

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 02, 2018

The House met at 1.30 p.m.

[MADAM SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

**COMMISSIONER OF POLICE
(NOMINATION OF MR. DEODAT DULALCHAN)**

The Prime Minister (Hon. Dr. Keith Rowley): Madam Speaker, I beg to move the following Motion:

Whereas section 123(3) of the Constitution of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, Chap. 1:01 (“the Act”) provides that the Police Service Commission shall submit to the President a list of the names of the persons nominated for appointment to the office of Commissioner or Deputy Commissioner of Police;

And whereas section 123(4) of the Act provides that the President shall issue a Notification in respect of each person nominated under subsection (3) and the Notification shall be subject to affirmative resolution of the House of Representatives;

And whereas the Police Service Commission has submitted to the President the name Mr. Deodat Dulalchan as the person nominated for appointment to the office of Commissioner of Police;

And whereas the President has on the 26th day of January, 2018 issued a Notification in respect of the nomination;

And whereas it is expedient to approve the Notification:

Be it resolved that the Notification of the President of the nomination by the Police Service Commission of Mr. Deodat Dulalchan to the office of Commissioner of Police be approved.

Madam Speaker, it is with a certain amount of anticipation and expectation that the population received this information in recent weeks, or I should say days, because, Madam Speaker, we have been waiting for this opportunity to close this matter for approximately five years. The last time there was a substantive officer in the post of Police Commissioner was at the time when we had the Canadian, Dr. Dwayne Gibbs—

Hon. Member: 2012.

Hon. Dr. K. Rowley: That was 2012, and since then, since the conclusion of those contracts prematurely a vacancy existed for the Commissioner of Police. And, Madam Speaker, if there is any development that indicates the dysfunctionality in certain aspects of the governance of this Republic, this particular matter highlights such dysfunctionality because we have been captured by a process which required all kinds of interpretations.

From where I came from, Madam Speaker, as Opposition Leader, where I have expressed on many occasions that this process is unacceptable and that it will amount to no good, I recommended then that we do away with it and offered support for a change. On becoming Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago, and trying to accelerate the process, the first hurdle I discovered in the process was that there appeared to be nobody really responsible for it, and as you try to push this stone up the hill, monumental excuses appeared. It was not the Prime Minister's Office, it was not the DPA, it was not the Commission, and it was not the Commissioner. The end result is that the process took a very long

time to get to where we are today. It has also been a very expensive exercise, but the population expected that having got to where we are with what I just read out, that we would comfortably move into someone occupying the position as the Commissioner and put an end to this situation of us not having in the post an officer so appointed. In the meantime, we have had the situation of acting appointments, and a lot has been said about that. I need not repeat, but it had the effect of contributing to the under-performance of the police service.

Madam Speaker, I simply want to repeat that it is not in dispute that the agency of the State that is responsible for policing the State under law is the police service. There is no other agency that is so authorized to carry out law enforcement in Trinidad and Tobago than the police service and, therefore, every citizen has an interest in the effective functioning of the police service. So, when we get to the point of wanting to appoint a Commissioner and Deputy Commissioners of the service, every citizen has an interest, Madam Speaker. Today, it is with great disappointment that I have to ask this House to acknowledge that we are not in a position to conclude this process to the satisfaction of the wider national community. One of the problems that the current police service faces is a lack of confidence in the service, an absence of trust between the service and the population. And it was our anticipation that with the coming of a Commissioner of Police, that these two impediments would have been addressed in some small measure, to begin to build a new tomorrow in Trinidad and Tobago and to restore into our community, a police service whose leadership is beyond reproach.

Madam Speaker, suffice it to say that as Prime Minister, I, like the man in the streets in Couva, Cedros or Scarborough, had to rely on what was published

Commissioner of Police
(Hon. Dr. K. Rowley)

2018.02.02

as speculation or inside information in the newspaper or on the television, because the process allows me and my team, the Government, no insight or involvement in this process. So, when the process is closed and it appears for the first time before me today, in this way, as against the background of all that has been said and all the disquiet that exists now in the population about the process, for this House to proceed without answers to the questions that have been raised is for the House to proceed without appropriate information that is required for the House to act appropriately, and for that trust to be based on a foundation of comfort that all is well in the State of Trinidad and Tobago.

Madam Speaker, I have seen it said that my colleagues on the other side have certain recommendations as to how we should proceed. I have no argument with those recommendations, whichever, but I simply want to say, Madam Speaker, that we are required under law to move forward with this process which has come through a number of hoops, over a number of hills, come to us in this House, to select a Commissioner of Police, in a time where the streets of Trinidad and Tobago are killing fields and the police service is in dire need of revolutionary leadership. Madam Speaker, in order to allow this House to make that decision in a way that would satisfy the population, it is my view that the House needs assistance; assistance to have questions answered before the House proceeds any further, and it is on that basis, Madam Speaker, that I recommend to my colleagues in this House that we revert to section 50(3) of the Standing Orders so that the House can be assisted. [*Desk thumping*]

Madam Speaker: Leader of the House.

The Minister of Planning and Development (Hon. Camille Robinson Regis): Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, in accordance with

Commissioner of Police
(Hon. Dr. K. Rowley)

2018.02.02

Standing Order 50(3), I beg to move that this debate be adjourned to a later date to enable a special select committee to obtain further information that may be necessary in accordance with what was suggested by the Member for Diego Martin West, to obtain further information necessary to assist us in proceeding with this debate. Madam Speaker, I beg to move.

Mr. Lee: Madam Speaker, a point of order.

Madam Speaker: Point of order?

Mr. Lee: Standing Order 39, "Dispensing with Notice".

Madam Speaker: Hon. Member, in terms of your objection, it is overruled.

Mrs. Persad-Bissessar SC: The question with respect to the vote.

Madam Speaker: I am now going to.

Mrs. Persad-Bissessar SC: Thank you.

Question put and agreed to.

SPECIAL SELECT COMMITTEE (ESTABLISHMENT OF)

The Minister of Planning and Development (Hon. Camille Robinson-Regis): Madam Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 38(1)(1), I beg to move that a special select committee of the House be established with powers as set out in Standing Order 111, for the purpose of obtaining additional and particular information to enable the House of Representatives to consider the notification submitted to it by His Excellency, The President, pursuant to section 123 of the Constitution, and Madam Speaker, I would like to indicate, in addition to the powers as outlined in Standing Order 111, that it be resolved that this committee be mandated to obtain information, documentation and or evidence relevant to and/or touching and concerning the method, process,

criteria and considerations utilized by the Police Service Commission and/or the firm employed by the Police Service Commission in the selection of candidates for the position of Commissioner of Police and Deputy Commissioner of Police to enable the House of Representatives to consider the notification submitted to it by His Excellency the President pursuant to section 123 of the Constitution and that this select committee of the House report by March 31, 2018. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Question put and agreed to.

Mrs. Kamla Persad-Bissessar SC (Siparia): Thank you very much. [*Desk thumping*] Madam Speaker, I am sorry I do not have sight of the Motion, so I will have to rely on what you just read. We were passed a copy of what—

Mrs. Robinson-Regis: Sorry, Madam Speaker. The Motion was passed to the Chief, the Member for Pointe-a-Pierre, and it is exactly the Motion that I have put, so you do have sight of it.

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar SC: Madam, what I have sight of is something that says:

- (a) Obtain information, documentation and/or evidence, et cetera;
- (b) Report by—

Thank you.

Mrs. Robinson-Regis: So, you do not have “Be it resolved”.

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar SC: That is right, we do not have the resolution.

[Procedural Clerk passes document to Mr. Lee]

So, what is before the Parliament, as moved by the hon. Member and Leader of the House, Member for Arouca/Maloney, the question that has been put is:

Be it resolved that a Special Select Committee of the House be established for the purpose of obtaining additional and particular information to enable the House of Representatives to consider the Notification submitted to it by His Excellency the President pursuant to section 123 of the Constitution.

Madam Speaker, the hon. Member has given very little reason as to why this is to be done. Indeed, the hon. Prime Minister previously started debate on the Motion to approve the Notification from the President, and spoke of several extraneous matters. Now, this may be a very good strategy to constrain debate on this particular Motion. But, Madam Speaker, we do see merit in having a special select committee set up. And this is because the office of the Commissioner of Police is one of the most important offices in the country when it comes to our democracy and enforcement of law and order.

And this very important office, Madam Speaker, has—[*Interruption*] you know, let the Opposition have its say, the Government will always have its way, Madam Speaker. This is a very important Motion, and the process that will ensue thereafter is also very important. So that, why is it that you would support having a joint select committee, Madam? Why?

Mrs. Robinson-Regis: A special select.

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar SC: A special—my apologies. Why would we go under a Standing Order to have a special select committee established? Now, it is not very often this has happened in this Parliament to the best of my memory. We have had many JSCs, but very few, if any, special select committees.

And it is something that we will support, given that the office is so important; given that this office is really a very integral part of our democracy.

And from the time our independent Constitution came into being there was given that special insulation to a particular autonomous independent body to appoint a Commissioner and a Deputy Commissioner. The constitutional provisions are very clear and then those provisions were sort of interpreted and amplified in many decisions coming from on top on the Privy Council level, and through our own courts. Indeed recently, in the case of *Harrydath Maharaj v the Attorney General* where we had cause to take the Legal Notice of 2015, the Order for the selection process, several parts of that Order were struck down as unconstitutional, as being in some ways interfering with the independence of the Police Service Commission.

In 2007, this Parliament—not this particular Parliament, but the Parliament then in 2007—changed the Constitution, and that makes that office even so much important, because previous to 2007, the Police Service Commission had a lot of powers: To appoint, to promote, to transfer, to discipline, and so on. Those powers were taken away and given, to whom? The Commissioner of Police. And, the Police Service Commission remained only with two offices. The two top offices with respect to appointments, transfers and so on, discipline. And therefore, given the plenitude of powers of a Commissioner of Police, it is imperative that the process that was engaged in to arrive at any nomination coming before us and for us to approve that that process must have been transparent, it must have been fair [*Desk thumping*] and it must be such as to preclude any taint of interference.

That is what the law provides, and that is why this joint select committee now—this select committee under Standing Order 95 is so vital because there have been all kinds of allegations in the public domain. And we know, Madam

Speaker, there are allegations about—I would not want to involve the Chair—many of us in this Parliament, which are totally false. There are allegations coming about high offices, small offices that are totally false. I mean, I read last night a headline in the newspaper, it said:

“PSC”—Police Service Commission—“to be interrogated”—today.

Madam, not true, it could not happen, because first you have to establish a committee and so on. So, then everything that is in the public domain is true? But then it is not for us, it is not for us to judge the truth of whatever the allegations are. But what it is for us to do, is to ensure, as I say, there was a transparent process, there was due process and everything else that goes with it to get the best candidate as a Commissioner of Police with the plenitude of powers, and that is so vital, Madam Speaker. Because, again, Privy Council rules have told us, listen, if there is any hint or taint of any kind of interference, political or otherwise, if there is any flaw in the process by which this is done, there would be no trust, and there is no confidence in the top office for Commissioner of Police.

And so this very important office, Madam Speaker, for us to determine issues of fact and law, this committee will be able to do it. This select committee determines issues of fact. I mean, there are issues relating to a quorum. They are saying that three people are not a quorum, when the Constitution is very clear, our own Constitution, so that is an issue of law that can be determined very easily by the committee, that in any service commission, this is section 129(2) of our Constitution, the supreme law of the land:

“At any meeting of a Service Commission three members shall constitute a quorum.”

So again, I am saying, some issues of law—another lawyer might disagree and interpret this in a different way. I would interpret it and say:

“At any meeting of a Service Commission three members shall constitute a quorum.”

And so all these issues, that is an issue of law. And there are issues of fact. There are issues of fact as to the process that took place, and that is why this select committee is going to be so vital. This select committee can help us to get: information, documentation, evidence touching and concerning method, process, and this is where we are when we go to a select committee, we can get all the information, documentation, anything touching and concerning the method, the criterion that is utilized by the Police Service Commission.

So, whilst we take this, I would say, maybe unique step or unprecedented step, it is because we must ensure that there had been no compromise in the process. So, here we are, persons—a question of fact again, one of law—are raising questions about whether they applied for the post or did not apply for the post, did that really happen or not happen? And if it did happen, was it lawful? Was it *intra vires* the process that should have been followed?

2.30 p.m.

There are issues touching and concerning the quorum. I mentioned that before. Issues touching on and concerning the Police Complaints Authority sending documentary evidence to the service commission. What was that? Did they send it to the service commission only for this process or did they send documentary things about disciplinary charges being laid? Did they send it in 2011 when those things transpired or in 2012 or '13 or '14 or '15 or '16 or in '17, and was it properly sent? If you sent it for disciplinary should it go to the Police

Service Commission? The law is clear. If you are sending for disciplinary—I made the point in 2007, the law changed.

So if you are saying discipline someone, disciplinary charges, what does the law tell us? You send it to who? The Police Commissioner, because discipline of all officers on the rank of Commissioner of Police, again I am saying that is an issue of law, it is a question of law. And then, of course, there are all kinds of stories about one nominee being close to a member of the service commission. That raises a whole issue of bias, apparent bias [*Desk thumping*] which again we have to see, we have to see what really happened. What transpired? Is this true? Is it not true? And if it is true, what steps were taken? And if it is not true, was any other nominee being considered? Was anybody else? Have there been disciplinary charges against anybody else?

We must thank the media for exposing certain allegations. But are there any other nominees who may be similarly circumstanced with respect to reports going for disciplinary action. With reports going about, well I know you, you know. I am reading that one nominee, for example, has been—and this is where the select committee is going to help us. It is going to help us as to what process, what were the facts, what were the issues also.

So I am reading, for example, that one nominee, as I said, was close to someone else because he worked in the police service with this other nominee who is a policeman. But did he work with any other nominee or any other candidate? Because we have seen an exposé with respect to two of the nominees; two of the nominees, thanks to the media, we have seen all these exposés. As I say, I do not take everything I read or see on the media, whilst grateful for raising the concerns whether they are true or not.

So here we go, a joint select committee—

Mrs. Robinson-Regis: Select committee.

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar SC:—select committee, we are so used to joint select, Madam, I do apologize again. The select committee of the Parliament is the place where this Parliament, you know, and I think this is a very positive thing to happen, because we would really be utilizing a very strong and powerful tool in the hands of parliamentarians when we go to the select committee. And this is why I had written to the hon. Prime Minister when he sent me an email requesting a meeting to discuss this matter. I wrote to the hon. Prime Minister and I would like to put parts of this into the record because it justifies my support for having a select committee.

I refer to the matter—this is the request by the hon. Prime Minister for a meeting with the Opposition about the Commissioner of Police. I have taken note of the reports and so on.

The appointment of a Commissioner of Police is a matter of great and general public importance not only to the Opposition but to each and every citizen of the Republic.

Continuing:

The public of Trinidad and Tobago will only hold trust and confidence in a Commissioner who had been appointed by a process that was fair, transparent, open and subject to the highest degree of scrutiny. If the matters reported in the public domain are credible, I am sure you will agree that the process employed to select the proposed nominees falls short on this standard. This has resulted in the trial of the proposed nominees in the court of public opinion even before they are subjected to the process that the law provides for their consideration by the Parliament that is the ultimate decision maker.

So we are here in this House and not the Senate—I was part of the discussions when the law was changed in 2007, as I think the Member for Arouca/Maloney was also part of the committee for the Government side at that time, and this was very clear. It was then requested by the hon. Prime Minister and agreed to by the two sides that the hon. Prime Minister, late Prime Minister, may God rest his soul, Prime Minister Manning, that we should put in, this should only be dealt with, approved by or say “yea or nay” in the House, not in the Senate. And again, that issue of the parliamentary representation that the House was given that seniority to deal with this. It will stop here or go further from here.

And so, what is now “awash in the public domain”, the words used by the hon. Prime Minister, raises more questions than answers with respect to the process employed and the proposed nominees. And this is why, Madam Speaker, a select committee is the way to go.

Whilst the Opposition fully respects the independence to the Police Service Commission—

I am continuing, Madam, on the reasoning for this suggestion.

—and the requirement for ensuring that it is insulated from political interference in the performance of its functions, the Opposition is of the view that any meaningful dialogue between Government/Opposition in this matter in present circumstances can only be achieved if there is full disclosure to both Government and Opposition of details of the process that was employed by the Commission in selecting the proposed nominees.

Madam Speaker:

Further, having carefully considered all that has transpired, I respectfully suggest for the public interest requires there be full disclosure by the Police Service Commission in this matter.

And I see in the Motion for the select committee that we will be looking not only at the Police Service Commission but also the firm that was contracted by this Police Service Commission as to their methods, their process and so on. So, I said:

A Special Select Committee of the House should be established to expeditiously enquire into and report to the House on this matter. Such a committee will be empowered under the Standing Orders of the House to summon the Commission before it and seek your disclosure of all relevant material that was considered by the Commission in arriving at this decision.

And so, fixed timeline and so on for reporting.

So, Madam Speaker, we are here today for this select committee to do exactly that. There are other areas and issues that this select committee could help us clarify, whether they be issues of fact or whether they be issues of law. For example, can you apply for one post but, you know, is that lawful? Can you apply for one post but then be offered another one? For example, where you have different qualifications and we have the two Legal Notices from 2015, 218 and 219, one is the Qualification Criteria and the other notice had to do with the Selection Process Criteria.

So where you have qualifications for Commissioner of Police, different for Deputy Commissioner of Police, how come you then pick up, everybody applied or two applied for Commissioner of Police, if that is in fact true, and then say, hey, you know what, I am not trusting the Commissioner of Police. Can you do that? It is an *intra vires*, the remit, the powers, the jurisdiction of the Police Service Commission.

Issues again that the Select Committee can help us to deal with this issue that confronts us for us to be able to vote on it, “yea or nay”, has to do with the role and functions again. Are the functions and the roles of the Commissioner and the

Deputy Commissioner the same that you could pick one up and say do this or do that? Again, why was that done, what was the process and what is the law? What were the issues of law when it comes to that?

And then again goalpost being shifted in process. You say, horses in mid-stream being changed and so on. The application form, we have seen them. They specifically asked—there are three positions, COP, Deputy Commissioner or both. Is it that they applied for both? So I am saying in the allegations they did not. They just applied for one side—the whole issue of what they are applied for. Then now, because of the 2015 Order that was made, several things changed. So a lot of things out there in the public domain, in law, are in my respectful view erroneous.

So, for example, they are saying that the firm must give you a shortlist. The firm will give you a shortlist. You know, that part of the 2015 Order was struck down by the courts of this land as being ultra vires, and therefore it was removed, the part about the shortlist. So all these people now have to do, as based on the service commission, has to do—so is that true in law that all they have to do and all the firm has to do—*[Interruption]*

Madam Speaker: Hon. Member—

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar SC: Yes, Ma'am.

Madam Speaker: While I understand what you are doing and I am allowing you, I want you be careful that in here we are not doing what we—establishing the committee or even trying to foreshadow to the committee what they should enquire into and what the result should be. Okay. So just be careful.

Mrs. K. Persad-Bissessar SC: I am guided, Madam. I am saying there are questions and there are concerns which this committee could help us with, given the mandate that they would obtain additional information to help us obtain documentation, evidence and so on, to make sure that this process is transparent.

And so, Madam, I am saying, the select committee is the only way to go, because that is the only place we can get this type of information. I am just giving examples, examples of information. If the Police Service Commission must do one, two, three, four, five, did the police commission do one, two, three, four, five as contained in the Legal Notice 218, as contained in 219? I believe 219 has to do with the qualifications; Legal Notice 218 has to do with the selection.

Did the service commission comply with the law? Is their decision in keeping with the law *intra vires* the relevant pieces of law? That is how they should have operated. We do not know that given the concerns out there. I am saying, for example, the Legal Notice says, look send me a list and then we see someone saying, you know what, we should take the list sent by the firm and we must keep it in the same rank, but when you read the Legal Notice, again, a question of law. Did that happen? The Legal Notice says they sent you a list. The court struck down shortlist, just send a list of the persons assessed and so on. And then it is the service commission, did they do that according to the law? The service commission must then set up the order of merit list.

So there is some confusion there which I do believe the select committee and therefore, Madam Speaker, to cut a long story short, [*Laughter*] we support the establishment of the select committee. [*Desk thumping*]

The Minister of Finance (Hon. Colm Imbert): Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thought it was necessary to respond to the contribution of the Leader of the Opposition to put this matter into some historical perspective. But first, Madam Speaker, for the benefit of the viewing public may I just explain what Standing Order 50(3) is, because persons may not understand what we have done. And 50(3) deals with the adjournment of the debate in the House, which we have done. And therefore, what we have done is—[*Interruption*]

Madam Speaker: Member, just for some guidance, we are on now to the Motion under Standing Order 38(1) for the appointment of a select committee of the House under Standing Order 95. So we have completed what has happened. Let us, please, be guided by what we are about. Thank you.

Hon. C. Imbert: Most certainly, Madam Speaker, just adding some clarity for the viewing public. Now, with respect to the matter raised by the Member for—sorry the matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition in her contribution. The problem we find ourselves in today, and the reason why the hon. Prime Minister has introduced this Motion that this whole question of the notification be sent to a select committee, then properly put to the House by the Leader of Government Business, is the fact that in 2006 changes were made to the manner in which the Police Service Commissioner is selected and appointed and changes were made with respect to the persons who had the authority to appoint, discipline, promote and attend to matters of a similar nature with respect to the police service, Madam Speaker.

So we are here today debating a Motion introduced by the Member for Arouca/Maloney after an introduction by the hon. Prime Minister and it is necessary to understand why we have to send this matter to a select committee. In 2006, the—as I said, the procedure for the appointment of the service commission, and the appointment of a Police Commissioner and Deputy Police Commissioners—[*Crosstalk*]—Madam Speaker, please?

Madam Speaker: Member, I am sure you are sufficiently senior that you could ignore that, address to me and please proceed. [*Crosstalk*]

Hon. C. Imbert: Madam, I am indeed very experienced, but that drone over there disturbs everyone. [*Crosstalk*]

Madam Speaker: Please, Member. I think we have adopted a particular tone

already, and I would ask all Members to let us keep in that tone. Member please, direct your contribution to me. I will conduct the business at the order.

Hon. C. Imbert: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. So in 2006, the then Prime Minister, because of the situation in the country, in terms of dealing with the efficiency and the effectiveness of the police, and the incidence of crime at the time, there was a culmination of discussions between the Opposition and the Government of the day that led to the Police Service Act of 2006, and amendments to the Constitution, in particular 122A, 123A, 123B and so on. The whole thing arose from a matter raised by the hon. Prime Minister at the time, Mr. Manning in 2004, Madam Speaker. It was a long time in coming. The state, the genesis for the reason why a notification came to the Parliament today and a reason why we are asking for this matter to be considered—*[Interruption]*

Dr. Moonilal: Madam Speaker, Standing Order 48(1).

Madam Speaker: So Member, I am allowing you some leeway to develop what you are going to say. While I am not yet certain that it is relevant, what I want to caution though is that I am going to strictly enforce the rule against tedious repetition.

Hon. Member: Yeah!

Madam Speaker: So—*[Pause]*—in response, I have not heard anything as yet that has added to anything different to what has already been said. So be careful, I am going to strictly enforce the rule against tedious repetition. I say that to all Members. Please continue, Member for Diego Martin North/East.

Hon. C. Imbert: No problem, Madam Speaker. When the then Prime Minister wanted to reform the police service legislation, it required a special majority and I am sure this House has not heard that, that it required a special majority. And it required the support of the then Opposition, Madam Speaker, including the

Member for Siparia. And the then Prime Minister, Patrick Manning, deceased, approached the Opposition to get the special majority required to reform the Constitution and to reform the manner in which a Police Commissioner is appointed. Prior to that the Prime Minister had a veto, the Police Service Commission very quietly went about its business determining who in its opinion should be—

Mr. Lee: Madam Speaker, 48(1). [*Crosstalk*]

Madam Speaker: I would really appreciate when a Standing Order—somebody rises on a Standing Order that the Chair be allowed the opportunity to determine that objection. It is the right of any Member to raise an objection. Member for Diego Martin North/East, please proceed.

Hon. C. Imbert: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker—and to arrive at the place we are today where we are asking for this matter to go to a select committee. The Opposition had a certain demand and one of the demands of the Opposition is that the very process that is the subject of this Motion, that is now going to a select committee with the support of members opposite, was a demand of the then UNC Opposition, that we appoint a Police Commissioner in this way, that the Police Service Commission, the reconstituted Police Service Commission which would be a creature of Parliament, would send a notification to the President, it would come to the House for its approval. That was a demand of the then UNC Opposition.

So we find ourselves in this conundrum where after almost seven years and \$7 million we have reached a point where as the hon. Member for Siparia has pointed out that there are all sorts of issues in the public domain. There are all sorts of questions about the process and we find ourselves in such an unfortunate situation as a Parliament that we have no choice but to request that this matter be fully ventilated in the public as far as the rules of Parliament will permit, that

persons be summoned and be asked to come and explain exactly what transpired; that persons involved in the process would explain to the Parliament and to the public—because we expect that this select committee will be televised—explain to everyone who is questioning all that we have read in the newspapers and the media for the past week, we require a select committee to flesh this all out so that we would understand [*Desk thumping*] how we have found ourselves in this situation where after almost seven years and after an expenditure of \$7 million, the procedure that was insisted upon by the UNC Opposition, was forced upon the then PNM Government—[*Interruption*]

Madam Speaker: Member, I am not going to allow you to continue along that course. We are not going back to what has happened in a previous debate. That has passed. Please continue. Move on.

Hon. C. Imbert: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. It was just necessary to make the point, we are here because of the UNC. But be that as it may, Madam Speaker, the only way, the only way, we would find out what has transpired is through the process of a select committee. I am told that even though there may be members of the Police Service Commission who may no longer hold office, their term having expired, and because the process for the appointment of members of the Police Service Commission is now a parliamentary process. So in order to reappoint and make the service commission whole, a notification will have to come to this Parliament for Members to debate and approve appointments to the Police Service Commission and therefore there are vacancies and there are persons who were involved in the process who are no longer sitting members of the Police Service Commission.

But I am told and I believe that the Parliament now has the power of subpoena, has always had the power of subpoena, so that even though persons may

no longer be members of the commission, the Parliament can summon them to come and give evidence before the select committee and the country will then find out exactly what transpired in this fiasco that we find ourselves in. And therefore, I am heartened that the Leader of the Opposition has given full support, which I interpreted the hon. Members words to mean, the appointment of a select committee and what I would say, Madam Speaker, with that expression of support coming from the hon. Member for Siparia that we can get this show on the road and appoint this committee. I beg to move, Madam Speaker.

Dr. Roodal Moonilal (*Oropouche East*): Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, for the opportunity to join this limited debate. The last presenter, the Member for Diego Martin North/East took us, albeit, briefly but threatened to take us for a longer journey to the deceased Patrick Manning and the Police Act of the early part of the century. And, Madam Speaker, it is not my intention to speak about the history of these matters, only in response to the Member who spoke before me.

Madam Speaker, of course, the Member who spoke before me, the Member for Diego Martin North/East, bought with him the very familiar mantra of, blame the UNC, blame Siparia and respectfully I say, blame Kamla. That is what he brought. [*Desk thumping*]

Notwithstanding that, Madam Speaker, we expected that—[*Interruption*]

Madam Speaker: Member, one minute. And this is just an observation. I have realized, apparently Members do not realize that when they speak, even if they are quoting something, it is their speech. Okay. And a certain practice is developing and I would want us to refrain from that. If we are speaking about a Member here, the rules tell us how we do it. Okay? So that this sort of practice of adopting somebody else's speech is ours when we say it here. Please.

Dr. R. Moonilal: Madam Speaker, thank you. I dare not repeat your words, but I

understand them. Madam Speaker, the matter before us now is a matter for the Motion to appoint a select committee of this House for a specific purpose. I must confess that earlier in the proceedings I myself had a difficulty following the order of the procedure by the Government, in particular, because we did have a situation where the Member for Diego Martin North/East rose and then had to prematurely take his seat to allow the Member for Diego Martin West to speak.

Madam Speaker, as I understand it [*Crosstalk*] and I just want to say for the record what I understand the process to be.

Madam Speaker: Overruled, please continue.

Dr. R. Moonilal: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I just want to explain what I understand the process to be, so I would be very clear on my own presentation. As I understood it, the Member for Diego Martin West opened the debate on the Motion to affirm the notification from His Excellency the President. The Member for Diego Martin West opened that debate and the Leader of the House adjourned that debate.

Mr. Al-Rawi: Madam Speaker, 48—you have ruled on this similarly for my colleague.

Madam Speaker: Okay, so, Member for Oropouche East, as I indicated earlier, we are not going back to the earlier debate that has been adjourned. We are now with respect to this Motion for the appointment of a select committee. So all who have been confused about the procedure, I think that has been settled and let us deal with what is before us now, please.

Dr. R. Moonilal: Madam Speaker, I will move on to the Motion that is before me which is a specific Motion dealing with an amendment to the substantive Motion.

Be it resolved that this Committee to be appointed—[*Interruption*]

Madam Speaker: Excuse me, there is no amendment to any substantive Motion

before us. There is a Motion before us. There is no amendment. And a Motion has already been adjourned, we have gone on to a new Motion. So I am not going to allow you to continue with your misconception. I hope it is now clear. Please continue.

Dr. R. Moonilal: Thank you very much on the clarification. So the second Motion before us deals with the establishment of a select committee mandated to obtain information, documentation and or evidence relevant to and/or touching and concerning the method, process, criteria and considerations utilized by the Police Service Commission and/or the firm employed by the Police Service Commission in the selection of candidates for the position of Commissioner of Police and Deputy Commissioner of Police to enable the House of Representatives to consider the notifications submitted to it by His Excellency the President, pursuant to section 123 of the Constitution. That is the Motion before us.

Madam Speaker, as the Member for Siparia indicated, those of us in the Opposition certainly did not have the time to read, to study and to internalize and prepare for the debate the Motion before us, this Motion on the select committee. It came very late obviously and now we have it in our hands to discuss. You see, Madam Speaker, we are debating this Motion, dealing with the establishment of a select committee against a back drop of something else which I will not speak about because that has gone.

Madam Speaker, a select committee of Parliament is indeed a very unique entity established with a very limited set of objectives and, Madam Speaker, it has a particular role that we all agree, is an important role and not wanting to get into history but this actually is a culmination of a greater desire and a greater objective to see greater and greater transparency in the affairs of Government and Parliament, so that the population as a whole can feel that there is no issue of lack

of disclosure, no issue of corruption, as the case may be, misconduct, et cetera.

3.00 p.m.

And when this debate was taking place years ago I was also on the compound at that time and there was this zeal to see our Parliament go in the direction, for better or for worse, of the American Congressional system where a subcommittee of the American Congress would meet to discuss appointments and so on—

Mr. Deyalsingh: Madam Speaker, Standing Order 48(1) and 55(1) (b).

Madam Speaker: Please continue. I will give you a little leeway.

Dr. R. Moonilal: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So the intention then was to reach to this stage and I am happy that today the Parliament has, indeed—the Eleventh Parliament—has reached a stage like this. The Leader of the Opposition has made this recommendation to the Prime Minister and the Government has accepted the wisdom of the recommendation from the Member for Siparia, and we are here.

Madam Speaker, regrettably, I understand and appreciate the words of the Member for Diego Martin North/East who spoke on this matter and the importance of a select committee. A select committee can examine policies, administration, even matters of finance. A select committee could examine that.

Mr. Deyalsingh: Madam Speaker, Standing Order 55(1) (b).

Dr. R. Moonilal: Madam Speaker, a select committee can—

Madam Speaker: Please continue, Member for Oropouche East.

Dr. R. Moonilal: Madam Speaker, it will be a busy afternoon for myself and you. Madam Speaker, these select committees can do something further. They can decide among themselves on a line of enquiry and pursue it, as the Member for Siparia said. But I want to get into one issue because they will jump up at a moment's notice on repetition. Given the goodwill that appears to exist on this

matter, the fact that the Government has accepted the advice of the Leader of the Opposition given that the Government has now advanced this Motion and, clearly, those of us on this side, we suspect them, but we will agree that this is the right way to go, I would also ask the Government to consider, given this goodwill, given the fact that there seems to be an agreement over this matter, to when, at a time relevant to this matter, that we consider establishing a select committee with equal numbers from the Government and equal numbers from the Opposition. [*Desk thumping*] That would be the logical—

Madam Speaker: Hon. Member, are you moving a Motion to amend?

Dr. R. Moonilal: Madam Speaker, I am merely making a suggestion for those on the other side, with wisdom. And given the gravity of the matter, as both sides agree now, why not appoint a committee with equal membership [*Desk thumping*] to build consensus on this matter? It is a humble suggestion. They can snigger, they can quarrel, they can groan, that is my humble suggestion.

You see, Madam Speaker, the select committee can act in this case as a review of what has happened at the Police Service Commission involving a consultant company, and so on. It can act as a review on finance administration policy. But if we carry partisan politics into this committee, I am afraid we will undermine the very objective of the committee. [*Desk thumping*] This matter should not involve politics. It should involve wisdom, and involving wisdom means that you should have some parity between the Government and the Opposition, if only on this matter. Because what is the purpose to put a committee of 10 and say, well, the Opposition will have one and the Government will have nine? What is that? Just to go and talk? Clearly, we need to look at assembling the numbers in parity.

Madam Speaker, while I welcome this initiative of the Government—I

welcome it—it is a pity that while there was so much news, information; this country was awash with information—awash with information on other matters in the energy sector—fake oil and so on—they rejected the appointment of a joint select committee to deal with fake oil. [*Interruption*]

Madam Speaker: Member, I am not going to permit you to speak about anything else other than the select committee proposed for this particular purpose. Okay? So that if you can move on to your next point, I will be willing to entertain you.

Dr. R. Moonilal: Madam Speaker, the joint select committee plays a wide-ranging role notwithstanding a limited mandate. And such committees can, and do, provide guidance—[*Interruption*] This man is now counting my words?

Madam Speaker: So Member, we are not on a joint select committee. We are on a select committee. I would ask you to move on to your next point. I think everybody has spoken to the benefits of the select committee. If you move on to your next point I will, again, be willing to hear you.

Dr. R. Moonilal: Madam Speaker, just on a point of clarification. Would I be permitted a minute or two to respond to the Member for Diego Martin North/East's issues of the Police Act that he raised, the matter of former Prime Minister, Patrick Manning's involvement with the Opposition at that time, with the UNC Opposition—

Madam Speaker: Member, please move on. I circumscribed the Member for Diego Martin North/East with respect to that. Please move on to your other points.

Dr. R. Moonilal: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Could I just—in responding only to what is being said in the select committee Motion, the Government indicated through the Prime Minister and through the Member for Diego Martin North/East, that arriving at this Motion to establish a select committee—the specific Motion—they arrived at this Motion because of

information in the public domain. It was not a Motion arrived at, at the end of a debate on the matter. Sometimes you have a debate on a matter and it is felt that the matter is so complicated, the matter is so comprehensive, we must make a select committee to further deal with the matter. This is an interesting point. We entered into the formation of a select committee at the beginning—

Madam Speaker: Member, you have already said about how special the process is. I am not going to allow you to go back to the initial debate, and therefore if you could move on to your other points, please.

Dr. R. Moonilal: Madam Speaker, the other point I wish to raise—and this is a specific point on this—is the deadline for this matter. I think I can raise that because that is pertinent. The Government, having made a Manifesto commitment to appoint a Police Commissioner; the Government, having provided this population with a promise that by December last we would have a Commissioner of Police in place, will now go to this select committee, and has indicated that the deadline they are looking at is March 31st. Madam Speaker, we are now on February 02nd, I believe. We have the Carnival break coming up. One is not sure how that will work with parliamentary meetings and so on, and to ask whether the Government, in any way, would use this process to further delay the appointment of a Commissioner of Police. Because the select committee needs to work quickly to ensure that this matter is dealt with expeditiously [*Desk thumping*] and cannot further create or add to, or even manufacture a crisis on this matter.

Mr. Deyalsingh: Madam Speaker, Standing Order 48(6).

Madam Speaker: Member, please continue.

Dr. R. Moonilal: Madam Speaker, this distraction is causing me—

Madam Speaker: Member, please continue.

Dr. R. Moonilal: This can impair my health the way they are jumping up there.

So, Madam Speaker, my point, really, is that we need to watch the timeline, whether it is realistic or not, and if March 31st is realistic, given the bulky nature of this—I do not want to repeat it; it is already in the record three times. Given what they are asking this committee to do, whether March 31st is realistic or not, or that is just a guise to come March 30th and extend for six months, and three months, then the parliamentary year comes to an end, then you go into the next parliamentary year, the next fiscal year, the budget comes and this matter remains on the drawing board, on the table, for two/three years. [*Desk thumping*] Is that their objective? Madam Speaker, thank you. [*Desk thumping*]

Madam Speaker: Member for Point Fortin.

The Minister of National Security (Hon. Maj. Gen. Edmund Dillon): Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, thank you for allowing me the pleasure to join in this Motion to appoint a Special Select Committee. As Minister of National Security, I wish to let the public know that I have waited very long for the day when the nominee for the Commissioner of Police would be selected and debated in this House, and to a large extent, that date is up to this House and, in particular, the Members on the other side.

Madam Speaker, the Ministry of National Security has been in a period of waiting for this process to come to a stage of appointment for quite some time. We have waited almost seven years with respect to the appointment of a Commissioner of Police to an institution which I can say, with the greatest degree of honesty, is the agency responsible for law enforcement in Trinidad and Tobago. We are in an area where crime is foremost in our minds, where we are dealing with situations where the safety and security of Trinidad and Tobago is very important to each and every citizen of this country. And therefore, the institution that is there to safeguard that, the institution at the point of despair, the institution with the

responsibility for law and order and for security in Trinidad and Tobago, must be an institution that is governed and led in the proper way. And so the appointment of a Commissioner of Police, a substantive Commissioner of Police, is very important for this organization. It is so important that even in the process one must be very careful. And even in the selection process, one must be very—

Madam Speaker: Member for Point Fortin, remember we are just talking now about the select committee. So please, once again, I advise Members about the rule against tedious repetition, and this is not about crime or anything else. It is about the appointment of a select committee.

Hon. Maj. Gen. E. Dillon: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, it is therefore important that in terms of the Motion to appoint this Special Select Committee that we adhere to certain timelines in the processes, but more importantly, that we treat with the issues particular within that Motion, because the issues have to do, and must concentrate on the whole process that took place that is before us. It is important that we, as a House, understand, but even more so as a people understand, what are the implication, what are the ramifications of the processes. And so the timeline is very important. Because, Madam Speaker, we have to understand that we are here to a large extent where the Minister of National Security was removed from the entire process and that, again, was an area to stymie the whole process based on the Opposition's intervention.

Mr. Lee: Madam Speaker, 48(1). That is not the Motion.

Madam Speaker: Member for Point Fortin, please continue on your other point.

Hon. Maj. Gen. E. Dillon: Madam Speaker, one can only look at what has happened in other jurisdictions with respect to the selection process of a Commissioner of Police to get an understanding that we are not unique in looking at certain kinds of attributes—ensuring there are certain kinds of attributes—that

have been part and parcel of the selection process. I can look for example—

Madam Speaker: Member, please, I am not going to let us talk about the selection process in this debate. Please move on to your other point.

Hon. Maj. Gen. E. Dillon: Sure, Madam Speaker. Therefore, let me concentrate then on the Special Select Committee. I believe that it is very important for us to move with that Special Select Committee because, again, as I said, it is so important for this House to participate in that process, for this House to have an understanding, for Members of this House on both sides to have an understanding as to what has transpired, to the extent where we have before us, nominees for a Commissioner of Police and two Deputy Commissioners of Police. It is important for us to understand that process for us to be able to vote—

Dr. Gopeesingh: Madam Speaker, 55(1) (b), please.

Madam Speaker: Member for Point Fortin, please move on to your next point.

Hon. Maj. Gen. E. Dillon: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I want to emphasize in terms of the deadline for this process, and the deadline is, and has been stated as the 31st of March. It is the deadline that is required to complete this process. [*Interruption*]

Madam Speaker: Please continue.

Hon. Maj. Gen. E. Dillon: Madam Speaker, this timeline is very important, and when one considers that it took us seven years, we are looking at, roughly, two months. It took seven years, so long under the Opposition, where they never even made attempts to appoint a substantive Commissioner of Police. We have seen that, in fact, the Acting Commissioner of Police has, in fact, been given until March 2018. So we are asking around the same timeline. We are asking for the same timeline—

Mr. Lee: Madam Speaker, 48(1), the relevance of the Acting Commissioner.

Madam Speaker: Please continue, Member for Point Fortin.

Hon. Maj. Gen. E. Dillon: Madam Speaker, the timeline that we are asking for is no different from the time that has been given to the Acting Commissioner of Police who holds the office at this point in time, the 31st of March. So therefore, I see no contention whatsoever—no contention from the other side—with respect to our demand, our request for the 31st of March deadline. It will give us sufficient time in the Special Select Committee to really and truly satisfy ourselves without any doubt and become comfortable in the selection of that very important position, the Commissioner of Police and Deputy Commissioner of Police.

In addition to that, we have to also understand that we are treating with governance and leadership of the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service. At the end of the day what we do in this House, what we do at the Special Select Committee, will have implications to the governance and leadership of the Trinidad and Tobago Police Service. So we must, with due diligence, carry out our jobs as parliamentarians, efficiently and effectively. If it is one area that we must share commonality, if it is one area that this House should come together with Madam Speaker, it is this important Motion before us to go before that Special Select Committee with a singleness of purpose to ensure the security of the people of Trinidad and Tobago. [*Desk thumping*] Madam Speaker, I therefore say, let us remember the importance of this Motion. Let us stick by our deadline. We are saying that the 31st of March, 2018, is the time by which we can deal with this. Let us do so for the benefit of the people of Trinidad and Tobago.

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

Madam Speaker: Member for Arouca/Maloney.

The Minister of Planning and Development (Hon. Camille Robinson-Regis):

Thank you very kindly, Madam Speaker. The Motion that is before us is very

clear. It is for the establishment of a select committee of the House of Representatives. I have heard the Member for Oropouche East and other Members on the side opposite to this, saying, sotto voce, that we must have equal Members in terms of the composition of the select committee. Madam Speaker, one thing I would like to just say is, when we have equal numbers on both sides, we will have equal numbers in the select committee. Until then, and until we change the Standing Orders, the Standing Orders will prevail. [*Desk thumping*] We do not have equal numbers. We are in the majority. You are in the minority. And let me just refer you to Standing Order 96:

“Composition and Chairmen of Select Committees”

Standing Order 96:

- “(1) Every Select Committee shall be so constituted as to ensure, as far as is possible, that the balance of parties in the House is reflected in the Committee.
- (2) In computing the balance of the parties—
- (a) Parties which are in a coalition will be treated as one group...”

So that would mean the UNC and the one Member of the one COP, who is the COP, you are that coalition.

“Parties which are in a coalition will be treated as one group; and

- (b) Opposition parties with fewer than three (3) Members and Independent Members will altogether be treated as one group.
- (3) Where a Member of a Select Committee dies or for any other reason his seat becomes vacant, then, subject to the preceding paragraph, the Speaker shall appoint another Member in his place.
- (4) Except as otherwise provided by these Standing Orders or by special direction of the House, a Select Committee may elect a Chairman

from among its Members.

- (5) Before participating in the consideration of any item of business before a Committee in which he has a financial interest, a Member should disclose the extent of that interest.”

That is the end of Standing Order 96, so that puts to rest equal numbers. Standing Order 95:

- “(1) The House may, from time to time, appoint Special Select Committees.
- (2) A Special Select Committee shall be appointed by Order of the House which shall specify the terms of reference of the Committee and shall consist of such Members as may be directed by Order of the House and, in the absence of such direction shall consist of such Members as may be chosen by the Speaker.”

Madam Speaker, that issue of us having equal numbers is not on. The Standing Orders do not allow for it and at this time, we have 23; you have 18. And let me just make the additional point that these Standing Orders, the committee was chaired by then Speaker, Wade Mark, who is now a Member of the Senate, who continues to be a Member of the UNC. You agreed to this. Thank you very much. [*Desk thumping*]

Madam Speaker, may I just make one other point. The Member for Oropouche East again made the point that it is very important for us to have a Police Commissioner and we are in full agreement. But I just want to remind those on the opposite side that they are on record as saying that it is better to have an Acting Commissioner because he would work more effectively.

Hon. Member: Who “say” that?

Hon. Member: Anand Ramlogan.

Hon. C. Robinson-Regis: The Attorney General under the Member for Siparia. [*Crosstalk*] Yes, but you have never refuted that point. [*Crosstalk*]

Madam Speaker: Order! Order!

Mrs. Persad-Bissessar SC: Rear-view mirror. [*Crosstalk*]

Madam Speaker: Member for Arouca/Maloney.

Hon. C. Robinson-Regis: Thank you very kindly, Madam Speaker. So, Madam Speaker, whereas at the conclusion of the tenure of Commissioner Gibbs, there did not seem to be any haste in appointing a Commissioner—

Dr. Gopeesingh: 48(1), Madam Speaker, irrelevance.

Madam Speaker: Continue.

Hon. C. Robinson-Regis: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Yes, there did not seem to be any haste at that time. Now, whereas the Member for Diego Martin West has said very clearly that the information in the public domain suggests that there are some concerns with regard to what has taken place and there is a clear need for the House to have a committee to examine exactly what took place, the date of March 31st is a date that we are certain the Members of the committee can meet and, of course, given the Standing Orders, if there is a need to extend, which we anticipate there would not be, that they can come to the House and ask for an extension.

Madam Speaker, we were very clear in moving this Motion. We said that the committee would be mandated to obtain information, documentation, evidence, touching and concerning the method, process, criterion, considerations used not only by the Police Service Commission, but also by the firm employed. And just on that issue, I would like to make the clear point that the Order that went out with regard to the President under 123(2), the Order was quite clear, and it said:

“The selection process for appointment to the offices of Commissioner of

Police and Deputy Commissioner of Police shall be conducted in the following manner:

- (a) the Commission on request of the Minister of National Security shall, in accordance with section 20A (1) (c) of the Central Tenders Board Act, contract an appropriate local firm (hereinafter referred to as ‘the Firm’) to conduct a recruitment process including inviting applications for the positions;
- (b) the Firm shall select, from the applications received, the most suitable candidates for the assessment process;” [*Interruption*]

Madam Speaker: Member, I would ask, therefore, you leave all of that work for the work of the Committee, please.

Hon. C. Robinson-Regis: Madam Speaker, I would like to indicate the concern that the commission work diligently to adhere to what was requested of it, and that is in the letter that we all received with the documents that we got with the notification. But one point that was of particular interest to those on this side, and to the Members of this side, was what was said at the last page of the letter of the Chairman of the Commission which was:

All applicants at this stage were interviewed for the position—

Mr. Lee: Madam Speaker, 48(1), please.

Madam Speaker: Member, again, I ask that the work that we are setting out for the committee be left out of the debate, please.

Hon. C. Robinson-Regis: Madam Speaker, if you so desire, but I am just trying to place on—

Hon. Member: You are challenging the Speaker?

Hon. C. Robinson-Regis: I am not challenging the Speaker. I have never done that, as matter of fact. As Leader of the House, I would never do that. [*Desk*

thumping]

Madam Speaker: Member, please continue on your other point and—[*Crosstalk*] while I understand that everybody is very eager and excited, I will ask people to please comply with the Standing Orders. Member for Arouca/Maloney, you have a few minutes left to wind up, if you could continue on your other point please.

Hon. C. Robinson-Regis: Thank you. Madam Speaker, one of the issues that was of concern and that was within the public domain was the issue that there may have been the possibility that the assessment centre was only geared for assessing the Commissioner of Police and that is why the position of Commissioner—and that is why in the request for the select—

Hon. Member: The committee will deal with that.

Hon. C. Robinson-Regis:—the request for the select committee, we have included as part of the mandate, issues touching and concerning, and the considerations utilized by the Police Service Commission and the firm employed by the Police Service Commission in the selection of the candidates. And that is of particular importance in terms of the mandate of this select committee.

3.30 p.m.

And, Madam Speaker, I again commend this Motion to the House. I am very pleased to see that the Member for Siparia is in agreement with a select committee being appointed, and based on what has been said by those of us on this side and by the Member for Siparia, I beg to move. [*Desk thumping*]

Question put and agreed to.

Madam Speaker: Leader of Government Business.

Hon. C. Robinson-Regis: Thank you very kindly, Madam Speaker. I now beg to move that the following Members be appointed to serve on the Special Select Committee of the House that has been established for the purpose of obtaining

additional and particular information to enable the House of Representatives to consider the notification submitted to it by His Excellency the President pursuant to section 123 of the Constitution.

Mr. Fitzgerald Hinds

Mr. Randall Mitchell

Miss Nicole Olivierre

Mr. Terrence Deyalsingh

Mr. Ganga Singh

Dr. Roodal Moonilal

Question put and agreed to.