. We leave out a lot of valuable information and sharpen and craft the rest so as to attract the market place, which really, in the end, does parliamentarians little good.

Therefore, when you hear the Chamber of Commerce and several people across the country condemning all parliamentarians for scandalous behaviour, there might be some of that, but there are so many other good and virtuous happenings in Parliament by parliamentarians, but the public sees nothing of that. If you reflect on that, what it does is that citizens feel all Parliamentarians of either House are a bunch of misguided delinquents, because of how the press reports, when it chooses to report, time and time again. From my observation, Parliament deserves better treatment, in an overall sense.

There are some people who speak here and deserve to be heard by the public, if not their views, being transmitted through the media. We should not be so slavishly reliant on the privately owned mass media for what transpires in Parliament; we have to catch up. It is surprising to know that a country like Dominica has a special Act that governs the broadcasting of parliamentary proceedings. We have to reach there. Australia and several other countries already have this as well. I think Sen. Mark is right; let us put his words into motion, as it were; information is the oxygen of democracy.

If there is skepticism about people unduly “gallerying” and saying things to attract the media, that would be short-lived. The public, itself, in its own

judgment, will know who is gallerying and who is of more substantive merit. Let the public judge the good, the bad and the ugly. Let them see the insides of the Parliament for once and let them come to their own conclusions.

I am always sympathetic to Parliamentarians, especially those in the Lower House who got elected, and their constituents never hear or hear very little of what they say or do in Parliament. Of course, it can work both ways, but that is up to them. We need to heal that breach. I thought that this Motion is a step in that direction.

I will submit, as the amendment implies to the Joint Select Committee, that we start by using Channel 4, so that the cost would not be very prohibitive. Some arrangement can be made, in the judgment of the Joint Select Committee if approved, as to the mechanics of implementation. I think we have reached the time in our parliamentary life. If we are headed for constitutional reform, I think we ought to look after the business of Parliament in a proper way; inject some energy into our activities and some more truth into what is reported, so that the public will have a greater respect, both for the privately owned media and the Parliament.

Mr. Vice-President, with these comments, I beg to move both the Motion and the amendment.

Thank you.

Mr. Vice-President: This Motion and the amendment require a seconder.

Seconded by Sen. Dr. Eastlyn McKenzie.

Question proposed.

The Minister of Science Technology and Tertiary Education (Sen. The Hon. Danny Montano): Mr. Vice-President, I rise in support of the Motion. As I have already indicated to the Professor, we on this side do not have too much of a problem with it. We would, at the appropriate stage, suggest a very minor amendment, which I have already discussed with the Professor, and that is, in view of the fact that it really is appropriate that a committee of both Houses be set up to discuss and move this Motion forward, putting a specific time frame on it may not be the most appropriate thing. There is certainly a question with regard to the expression “in an equitable and discreetly edited form”. I would deal with that in a little while.

Mr. Vice-President, the Professor is, certainly, pushing on an open door. This is not the first time that this issue has come up. It came up in 1989 when the

present Prime Minister was in support of the Motion. I am pleased to inform this Senate that the Prime Minister is still presently in support of it; and for a very simple reason. I spoke to him very briefly on this issue.

Mr. Vice-President, the very word Parliament comes from the French word *parlement* which means “a place of speaking”. It is an old English word. I think the first Parliament was, probably, under King James I. It was set up very much like this, so people could come and listen to the knights of the realm speak to one another on the issues of the day. It is a very simple thing. By extension, if you consider that we have a public gallery and anyone can come and listen to the debates of the Parliament, you realize that the very purpose of being here is so that people can hear what is being said. That is the purpose of the Parliament.

The purpose of the Parliament was to empower the people through their representatives, those who could speak for the people to the Executive. In those days it was the king himself, but, at least, there was some form of representation. Of course, it would make absolutely no sense whatever, if that representation was done in secret. Therefore, Parliament, by its very nature, must be carried on in the full and public view. The only question is: How should that be done? There are many views on it.

As we speak right now, there are over 80 countries, including ours, that have some form of electronic media broadcasting the debates in some form or another. In our case, of course, we have two media companies that do their own editing for a commercial purpose; then we have the Information Division with two cameras on either side. I am not sure if they come here with any tape, because I do not know what happens to whatever they photograph. It goes into a public service vacuum and disappears inside; nothing ever seems to come out; but the reality is, they are here. It would not stretch the imagination or be difficult to actually provide them with the tapes so that tapes could actually be made, and then some form of publication actually be done of it. The form of publication is not a simple issue.

Sen. Prof. Deosaran said that the people must be the final arbiter of what is said. Basically, that was in support of the proposition that, quite frankly, the whole purpose of the Parliament is to have the representatives of the people speak on behalf of the people. Even though we are Senators and do not directly represent the people, as being part of the legislative process, certainly, whatever we say should be in the public domain in a more organized way than it is presently.

The Senator went on to compliment a number of journalists, and said, "...but we cannot tell journalists what to print, we have to see about our own business."

That was a direct quote of what he said, and that is pretty well true.

Mr. Vice-President, the media has a most important role to play in any democratic society. There is no doubt that in Trinidad and Tobago the journalists are, by and large, somewhat inexperienced, when you compare what they do with, perhaps, what happens in more developed countries. With the plethora of new tabloids, radio stations and so on, the few good journalists outside there are stretched rather thin. Notwithstanding that, I know that they all do their best to function as fairly as they can, under the circumstances.

The Senator, quite rightly, took umbrage at some articles. In fact, he referred to a column in the *Sunday Guardian* which talked about bus route passes for the Independent Senators, and some supposed position where he was defending Sen. The Hon. Chin Lee in one newspaper and supposedly attacking him in another. The reality is, Senator, once you are in the public eye, you are subject to the interpretations of the people who listen. Unfortunately, because of a lack of training on the part of journalists in Trinidad and Tobago, what you say and what they hear are not necessarily the same thing. We all struggle with the interpretations of journalists.

Mr. Vice-President, I will give you a classic example. I certainly do not want to make war with the media; I have no axe to grind with them whatsoever. They are free to publish anything they want about me, as long as it is not libellous. I would certainly like to think that I speak fairly clear, but even so, I am misinterpreted. Last week Friday I had the opportunity to act, on behalf of my colleague, as Minister of Foreign Affairs. I had to go to the American celebration of July 04, their 227th anniversary of Independence. Of course, everybody expected me to make war on the United States. I was not going to do that.

The United States and Trinidad and Tobago are friends and allies, and are going to remain as friends and allies. We have been so for many years, and will remain so for many years, but there are areas of disagreement. There are many areas of disagreement, but our friendship is strong enough to deal with these areas of disagreement. We do not like the latest issue; it is a rather repugnant and clumsy way to impose their will on us, but, quite frankly, we will move past that.

When we look at the issue of the International Criminal Court (ICC), for instance, the Clinton administration had signed to it and had been signatories for two years, until the Bush administration. The Bush administration revoked their acquiescence to the ICC. When you look at that you realize that it is not necessarily a position of the United States, so much as it is a position of the present administration of the United States. If Mr. Bush is gone by the end of next year, in the November 2004 elections, and the democrats come back into government, then it becomes a non-issue. So there is no way that we are going to get into a war with the United States; our friendship must and will stand.

Mr. Vice-President, I was very careful about what I said. Allow me to show you what tends to happen no matter how careful you try to be. This is a transcript of my speech; I did not read it, I just spoke it:

“The United States is, in fact, merely 227 years young, in the context of world history, when you consider the ancient civilizations of Greece and Rome. It is now the most powerful nation on the planet, but in looking at that, it is important to understand that power demands responsibility and maturity that youth often denies.”

The American Ambassador certainly got the point that I was making.

I went on to say:

“Excellency, rest assured that Trinidad and Tobago are your friends and we would remain firmly your friends, and as we move down the road of history we would like to feel that the issues that are for the common good of all humanity must take precedence over narrow self-interest.”

The report in the *Sunday Guardian* of July 06 by the reporter named Neidi Lee-Singh Rojas, has the byline: “Montano begs for US friends”. Mr. Vice-President, I do not know how anything I said could have been interpreted in that way. I have absolutely no idea! However, that is what was done. I sympathize completely with the goodly Senator as to what the media can do, but, quite frankly, it is very largely a lack of experience and training on their part.

Insofar as Sen. Prof. Deosaran and my having to mention the *Guardian* newspaper, it is not surprising that their readership is the lowest in the country when you get that level of reporting, because when you make mistakes, the people know. We do not have to do anything about it. I do not have to get on a high horse and criticize the media and Miss Rojas. I do not need to do that, because the people already see what is really the truth.

Mr. Vice-President, let me just go on a little. The reality is, the point about being misunderstood applies even here, in the sense that even if the proceedings in Parliament were to be broadcast live, listeners outside there, whether they were listening on the radio or television, not having the level of sophistication or, necessarily, the understanding of the issues that some of us here may have—and I stress, may have—the reality is that the average citizen may very well misinterpret what you say. You may not need the media to misinterpret for you; they may do it on their own. But I take the point that, at least, it should be left up to the public to make their own decisions on that. I think that point is well made.

I took a little time to see what happens in some other countries, and there are a number of issues. The issue is not as simple or as clear as whether we should televise the debates live or not, there are other issues involved. I spoke to His Excellency, the United Kingdom (UK) High Commissioner, this morning, and he told me that in the UK in the House of Commons they are broadcast live on a cable channel that is owned by the Parliament. They actually transmit it; nobody else does it.

His Excellency quipped, “Nobody watches it, but it is transmitted live on cable.” He did say that, surprisingly, it is also transmitted live in the United States. He said that they have received all kinds of letters and so on from citizens in the United States who look at the proceedings in Britain, and find it very interesting how they are done. It is quite different, of course, from the Senate and Congress in the United States. He said that it is not very widely watched in the UK.

Mr. Vice-President, I went to see what actually happened in the United States. I was not able to get hold of anybody in the embassy to tell me what actually happens, but from what little I did learn, there are a number of different methods in which the proceedings in the United States’ Senate and Congress, the House of Representatives, are transmitted. It is done via the Internet by a number of different agencies. One of them is called the Federal News Service; another one is called Fed Net and, of course, there is the Public Broadcasting Station (PBS), which is a privately owned non-profit company. It is actually owned by 345 television stations. Of course, they have no advertising at all.

Those proceedings in the Senate and the House are not necessarily live, but are broadcast at different times and, frequently, the individual speeches of a member are broadcast one at a time, so it is not necessarily as they say, a gavel-to-gavel transmission of the debate. But there seems to be, pretty well, some very wide coverage in the United States.

I then turned to Canada to see what happens there. The High Commissioner for Canada was very gracious, and gave me quite a bit of information. He sent me a package with about 20 pages to tell me what happens in Canada. It gave me a little better understanding as to what are some of the issues. The Canadians went to public live broadcasting of their debates in 1977, quite a long time ago, so they were, in fact, one of the pioneers at it. They made some mistakes, but, apparently, have been a model for a number of other countries.

In Canada, the control of the transmission of the radio and television broadcast falls directly under the control of the House of Commons, and is supervised directly by the Speaker of the House. Parliament, itself, manages its own affairs, in that sense; it is not left up to some private sector company, the media or something of the sort.

In the beginning, the broadcast would pretty well run unrestricted. There were no guidelines, and they quickly ran into a number of problems that we have not yet run into with our media being here. In Canada, because the media is very vibrant and well trained, even though the broadcast was owned by the State, as it were, owned by the Parliament, the people who were doing it had been trained in the media. Therefore, what they were naturally attempting to do was to make the transmission as entertaining as possible, not just a dry, routine fix the camera on the speaker and record what he says.

They started to do what they described in hockey as “following the puck”, that is, if there was anybody speaking or cross talking, the camera would cut backwards and forwards; they began to do all those sorts of things. They also began to play with the camera on the expressions of sitting Members in the Parliament. If they were sleeping, reading, yawning or making other more impolite gestures with their hands or whatever, then the camera would frequently focus on those Members. Of course, many Members found it somewhat embarrassing and irritating, and it caused a little conflict, so they quickly brought in some guidelines; not regulations, but some guidelines as to how things must be done.

The basic guideline was that the cameras must be focused on the Speaker of the House. When someone else was speaking, the camera would shift to that person, and it would be restricted to a head and shoulders shot of the speaker, and would be kept there until he or she had finished. The whole idea of trying to produce good television ended, and it became a rather dry, routine transmission of the events of the day. What they do is a gavel-to-gavel transmission from beginning to end. They would transmit the whole session, and there is no editing.

Mr. Vice-President, they actually have all the equipment lodged in their Parliament and, in the Parliament building itself, they have a broadcast station. They broadcast via satellite to a number of cable networks, television and radio stations that transmit it on their own systems. The original transmission is done by the Parliament itself, in the Parliament building. That brings us to another issue that I want to mention, by the way. That, in fact, is one of the difficulties we are facing with this building and this Chamber.

The architects looking at the restoration of the building are looking at all of this—[*Senator points to ceiling*—]and saying, “We cannot do that here; to do that here is going to damage a lot of what we have.” That is what we have been advised; I stand to be corrected. I am not an architect; I am not an engineer, but that is the professional advice that we have received. [*Interruption*]

3.30 p.m.

Sen. Prof. Ramchand: Mr. Vice-President, I wonder if the hon. Minister could supply a copy of that written advice from the architects?

Sen. The Hon. D. Montano: I do not have it, I am not a member of the committee, but I would try to get it for you. I do not have the authority, but I would certainly seek it out for you; but that is what I am advised, and there is no reason for me not to accept that the report is true. Of course, it is one professional’s opinion, but is an opinion that has been received.

They went on to say that the Canadians now guard their right to their television transmissions very jealously and even though they are extremely critical of the behaviour of many of the Members of Parliament—like here in Trinidad and Tobago—they still do not want to have that right taken away, they want to have the right to be able to see what goes on in the Parliament.

The report I received from the Canadian High Commission said that notwithstanding the fact that in 1977 they brought the cameras in on a full-time basis, that there was no noticeable change as to how Members of Parliament behaved in the Parliament, or how they spoke, and they found there was no change to the quality of the contributions made. Where they were poor they stayed poor, where they were good they stayed good and there were no changes at all.

There were a couple of issues worthy of considering and these are that much of the work of Parliament is done through the committees. There were all kinds of committees; the Public Accounts Committee, Public Accounts (Enterprises) Committee and others, and the question arose as to how many of those committees should also be broadcast live.

In Canada, as I understand it, what happens is that the chairman of the committees and the committee itself can take a decision on a case-by-case basis as to whether or not the proceedings should be broadcast live. If they agree that they should be, they are still required to go to the Speaker of the House to get his approval to do that. So there are issues that need to be considered, but in the Motion, it says that the business should be transmitted in an equitable and discreetly edited form on fixed days.

Mr. Vice-President, there are problems with that. We are already subjected to a form of ad hoc editing from the privately owned media companies and in the interest of democracy we all submit ourselves willingly to that approach even when they get it wrong. It is their constitutional right to get it wrong and publish it wrong, and we live with it and try to return on another day to try to make sure what we say makes sense and it is clearly and properly understood. The problem about editing parliamentary debates, is that if we go down that road, the Government of the day would be in control of the Parliament and there would always be the perception that the editing is going to be done in such a way as to be biased in favour of the Government of the day, in which case it is no longer equitable broadcasting, it becomes propaganda.

The Government has the Information Division, which can broadcast and publicize its own agenda and its own programmes, but in terms of debates in Parliament, that is something you do not want interfered with in terms of any bias from one side or the other. Therefore, what mechanisms would one set up to ensure that there is no bias on the part of any sitting administration? The real value of the Parliament is the critique that comes from the Opposition and Independent Senators in this Chamber and, therefore, you do not want to be accused of editing out criticisms that you do not especially care for, and that is an issue that has to be carefully worked out.

In doing all that, there is another issue which is the cost of it. To do this on a regular basis is not going to be an inexpensive undertaking. It is going to be expensive both in terms of the equipment required to photograph and record in an audio form, as well as to transmit and manage the whole system. The question is who should pay for that? Should it be done entirely by the State? Should there be some private sector involvement? Should it be like a PBS where you look for contributions from the public and have them aired in that way? There are a number of ways in which the whole thing could be approached and I do not think that we have had the opportunity as yet to determine what would be the best way of doing it.

Of course, the other thing I started to talk to you about was regulating or setting guidelines for what the cameras can and cannot do. I have seen many instances here, if the privately owned media were a bit more on the ball, it would be embarrassing to a number of Senators. I am grateful they just fix the cameras as they do, and the technicians sit, or leave, or whatever and if you move around like I do, you are either in or out of the scope of the camera. We are lucky for the time being that we have not had to deal with those issues. And that does not mean that they are not likely to arise and what will start happening is that some Senators and Members of Parliament in the other place are likely to accuse the agency by saying: You are always taking an unflattering shot of me. Or you are always doing this at this time, that time, or the other time. And you can run into all sorts of problems so you have got to fix your guidelines in such a way that everybody agrees on what the ground rules are.

So that is important, and your amendment to the Motion is very important that both the Members in the other place and in this Senate can agree on what the rules should be, how they should be done, when they should be done and so forth.

There is a question that I want to deal with very quickly that is: What role should the private sector play in the transmission of debates of the proceedings and activities in Parliament? It might be when I talk about the business of Parliament and proceedings, it is not just the debates, they are all the meetings of the different committees and so forth. Should the private sector be involved at all? Should the private sector be given a certain mandatory time for the transmission of debates? Should they be sponsoring their time on the Parliament channel or whatever it might be? These are issues we need to look at very seriously.

Mr. Vice-President, just to wrap up, I think it is important that Senators understand that the Government is in support of the Motion. We support the position that the people have a right to know what is said and done both in the Senate and the House of Representatives, but it needs to be looked at carefully so we do not get it wrong. We must do it right. It is not that difficult, there are precedents to follow. It is not like we are reinventing the wheel.

I dare say that if a committee was set up, a select few could be sent to see what happens in the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States of America and actually see what takes place, and I think everybody would have a better idea as to what we are talking about, and a better understanding to the magnitude of the problem and maybe the cost of the problem. They would also see a physical set-up so they can understand how it could be done in the context of a debate for the future use of this building. Could it in fact be done inside here? I do not know, but I think these are things we need to look at very closely.

In closing, Mr. Vice-President, I would like to say that we support the Motion and I do not think we would have any difficulty with it. However, at the appropriate time, either I would move it or ask the mover of the Motion to amend his own Motion. Which is to put a full stop at the end of the word “radio” in the first paragraph which says:

Be it resolved that the Government arrange, with appropriate permission for full debates and the business of both Houses to be transmitted to the public through the electronic media (television and radio).

And delete everything after that because the supplemental resolution really says what has to happen, and it would happen in its own time and fairly quickly and we can move on from there.

Mr. Vice-President, I thank you very much.

Sen. Wade Mark: Mr. Vice-President, I join in this debate dealing with broadcasting as it relates to proceedings of the Parliament. When we look at the resolution and what it is calling for, it tells us that to arrive at some kind of consensus would require what is proposed in this particular Motion. Certainly, it would require a meeting of minds, and this is why we support the establishment of a joint select committee of Parliament to look at this question because we would have preferred live transmission. We would have preferred in this resolution not fixed days, but every day, but these are matters that would best be deliberated upon at the committee stage where we bring our minds to bear collectively on this issue.

So we thank Sen. Prof. Deosaran, and we think this is something that has been going on for sometime in terms of the discussion on the question of whether we should have live broadcast.

Mr. Vice-President, I do not think you are aware that outside the budget speech where the Minister of Finance is carried live, the Leader of the Opposition is carried live, and the closing address of the Minister of Finance is also supposed to be carried live, I have been trying to establish how long we in Trinidad and Tobago have been trying to consider this question of broadcasting and televising the proceedings of both Houses of Parliament.

The information takes us back to 1984 when a decision, in fact a special select committee of the House of Representatives was appointed and it held its first meeting on November 29, 1984 and that meeting had some very interesting personalities.

They were: Mr. Mathew Ramcharan, who was the Chairman, Mr. Overand Padmore, Mr. John Donaldson, Mr. Basdeo Panday, Mr. Sham Mohammed, Mr. Kelvin Ramnath, Mr. Carter, a former President—he acted as Secretary—Miss Norma Cox, who was Clerk of the Senate and who is now retired, and absent from that meeting were Mr. Cyril Rogers and Mr. Nizam Mohammed. That was in 1984, and it was the first time the House sat to consider all questions and aspects relating to the broadcasting and televising of proceedings. So this has been a struggle that has been going on for sometime and we had never made a comprehensive, all-round decision on arriving at a position as to what we should be doing outside the budget speech.

Arising out of these meetings held on November 20, 1984 and also on November 29, 1984, the House of Representatives agreed, based on an interim report submitted by this special select committee, to bring for the first time to the people live broadcast of the budget presentation.

So for the first time in Trinidad and Tobago the budget speech came across the television screen and radio station. What was even more important was that in 1984 for the first time, the Leader of the Opposition's response to the Minister of Finance's speech was also broadcast live. So I raise this question and draw it to your attention to let you know that this struggle for live transmission, delayed transmission of parliamentary business is not something new. It has been around for sometime now and outside the budget, special events are carried live.

If we were to bring the President of South Africa and he had to address a joint sitting of the Parliament then that would be carried live. When we have the ceremonial opening of Parliament, that is carried live. So when one looks at what is carried live via the media, it is limited. It is the budget speech, special events and occasions, and the ceremonial opening of Parliament and really, as a young democratic State I think the time has come for us to put the Parliament into the homes of people. We feel that even though you would require many guidelines—if you are going to telecast or televise live transmission, obviously guidelines would have to be established. Where there is live broadcast whether it is England, Canada, India and right here in Dominica, not to mention the European Union Parliament, all these jurisdictions have had the experience of some degree of live broadcasting. So that is something we need to advance.

Mr. Vice-President, live broadcasting of debates in the Parliament would go a long way in bringing about some degree of media balance and it would promote some form of accurate coverage, and a more fair and balanced reporting on the proceedings of the Parliament. Because we do not have live transmission paid for by taxpayers, we are always at a disadvantage; the population does not get unbiased coverage.

What we get on a daily basis based on the fact that the Parliament of Trinidad and Tobago does not have its own equipment, it does not have its own television unit, it depends on the Government Information Division to broadcast and televise proceedings of Parliament, and you know what happens when you have the Government Broadcasting Unit taping proceedings. What is shown on television at the end of the day is clearly unfair in terms of the coverage and that is why the Parliament should have its own equipment and its own staff in order to broadcast and if that takes place, then there will be a certain level of fairness and balance in its transmission to the population. So when we are talking about parliamentary broadcasting, and televising of proceedings, we have to take into account as one of the Senators said, the cost. It is not going to be cheap, but this Parliament should be in charge of its own proceedings and not depend on the private sector, media-driven houses for coverage because we know what happens.

We know that in many instances journalists have their own biases and they are entitled to that, but in Britain there are newspapers that are clearly in support of the conservative party and they say they are for the party; there are newspapers in Britain in support of the labour party and they say so, but we have some hypocritical editors in this country; two-faced editors and newspaper owners who give the country the impression that they are independent and fair, but in fact they are pro-PNM.

The *Newsday*, pro-Chin Lee, pro-PNM; the *Express*, pro-PNM, Ken Gordon; the *Guardian*, the same thing, pro-PNM and I have examples to show the bias and sometimes vulgar discrimination that takes place in these newspapers. Like they sing for their supper, but not under us, they could not sing because they were trying to run us out of town whilst we were there for five years. They missed the PNM badly so they brought them back; the *Guardian* and the Minister of National Security, who I understand has shares there.

So when we look at reporting I would like to make the point that many newspapers, like media houses have their jobs to do and I have no problem with that, but they must be fair and balanced in their reporting. They must not give the impression that they are independent and balanced and fair and they are unbiased. When one looks at their writings one sees the extent.

I give an example. A closet PNM journalist who, for a number of years gave the impression that he was balanced and fair, Maxie Cuffie, editor of the *Express* and the big man who used to run TV6—that is why we could not have been on television. The reason the UNC could not get proper coverage on TV6 and in the

Express was because Maxie Cuffie was in charge of both TV6, as editor and also the *Express*, as editor. Do you know where he is today? In the bosom of the Attorney General. He is now the Public Relations Advisor to the Attorney General of Trinidad and Tobago, maybe drawing \$50,000 a month.

So when they mamaguy the country and the population, these journalists who are giving the impression that they are balanced, fair and independent, end up being stooges and tools of the PNM. I want the Attorney General to tell me today if Maxie Cuffie—

Sen. Morean: On a point of order. May I say that the Senator is misleading the Senate. Mr. Cuffie is not the public relations officer to the Attorney General.

Sen. W. Mark: All right, tell us what he is. I take my seat, could you rise again?

Mr. Vice-President: Hon. Senators, please do not allow the sitting to degenerate to this. Continue please.

4.00 p.m.

Sen. W. Mark: Mr. Vice-President, if I said public relations advisor and he is a consultant, I would now say he is a consultant to the hon. Attorney General of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago. But my point is not so much whether he is a consultant, advisor or whatever, I am saying that Maxie Cuffie was the editor of the *Express* when the UNC was in power for six years and if you look at the editorials of the *Express* and the biased reporting of TV6 when that fellow was in charge of those stations, it was blood on sand. They wanted to get rid of the UNC. He was giving the people the impression that he was balanced and fair, when the man was a closet PNM and now that the PNM is in power it is pay back time. The Attorney General has embraced him and he has now embraced her and is now working under the very kind heart of the Attorney General, Sen. The Hon. Glenda Morean.

Hypocrites again! The hush-hush arrangement by the media! To show the biasness of this media, many people in this country do not know that Selwyn Cudjoe, who broke the law—the police told him “Do not march”; he said he was marching; he subverted the law—today, hush-hush; the media “ain’t” tell the country yet you know, but I was able to discover that Selwyn Cudjoe has been placed in the Central Bank as a director when I went to a function recently to listen to the President of Botswana, where Mr. Cudjoe gave an address about Eric Williams. That was the first time I knew that Selwyn Cudjoe, a subversive, a person who broke the law and went against the UNC government; preached race; all kinds of disturbances in this country—has now been rewarded. He is a big journalist, you know.

Mr. Vice-President, you could recall that every Sunday you read in a column in the *Express* or the *Guardian* Cudjoe writing from abroad and attacking the UNC. This man called for the overthrow of the legitimately, democratically and constitutionally elected government and he is rewarded with a directorship at the level of the Central Bank—another stooge, a tool and instrument of the PNM, who gives the impression to the country that he is so fair and balanced. I was shocked to read in the newspapers recently when I saw an NEL issue of shares or some report on NEL operations—who could I see as a big director on NEL board but Dr. Selwyn Ryan.

This thing is going on hush-hush, Mr. Vice-President! Nobody in the country knows about these things! Would you tell me the media does not know about that? The media knows! I am just saying, Sir, that we have a situation in this country where the media is supposed to be objective, balanced and fair in their reporting, but they are under the control of forces that are in favour—but they pretend not to be in favour—of a particular party. I have no problem with whichever party a media person would like to support. That is his right. I have no problem with that, but do not pretend. Do not mamaguy the people and tell the country you are balanced; you are unbiased and you are fair when you know, in fact, you are a stooge, a tool and an instrument of the PNM and you are mamaguying the population.

How can we get proper coverage of our proceedings in Parliament when you have a man like Maxie Cuffie in charge of the *Express*? When we speak here we can never get proper coverage in the *Express*. If we say something positive, he would change it into something negative to make the UNC look bad, because he is singing for his supper. That is the kind of thing we have to deal with.

That is why it is our view and our opinion that we should have our own independent equipment and television unit within the Parliament. It is only under those circumstances that we could be guaranteed fair and balanced reporting of proceedings in this Parliament and not these hypocrites that you have all over the place posing as objective journalists and they turn out to be stooges and instruments of the PNM.

Live broadcasting or televising of our debates would perform, what I call, an auditing function. It would root out the weak, the non-performers; it would expose to the population those people who do not deserve to be in Parliament, whether they are on the Opposition Benches, the Government Benches or on the Independent Benches. It would expose people like the Minister of Public Utilities and the Environment when he tries to pull wool over people's eyes. People would see how they are mamaguying the country. They talk about transparency—none!

There is a reporter called Judy Raymond who comes here every week—she is not here today—if you read her columns—bitter! Bitter against the UNC! We could do nothing right, only the PNM! And she says she is an objective journalist. She comes here every Tuesday. It is as though her mission is just to write acid. She is just acid, vitriol, pitch oil, fuel, against us! I ask myself: How can she be a balanced journalist when every week you read her article she attacks the UNC? We cannot do anything right. Everything we do is wrong. But the PNM is right. Sen. Gift, “yuh” good boy—no problem. But you see “we”? Negative!

How can we talk about balanced reporting? There is no balance here, no objectivity in these reporters. Most of them are singing for their supper. They are looking for a contract here; a contract there; some job here; some job there; they want a ride in the Minister of National Security’s car, and they give him a nice article afterwards.

How can we get fair coverage unless we have our own equipment in this Parliament to ensure that the population gets justice in the whole process? I think that the need for us to promote, what we call, fair reporting, is critical. I think we need more journalistic independence and integrity among those persons who peddle that name, because in truth and in fact they are stooges and tools of the ruling party.

I must tell you that this particular matter is a very complex one. I do not want to mislead you or the Parliament that the whole question of televising and broadcasting of parliamentary proceedings is a simple matter. If you look at Canada, Australia, England, you have, for instance, guidelines being established; what can and cannot be done. After a while, of course, standards have to be set because if you do not set standards you are going to be in some trouble. I am saying that one of the things that this joint select committee would have to do is establish proper guidelines for the televising of these programmes and what would emerge at the end of the day is an electronic *Hansard*.

When we are talking about live televising of parliamentary proceedings we have to deal with copyright issues; with the control and use of material. When you are dealing with live broadcasting you have to establish guidelines so that no side—it does not matter which side—could use that procedure for, let us say, advertising. So there has to be standards established.

There is also a need for us to have large-scale consultation with the stakeholders. I am talking about the private sector media because I agree that if they can play a role in this exercise, they should be consulted. Of course, all

Members of Parliament must be consulted and be involved in this exercise and we have to deal with the question of members of the public as well.

There is a very old Act, Chap 2:02, called the House of Representatives (Powers and Privileges) Act. It is Act No. 3 of 1953. This Act is extremely useful but it needs to be amended; it needs to be repealed; it needs to be updated. This is all part of Constitution reform at the level of the Parliament. This Act says:

“An Act to declare and define certain powers, privileges and immunities of the House and the members of such House, to secure freedom of speech in the House, to regulate admittance to the precincts of the House, to give protection to the persons employed in the publication of the reports and other papers of the House and for purposes incidental to or connected with the matters aforesaid.”

This was supposed to prescribe certain rules and regulations. It was supposed to outline, define and prescribe certain immunities, privileges and powers, but what you had was an Act that was passed in 1953, amended in 1963 and since then it has never seen the light of day. These are some of the things that the Attorney General should be paying attention to when we come to the question of parliamentary broadcasting, because when you are talking about live proceedings, you are talking about powers and privileges here, about immunities. Therefore, there must be an Act that would protect parliamentarians. We know that it already exists within these precincts, but when you go live in people's homes and in the country as a whole, you have to prescribe, as this has identified. It is an area I feel that the Government would have to address when it gets to the committee stage. As I said, it would also be costly. Make no mistake about that, there would be some cost attached.

We on this side have raised many issues but, as you know, when we raise issues, because we depend on the private media we do not get the necessary coverage that we would like. I recall Sen. Dr. Jennifer Kernahan debating a very important issue on Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) that never saw the light of day in terms of the population knowing what we were seeking to advance in the Parliament. I remember Sen. Arnim Smith raising the issue of crime and criminal activity in the country. Again, we saw nothing appearing in the newspapers. The *Newsday* was extremely biased against us in the last election. You felt as though the *Newsday* was a PNM rag. But today I am noticing it is doing some balancing. It would give a little coverage here and there to mamaguy us. But do you know what? It is like a PNM manifesto. But they have their role to play.

We have public meetings every Monday night on the people's forum. I am sure you listen to us, Sir. For the next five years, throughout the length and breadth of the country, we would take the issues to the people. We are establishing our own Parliament, you know. Whilst we are waiting, based on Sen. Prof. Deosaran's Motion, to get live television coverage—we are not waiting on that, you know. Every Monday night from now until we get rid of the PNM, five years or before, we shall be in your homes, your churches and synagogues; anywhere! We are going to be there with a live broadcast: 90.5, 94.1 and we are going to 95.5 just now. We bring the issues of the Parliament to the people every Monday night. I want to invite you one of these days, you know, Mr. Vice-President. These meetings are very educational. People are happy—

Mr. Vice-President: Sen. Mark, while you are establishing your Parliament, I would like you to return to discussing the matter of this Parliament, please. [Laughter]

Sen. W. Mark: I thought we were talking about the people's Parliament, Sir. That was just an aside. I just wanted to alert you that that exists, if you were not aware.

I was making the point that we have raised a number of issues on our side. I remember Sen. Carolyn Seepersad-Bachan giving us a lot of information relating to the Atlantic LNG and the production to reserve ratio, and certain critical policy issues. Outside of one newspaper—I think it was the *Newsday*—the UNC got no coverage on that matter. Even on the Government Benches, sometimes they make some reasonable contributions—Sen. Christine Kangaloo; and they do not cover the Senator as well. I have to even try to protect you, Christine.

Sen. D. Montano: On a point of order. I think I need to remind the good Senator again, that the Senator is a Minister and needs to be addressed and referred to by her title. Outside the Chamber, yes, we are friends and we can call one another by our first names, but here there is a protocol that must be adhered to and I would like to remind him of that. [Desk thumping]

Sen. W. Mark: Do you notice something? Whenever I slip, I have a good friend who reminds me. I am very grateful for any reminder coming from my dear friend. But I addressed her as “Senator”. I see before my eyes—I do not know if I need to change my eyeglasses, but I see “Sen. The Hon. Christine Kangaloo” and I thought I had addressed her as that. I did not know I had to go elsewhere.

The reality is that we on this side believe that the debate on this Motion should be very short. We do not believe we should go into too many details on this particular Motion, the reason being we are in support of the Motion; the

Government, through Sen. Danny Montano—Sen. The Hon. Danny Montano—supports it as well. So if the Government is in support; the Opposition is in support and the mover has moved this Motion, we should have no more—well I am not trying to curb anybody from speaking because everyone has a right to speak, but what I am suggesting, Sir, is that because of the importance of this matter we should agree, once there is consensus, to have it referred to a joint select committee of Parliament. If we do not have that privilege, then a select committee of the Senate, because I do not know if the rules would allow us on a Private Members' Motion to extend it to the House of Representatives. But because of the importance of uniformity and for us to establish standards—so that, for instance, one House does not have one set of rules and the other House would have another set of rules—we are suggesting and supporting the establishment of a joint select committee of both Houses of Parliament. So at the end of the day we would have consensus and one approach to how we are going to deal with broadcasting.

Sen. Prof. Deosaran: Mr. Vice-President, I merely want to intervene briefly, Sir, with your permission, to underline the fact that I am in full agreement with the proposal just made by the hon. Senator, about having the debate, perhaps, as brief as possible and moving to the establishment of the joint select committee. I merely want to let the Senate know that I am in full agreement, as mover of the Motion, in that respect.

Sen. W. Mark: Thank you. Mr. Vice-President, it took the Canadian Parliament, I understand, a number of years to arrive at a final position on the televising of parliamentary proceedings. So I think if we are serious and committed to this Motion, we should really move post-haste in getting the committee established; letting it go to work; establishing a time frame for it to report to the Parliament and before this parliamentary term comes to an end, we can, in fact, as a Parliament, establish for the first time some degree of broadcasting and televising. Whether it is live, discreet, whatever, we should be in a position to establish some degree of broadcasting and televising.

Normally I am very lengthy but this afternoon I am not going to be long because I am in support of this Motion. I know it has to go to a joint select committee. The UNC is in support of the Motion. We want to compliment the Senator for bringing this Motion. We think this is something that the country requires. It is part of the whole revolution in education and we need to ensure that the population knows what is taking place on a daily basis. [*Interruption*] We would support this Motion by Sen. Prof. Deosaran.

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice-President.

Sen. Prof. Ramchand: Mr. Vice-President, I really do not know whether I should say anything because I am in such complete agreement with Sen. Mark's proposal. I wonder if we could get a response from the Government and from the whole Senate.

Sen. Dumas: Could I ask a question of Sen. Mark? I wonder if Sen. Mark would care to tell us whether he wants to wait on Constitution reform for this matter.

Sen. Mark: When we establish the joint select committee to deal with this matter, there are some Constitution reform issues that would arise and we would distil those at the level of the joint select committee.

Mr. Vice-President: Hon. Senators, it is 4.25 p.m. and I suggest that we now take the tea break. After we return we shall hear from Sen. Prof. Ramchand. This Senate is now suspended for the tea break and we would resume at 5.00 p.m.

4.25 p.m.: *Sitting suspended.*

5.00 p.m.: *Sitting resumed.*

ADJOURNMENT

The Minister of Community Development and Gender Affairs (Sen. The Hon. Joan Yuille-Williams): Mr. Vice-President, I beg to move that this Senate now adjourn to Wednesday, July 09, 2003 at 1.30 p.m.

Mr. Vice-President: Hon. Senators, there is a matter to be raised on the motion for the adjournment of the Senate.

Caroni (1975) Limited Workers (Insensitive Approach by Government)

Sen. Wade Mark: Mr. Vice-President, I rise almost for the sixth, seventh or eighth time to bring this issue of the insensitive approach being taken by the present Government under the stewardship of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources as it relates to the handling of the Caroni (1975) Limited matter. I refer, specifically, to the approach that the Government has taken as it relates to the workers of Caroni (1975) Limited.

We had warned the Minister on many occasions when he came here that his approach was wrong and that he was violating and trampling upon all basic, industrial relations principles. The hon. Minister's constant refrain was that they consulted with the unions. He would read for us lengthy pieces about meeting after meeting that he or his people held with the unions involved. Well, the truth

Caroni (1975) Limited Workers
[SEN. MARK]

Tuesday, July 08, 2003

has now come to light, Mr. Vice-President. The Minister has either misled the Parliament, deliberately, or the Minister was totally misadvised by his legal team or his industrial relations team.

Mr. Vice-President, I have a copy of a public document which has been released by the Industrial Court of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago which deals with the judgment involving the All Trinidad Sugar and General Workers Trade Union (ATSGWTU) and Caroni (1975) Limited. What this says to us is that our Minister—and he is my friend but because he is my friend I need to protect him. I think that our Minister of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources is devoid of any proper understanding of basic industrial relations practice. He does not understand that issue. We have another Minister, who is coming here tomorrow, who is worse than him—the Minister of Health. He does not understand basic industrial relations practice.

I believe that the Minister of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources has refused to utilize the repository of information that is currently stored in the Ministry of Labour and Small and Micro Enterprise Development. Mr. Vice-President, the Minister of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources has failed, since this matter started, to refer it to Mr. Achong, the Minister of Labour and Small and Micro Enterprise Development. So what you have taking place is that apart from the arrogance from my friend on this issue, it is clear that he does not understand basic industrial relations principles.

Mr. Vice-President, if my friend, the hon. Minister, had understood basic industrial relations principles, you would not have had a headline like this after the court judgment on Friday, June 27, 2003 on Saturday's *Express* dated June 28, 2003:

“All must go

Retrenchment for 9,000 daily-paid”

That was the headline in the newspaper. This is what my hon. friend said. In this article he is quoted as saying:

“Well we would have no choice; if we cannot go the VSEP route then the next step is to make the jobs redundant and therefore go toward the collective agreement based on the agreements between Caroni and the daily-paid workers' union representatives and apply that.”

He goes on to say that action should take place in the next ten days. Well, thank God, ten days have gone and no action has been taken. What the Minister does

not understand, Mr. Vice-President, is that there is a procedure involved in industrial relations. If you want to retrench people, you should not do what this hon. Minister attempted to do. He said to hell with the Industrial Court judge. He has also said whatever the court says he does not care, 9,000 workers have to go. It is as if the Minister has a death wish to get rid of 10,000 workers. Why?

Mr. Vice-President, I am telling you this afternoon, I have information on WASA but I am not saying that WASA workers should go home. I am for workers! I am a trade unionist! I want to protect workers' jobs! I want to advance their welfare and interest. Mr. Vice-President, WASA's total accumulated debt is \$6 billion. Under the former Minister of Public Utilities, Sen. The Hon. Martin Joseph, last year in 2002, the accumulated debt was \$430 million. The Minister of Public Utilities and the Environment and the Prime Minister told those WASA workers—about 4,000 of them—none of them were going home and that they should not worry about retrenchment. So even though there is a deficit in WASA, everybody is safe at WASA. Even though the accumulated debt at WASA is \$6 billion, Mr. Vice-President, nobody must go.

At Caroni (1975) Limited, however, the Minister who earned his wealth and his income, as I understand it, by going through the sugar industry when he was a younger man, selling them cloth and renting them cloth—buy now, tomorrow come back. [*Interruption*] He rented cloth to them. The sugar workers and the poor people made the hon. Minister what he is today! He is a wealthy “fella”! That is a Minister who has apparently forgotten the bridges that he has crossed. He intends to burn those bridges. He has forgotten his past. It really hurts me when, for instance, a Minister like the Hon. John Rahael could be so insensitive and brutal in his approach to these workers. I want to know if the hon. Minister really has children! He cannot be so heartless and brutal!

Mr. Vice-President, Minister Rahael is just moving in an insensitive, careless and reckless manner. I want to know if he is drunk with power because I never knew him to be such a person! He was always the decent type, all of a sudden he is drunk with power and he is doing everything and anything. So, Mr. Vice-President, what I am saying is that there is a process involved in retrenching workers. The process is being manifestly subverted by the hon. Minister in his haste to destroy the lives of 10,000 workers.

Mr. Vice-President, the International Labour Organization (ILO) has established standards. There is one on the termination of workers' employment and that, too, has been violated by the Minister of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources in this haste to get rid of workers. It is immoral; it is inhumane to proceed in the way the Minister is proceeding to close down an entire industry.

Caroni (1975) Limited Workers
[SEN. MARK]

Tuesday, July 08, 2003

Mr. Vice-President, people are getting the impression that the Ministry of Labour and Small and Micro Enterprise Development and the PNM is on a racial agenda. They are of the view that they are out to get rid of these people in the industry because they support the UNC. *[Interruption]* I am saying that is the conclusion that people are coming to. You are prepared to get rid of the people merely because of their race! I am saying if that is true, it is the wrong approach. Do not tell me that you are prepared to give the Community-based Environmental Protection and Enhancement Programme (CEPEP) \$400 million to cut grass and to paint stones and at the end of the day—*[Interruption]* I am supporting CEPEP, I want to represent them! What I have problems with is the big shots and bigwigs who are making plenty money off CEPEP. That is the problem I have! Give the workers protection; that is what I am saying!

I am of the view, for instance, that if there is a shortfall in Caroni (1975) Limited—nobody is against restructuring in Caroni (1975) Limited, what the Minister has to do is to sit with the unions—apparently he is a hater of unions! He does not want to meet with the unions! He does not understand that unions have a role to play in national development. If one is going to restructure an industry one has to sit with the unions and the workers and arrive at some kind of consensus but the Minister is not doing that. The Government has a responsibility to carry out economic development programmes but he must do so with a human face.

Mr. Vice-President, nobody is arguing about restructuring. If you could give CEPEP \$400 million and no returns come in, but in Caroni (1975) Limited you are taking away \$600 million to send 9,000 workers home, from an industry that is earning foreign exchange at this time—*[Interruption]* It earns foreign exchange. You see people who do not understand history are condemned to repeat it. People who are well off, through the exploitation of ordinary people, are insensitive and almost impervious to their cries and their needs. It is until there is a revolution and an upturn, when people start to do things that people like John, the hon. Minister, would get the message. Do you feel that you could take advantage of people all the time? Do you feel because you have some power today, you could wield your power like a big stick and do people what you want? They would come after you after a while and I would help them. *[Interruption]* Of course, I would help them! If you are not interested in the ordinary people why must I be interested in you? *[Interruption]* That is not true.

Mr. Vice-President, I am arguing on behalf of the workers. The UNC supports restructuring of Caroni (1975) Limited but we are violently opposed to the retrenchment of 10,000 workers in that industry. We call on the Government at

this eleventh hour to sit and talk to the workers; talk to the union; find a solution. Do not tell people that the Industrial Court told you to report by July 10, 2003 and all you are offering the workers between now and July 10, 2003 is VSEP. What kind of insensitivity is that? These are the things that would cause people to do things that you would not expect. If you have a Minister who is totally impervious; he is totally insensitive; he is reckless, Mr. Vice-President, he is going to leave people no choice! So I want to appeal to the Minister to try to be a little more sensitive; try to be a little more caring; he did and said a lot of unnecessary things. The Industrial Court has now told you, Minister, that you were wrong! The Minister was wrong and I want the hon. Minister to tell the Parliament that having regard to all that people have said, given all the experiences we have had and given his commitment to people, whether the Government is reconsidering its position as it relates to the restructuring of the industry to ensure that there is consensus at the end of the process. Everybody is for restructuring; we support restructuring but we cannot support the wholesale and wholesale retrenchment of 10,000 workers and those families.

Mr. Vice-President, I thank you very much.

The Minister of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources (Hon. John Rahael): Mr. Vice-President, once again the issue of Caroni (1975) Limited has brought me to this honourable Senate. The Motion in front of us: the imminent retrenchment of 10,000 workers employed by Caroni (1975) Limited by the Government in defiance of the ruling or order of the court is flawed. Mr. Vice-President, there is no imminent retrenchment of workers in defiance of any ruling by the Industrial Court. The Industrial Court has, in fact, ruled that the union and the company should meet again and report back to the Industrial Court by July 10, 2003. As of today, there were meetings held between the union and the company and discussions are taking place, as they have always taken place since March 2002.

I have already reported to this honourable Senate the various meetings that were held by all the unions representing all the different categories of workers of Caroni (1975) Limited. So to come here and say that the company has not met with the unions is wrong and far from the truth. I have given the dates of those meetings; I have reported to this honourable Senate the various unions that represent the various categories of workers in Caroni (1975) Limited, so that itself is also inaccurate, as most of what the hon. Sen. Wade Mark has said in the past 15 minutes.

Mr. Vice-President, it is because I care for the workers and because this Government cares for all the citizens of Trinidad and Tobago—[Desk

Caroni (1975) Limited Workers
[HON. J. RAHAEL]

Tuesday, July 08, 2003

thumping—that we are going about this restructuring in a very humane manner. It is not that the UNC did not have a plan for Caroni (1975) Limited. In another place, I produced evidence that the UNC government was going to shut down Caroni (1975) Limited and send all the workers home, based on the collective agreement that exists with the unions today. When I produced that in the other place they could not have responded because it was documented to the effect that all of the workers and the shut down of Caroni (1975) Limited was imminent. [Interruption] It was, Mr. Vice-President. It is this Government which has decided that we must restructure the sugar industry and give it an opportunity to survive. How are we to do that? We could only do that by taking certain actions.

I have repeatedly said here that we had to come out of the cultivation of cane and let private farmers produce cane. Mr. Vice-President, with the private farmers producing cane, we would have been in a position to purchase the raw material for the production of sugar at a more economical price. We talked about, instead of operating two factories to operate one. We looked at the entire sugar industry in a holistic manner. We also talked about the manner in which we purchased cane from the farmers. We are still having discussions with farmers with respect to purchasing cane by quality and not quantity, and they too are resisting that. Change is being resisted in everything even if it is for the betterment of the people involved and the country as a whole.

This Government, instead of going towards the collective agreement and disengaging all the workers of Caroni (1975) Limited, talked about giving an enhancement and VSEP so that they would be able to access a better package than what was agreed to between the union and the company. So we were able to give an enhancement at an average of 30 per cent more than what they are entitled to through the collective agreement—if we had gone the retrenchment route. In addition to all of that we talked about the various opportunities that the Government had put forward for the workers to access the whole question of training and retooling; all the various opportunities to get agricultural lands for those who wished to continue in agriculture.

As I say that, Mr. Vice-President, I am very happy to report that in the first quarter of 2003, as reported by the Central Bank, the GDP contribution to the economy was 1.4 per cent as compared to 0.4 per cent of the last quarter in 2002. What is also very significant is that the impetus of that contribution came, not from the energy sector but, primarily, from agriculture. [Desk thumping] So that we were able, Mr. Vice-President, after the continuing decline in agriculture—during the time when UNC was in power there was a constant decline in the

contribution to GDP in agriculture and we were able to stop that decline in 2002. The contribution to the GDP from agriculture in 2001 was 3.0 per cent and in 2002 it was 3.4 per cent. Already we are seeing a vast improvement in agriculture production and productivity in Trinidad and Tobago. This Government has now put agriculture on the front burner, not like the previous administration that totally ignored agriculture. They ignored the workers of Trinidad and Tobago who were involved in agriculture.

So, Mr. Vice-President, this Motion is flawed; the matter is still in front of the Industrial Court and I will not respond to it.

Sen. Mark: Mr. Vice-President, I just want, through you, to inform the hon. Minister of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources that he is misleading this Senate when he says that a Cabinet decision was taken or a report was submitted indicating retrenchment and closure of the industry. [*Interruption*] I am saying that he is misleading the Senate—[*Interruption*] I am on a point of order. He cannot produce any Cabinet decision that would show that happened. So he is misleading the Senate, Mr. Vice-President, and he should withdraw the statement.

Hon. J. Rahael: Mr. Vice-President, here we go again, it is either the hon. Senator is hard of hearing or maybe he fell when he was a child but I never said anything about Cabinet. I said that the UNC government was, in fact, going to do something based on a report that was agreed to by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Trade and Industry and Minister in the Ministry of Finance. I said that I laid it in another place and he can get the document there if he wished to see it.

Nevertheless, Mr. Vice-President, this matter is still in front of the Industrial Court and therefore I have no response to this Motion.

Thank you, Mr. Vice-President.

Question put and agreed to.

Senate adjourned accordingly.

Adjourned at 5.24 p.m.

Written Answer to Question

Tuesday, July 08, 2003

WRITTEN ANSWER TO QUESTION**Secondary Entrance Assessment
(Sufficient School Places)**

Pursuant to her reply to question 65, earlier in the proceedings, the Minister of Education (Sen. The Hon. Hazel Manning) caused to be circulated to Members of the Senate the following statistics:

CODE	SCHOOL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
436	Laventille Junior Life Centre	27	8	35
438	Carenage Junior Life Centre	14	11	25
	TOTAL-PORT OF SPAIN AND ENVIRONS	2068	1868	3936

DISTRICT 4 - ST. GEORGE EAST

CODE	SCHOOL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
001	Arima Government Secondary School	52	56	108
007	Brazil Government High School	24	17	41
008	Blanchisseuse Government High School	8	20	28
029	Hillview College, Tunapuna	109	0	109
033	Holy Cross College, Arima	70	0	70
047	Lakshmi Girls Hindu College	0	140	140
062	Pentecostal Institute of Learning	17	18	35
066	Qualitative School of Education	25	25	50
068	Rafeek Memorial TML	40	49	89
077	St. Augustine Girls High School	0	108	108
080	St. Charles Girls High School	0	30	30
083	St. Joseph's College	60	30	90
087	St. Dominic's Convent	0	30	30
085	St. George's College	48	49	97
097	St. Joseph's Convent, St. Joseph	0	114	114
117	San Juan Government Secondary School	54	54	108
120	Bon Air Government High School	89	89	178

Written Answer to Question

Tuesday, July 08, 2003

CODE	SCHOOL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
141	Tunapuna Government Secondary	52	52	104
143	A.S.J.A. Girls College–Tunapuna	0	70	70
202	Caribbean Union College	37	38	75
313	Aranjuez Junior Secondary School	242	213	455
317	Barataria Junior Secondary	228	274	502
329	Curepe Junior Secondary School	302	300	602
337	Five Rivers Junior Secondary School	220	217	437
345	Mount Hope Junior Secondary School	199	200	399
369	El Dorado Secondary School	109	107	216
370	El Dorado Secondary Comprehensive School	103	103	206
375	Barataria Secondary Comprehensive School	70	75	105
376	San Juan Secondary Comprehensive School	41	42	83
377	Malick Secondary Comprehensive School	35	36	71
442	Mound D'Or Junior Life Centre	17	18	35
091	Trinity College East	175	0	175
038	Bishop Anstey High School East	0	175	175
098	Ambi Career Institute	26	24	50
	TOTAL	2452	2774	5226

DISTRICT 5-ST. PATRICK

CODE	SCHOOL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
045	Iere High School, Siparia	42	40	82
056	Shiva Boys Hindu College	106	0	106
057	Point Fortin College	52	53	105
110	Holy Name Convent, Point Fortin	0	70	70
125	Palo Seco Secondary School	52	53	105
126	Parvati Girls' Hindu College	0	105	105

Written Answer to Question

Tuesday, July 08, 2003

CODE	SCHOOL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
127	Vessigny (Antilles) Secondary School	33	33	66
203	Fyzabad Anglican Secondary School	50	50	100
209	Holy Faith Convent, Penal	0	108	108
324	Cedros Composite School	60	60	120
353	Penal Junior Secondary School	221	169	390
354	Point Fortin Junior Secondary School	217	162	379
365	Siparia Junior Secondary School	137	102	239
374	Fyzabad Composite School	49	49	98
	TOTAL	1019	1054	2073

DISTRICT 6-SOUTH EASTERN

CODE	SCHOOL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
019	Cowen Hamilton Secondary School	55	56	101
040	Guayaguayare Secondary School	0	0	0
067	Rio Claro College	61	60	101
073	Rio Claro High School	52	53	105
109	St. Stephen's College	60	60	120
151	Tableland Government High School	29	31	60
342	Mayaro Composite School	98	90	188
344	Moruga Composite School	37	38	75
355	Princes Town Junior Secondary School	312	296	608
368	Tabaquite Composite School	32	34	66
464	Christ College	31	6	37
	TOTAL	767	724	1491

DISTRICT 7-VICTORIA

CODE	SCHOOL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
003	A.S.J.A. Boys College (San Fernando)	102	0	102
004	A.S.J.A. Girls College (San Fernando)	0	105	105
018	Debe Government High School	15	15	30
044	La Romaine Secondary School	89	87	176
049	Naparima College	103	0	103
053	Naparima Girls High School	0	117	117
065	Presentation College, San Fernando	111	0	111
070	A.S.J.A. Girls College (Barrackpore)	0	82	82
081	St. Benedict's College	105	0	105
101	St. Joseph's Convent	0	119	119
114	Open Bible High School	17	18	35
121	San Fernando Government Secondary	53	55	108
215	Southern Academy of SDA	40	40	80
318	Barrackpore Secondary School	100	104	204
320	Barrackpore Secondary Comprehensive	100	100	200
340	Gasparillo Composite School	30	32	62
341	Marabella Junior Secondary School	77	65	142
357	San Fernando East Junior Secondary School	222	222	444
359	Ste. Madeleine Secondary School	80	81	161
373	Williamsville Junior Secondary School	138	132	270
378	San Fernando Senior Comprehensive School	98	98	196

Written Answer to Question

Tuesday, July 08, 2003

CODE	SCHOOL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
346	Marabella Senior Comprehensive School	67	36	103
475	La Romaine Junior Life Centre	21	14	35
	TOTAL	1568	1522	3090

DISTRICT 8 - TOBAGO

CODE	SCHOOL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
013	Bishop's High School	60	63	123
040	Goodwood High School	39	48	87
075	Roxborough Composite	60	60	120
129	Scarborough Secondary School	74	74	148
379	Signal Hill Secondary Comprehensive School	74	74	148
128	Light and Life Pentecostal High School	59	73	132
048	Mason Hall	76	77	153
	TOTAL	442	469	911

In respect of Part (b) of Question 65, Government wishes to advise that not only are there sufficient places for all students who wrote the Secondary Entrance Assessment Examination held in April 2003 but given the availability of spaces in both public and private schools at the secondary level there now exists an excess of one thousand two hundred and forty three (1,243) school places nationally. However, in certain education districts there may still be shortfalls