

National Assembly Debates

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF THE FIRST SESSION (2001) OF THE EIGHTH PARLIAMENT OF GUYANA UNDER THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CO-OPERATIVE REPUBLIC OF GUYANA

16TH SITTING

2.00 PM

Thursday, 16th August, 2001

MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY (68)

Speaker (1)

The Hon. Hari N. Ramkarran, S. C., M. P. - *Speaker of the National Assembly*

Members of the Government - People's Progressive Party/Civic (34)

- | | |
|--|--|
| The Hon. Samuel A.A. Hinds, M.P. | - <i>Prime Minister and Minister of Public Works and Communications (Absent - performing the functions of the Office of President)</i> |
| The Hon. Reepu Daman Persaud, O.R., J.P., M.P. | - <i>Minister of Parliamentary Affairs</i> |
| The Hon. Clement J. Rohee, M.P. | - <i>Minister of Foreign Trade and International Co-operation</i> |
| The Hon. Harripersaud Nokta, M.P. | - <i>Minister of Local Government and Regional Development</i> |
| The Hon. Gail Teixeira, M.P. | - <i>Minister of Culture, Youth and Sport</i> |
| The Hon. Dr. Henry B. Jeffrey, M.P. | - <i>Minister of Education</i> |
| The Hon. Saisnarine Kowlessar, M.P. | - <i>Minister of Finance</i> |
| The Hon. Shaik K.Z. Baksh, M.P. | - <i>Minister of Housing and Water</i> |
| The Hon. Navindranauth O. Chandarpal, M.P. | - <i>Minister of Agriculture (Region No. 4-Demerara/Mahaica)</i> |
| The Hon. J. Ronald Gajraj, M.P. | - <i>Minister of Home Affairs (Region No. 3-Essequibo Islands/West Demerara)</i> |
| The Hon. Rev. Dr. Ramnauth D.A. Bisnauth, M.P. | - <i>Minister of Labour, Human Services and Social Security</i> |
| The Hon. Clinton C. Collymore, M.P. | - <i>Minister in the Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development</i> |

Thursday, 16th August, 2001

The Hon. Satyadeow Sawh, M.P.	- Minister of Fisheries, Other Crops and Livestock (Region No. 5 - Mahaica/Berbice) (Absent)
*The Hon.S.Rudolph Insanally, O.R, C.C.H, M.P.	- Minister in the Office of the President with responsibility for Foreign Affairs (Absent)
*The Hon. Doodnauth Singh, S.C., M.P.	- Attorney General and Minister of Legal Affairs (Absent)
The Hon. Dr. Jennifer R.A. Westford, M.P.	- Minister of the Public Service
The Hon. C. Anthony Xavier, M.P.	- Minister of Transport and Hydraulics
The Hon. Bibi S.Shadick, M.P.	- Minister in the Ministry of Labour, Human Services and Social Security (Region No. 3 - Essequibo Islands/ West Demerara)
**The Hon. Manzoor Nadir, M.P.	- Minister of Tourism, Industry and Commerce
The Hon. Carolyn Rodrigues, M.P.	- Minister of Amerindian Affairs
The Hon. Dr Leslie S. Ramsammy, M.P.	- Minister of Health
Mr S. Feroze Mohamed, M.P.	- Chief Whip
Mr Cyril C. Belgrave, C.C.H., J.P., M.P.	- (Region No. 4 - Demerara/Mahaica)
Mr. Donald R. Ramotar, M.P.	- (Absent)
Mr Husman Alli, M.P.	- (Region No. 7 - Cuyuni/Mazaruni)
Mr. Komal Chand, C.C.H., J.P., M.P.	- (Absent)
Mrs Indranie Chandarpal, M.P.	
Mr Bernard C. DeSantos, S.C., M.P.	- (Region No.4 - Demerara/Mahaica) (Absent)
Mrs Shirley V. Edwards, J.P. M.P.	
Mr Odinga N. Lumumba, M.P.	
Mr Heeralall Mohan, M.P.	- (Region No.2 -Pomeroon/Supenaam)
Mr Ramesh C. Rajkumar, M.P.	- (Region No. 6 - East Berbice/ Corentyne)
Mr Kumkaran Ramdas, M.P.	
Mr Khemraj Ramjattan, M.P.	- (Region No. 6 - East Berbice/ Corentyne)
Dr Bheri S. Ramsaran, M.D., M.P.	
Mrs Philomena Sahoye-Shury, C.C.H, J.P, M.P.	- Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Housing and Water
Mrs Pauline R. Sukhai, M.P.	- (Region No.1 - Barima/Waini)

* Non-Elected Minister

** Elected Member from The United Force

Members of the Opposition (30)

(i) People's National Congress/Reform (27)

Mr. Hugh Desmond Hoyte, S.C., M.P.	- <i>Leader of the Opposition</i> (Absent)
Mr. Robert H. O. Corbin, M. P.	- (Absent)
Mr. Winston S. Murray, C.C.H., M.P.	- (Absent -on -Leave)
Mrs Clarissa S. Riehl, M.P.	- <i>Deputy Speaker of the National Assembly</i> (Absent)
Mr E. Lance Carberry, M.P.	- <i>Chief Whip</i> (Absent)
Mr Ivor Allen, M.P.	- (<i>Region No.2-Pomeroon/Supenaam</i>)
Mrs. Deborah J. Backer, M.P.	- (Absent)
Mr. Deryck M.A. Bernard, M.P.	- (Absent on Leave)
Mr. C. Stanley Ming, M.P.	- (Absent on Leave)
Mr. Raphael G. C. Trotman, M.P.	- (Absent)
Mr Vincent L. Alexander, M.P.	- (<i>Region No.4-Demerara/Mahaica</i>)
Mr. Andy Goveia, M.P.	- (Absent)
Mrs. Volda A. Lawrence, M.P.	- (Absent)
Dr Dagleish Joseph, M.D.,M.P.	- (Absent)
Miss Amna Ally, M.P.	- (<i>Region No.5-Mahaica/Berbice</i>) (Absent)
Miss Sandra M. Adams, M.P.	- (<i>Region No.10-Upper Demerara/ Berbice</i>) (Absent)
Mr. Jerome Khan, M.P.	- (Absent)
Dr George A. Norton, M.P.	- (Absent)
Miss Myrna E. N. Peterkin, M.P.	- (<i>Region No.4-Demerara/Mahaica</i>) (Absent)
Mr. James K. McAllister, M.P	- (<i>Region No.3-Essequibo Islands West Demerara</i>) (Absent)
Miss Lurlene A. Nestor, M.P.	- (<i>Region No.4-Demerara/Mahaica</i>) (Absent)
Mr Abdul Kadir, J.P., M.P.	- (<i>Region No.10-Upper Demerara/ Berbice</i>) (Absent)
Mr Ricky Khan, M.P.	- (<i>Region No.1-Barima/Waini</i>) (Absent)
Mrs. R. Bancroft, M.P.	- (<i>Region No.8 - Potaro/Siparuni</i>) (Absent)
Mr Nasir Ally, J.P., M.P.	- (<i>Region No.6 -East Berbice/Corentyne</i>) (Absent)
Miss Judith David, M.P.	- (<i>Region No.7-Cuyuni/Mazaruni</i>) (Absent)
Miss Genevieve Allen, M.P.	- (<i>Region No.4-Demerara/Mahaica</i>) (Absent)
(ii) Guyana Action Party/Working People's Alliance Party (2)	
Mrs Sheila V.A. Holder, M.P.	- (<i>Absent-on Leave</i>)
Mrs Shirley J. Melville, M.P.	- (<i>Upper Takutu/Upper Essequibo</i>)
(iii) Rise, Organise and Rebuild Party (1)	
Mr Ravindra Dev, M.P.	

OFFICERS

Mr Frank A. Narain, C.C.H., Clerk of the National Assembly
Mr Sherlock E. Isaacs, Deputy Clerk of the National Assembly

Thursday, 16th August, 2001

PRAYER

The Clerk read the Prayer.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE SPEAKER

Hon Members, the Hon Prime Minister is performing the functions of the President during the absence of the President from Guyana, and will therefore not be present at today's sitting of the Assembly. The Hon Member, Mr Reepu Daman Persaud, Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, is performing the functions of Prime Minister.

Leave

Leave has been granted to the Hon Member, Mr Deryck Bernard for today's sitting.

PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AND REPORTS, ETC.

By the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, Hon Reepu Daman Persaud:

Annual Report of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the year 1999.

PUBLIC BUSINESS

BILL - SECOND AND THIRD READING

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR PUBLIC PURPOSES (AMENDMENT) BILL 2001 - Bill No. 11/2001 (Published 8th May, 2001)

A Bill intituled, an Act to amend the Acquisition of Lands for Public Purposes Act

The Speaker: Hon Members, our business for today begins with the second reading of the Acquisition of Lands for Public Purposes

(Amendment) Bill 2001, in the name of the Hon Prime Minister. The Hon Member Mr Anthony Xavier will move the second reading of the Bill.

Hon Mr C Anthony Xavier: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Prime Minister to move the second reading of the Bill, Acquisition of Lands for Public Purposes (Amendment) Bill 2001, Bill No. 11/2001.

Mr Speaker, the Acquisition of Lands for Public Purposes Act Chapter 62:05 was passed in the year 1914 and since then has undergone a number of amendments. A more important amendment was effected by Act 23 of 1990 which amended Section 18 which now states:

The compensation for land acquired must take into account the market value of the land on the date of the publication in the Gazette of the order declaring the work on the land to be a public work.

Mr Speaker, this amendment was made possible by the repeal and re-enactment of Article 142:1 of the Constitution by the said Act 23 of 1990, which, on the question of compensation in respect of property compulsorily acquired, in effect, provided for adequate compensation and gave a right of appeal to the High Court to determine such compensation.

Further, Mr Speaker, by Bill No. 18/2000 which was passed in this National Assembly, Article 142 of the Constitution and the recommendation of the Constitution Reform Commission is being further amended to state in the clearest of terms that the compulsory acquisition of property must be made by written law requiring the prompt payment of adequate compensation. But the Acquisition of Lands for Public Purposes Act remains basically an old Act, with some sections appearing to be anachronistic and perhaps unclear. Then there was the High Court Judgment of Andrew James and the Attorney General of Guyana in which certain statements were made

which can be construed as casting doubt as to whether land alone can be acquired or whether in order to acquire land there must be a building on the land. Mr Speaker, there are differences of opinion on this subject.

This Bill, it is hoped, will clarify the situation and put beyond doubt that land, whether it has a building on it or not can be acquired for a public work to be constructed thereon. Perhaps it should also be emphasised that it is the work to be done on the land that has to be declared a public work. Bare land, as the judgement to which I refer states, cannot be declared a public work.

Colleagues, Mr Speaker, this is indeed a simple non-controversial amendment comprising one important section. It is intended to rest concerns as to the true import regarding certain sections of the Acquisition of Lands for Public Purposes Act. These concerns have unfortunately remained un-attenuated by the decision to which I referred earlier, hence the necessity for this Bill. I am therefore asking, Mr Speaker, that all Members give their unstinted support in view of the nature of the Bill.

Thank you. *[Applause]*

The Speaker: Thank you, Hon Member.

Hon Member, Mrs Melville.

Mrs Shirley J Melville: Mr Speaker, in relation to the amendment of the Acquisition of Lands for Public Purposes Act, I would like to state that it can be perceived as setting precedence for political **decisions**. In our country now we need to have confidence building and free distribution of land in order that we can create the environment to attract foreign and **domestic** investment.

Mr Speaker, **this** amendment could also directly affect persons. For example, there is a Member of Parliament in this House today whose land has been threatened and he may be having to seek, in the

future, a piece of land to live in neighbouring Brazil.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you, Hon Member.

Hon Minister of Finance.

Hon Saisnarine Kowlessar: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the Acquisition of Lands for Public Purposes (Amendment) Bill 2001. In so doing, I wish to state that this amendment is by no means contentious or ought not to be contentious since it is merely inserting a new section to a long standing Bill. A new section that will give the Bill clarity and will strengthen it in its application. Mr Speaker, there is nothing sinister about this amendment. It is neither anti-business, anti-investment nor anti-private sector since it is designed to benefit the vendors, store owners, the city of Georgetown as a whole, and by extension the country. It is a measure designed to benefit both the law and the public at large, and as I said, it is intended for the public good. It is obvious that the Government wants to do things the right way, and the fact of the matter is that Governments can acquire private land for use in the national interest as has been done in developed countries like the United States and the United Kingdom. We on this side of the House do believe that Government should provide the opportunities and provide the conditions for its people to grow and improve their lives. In this case the Government is not acquiring land for the sake of acquiring it. Nor is it acquiring it for any expansionist purpose on its part. In fact, the law will give the Government such flexibility as may be necessary especially in emergency situations as in the present case with respect to the vendors issue. And, Mr Speaker, you, more than anyone else would know, that the law must not be seen as static or must not be static in its own right but must be dynamic and must change according to changing circumstances and conditions. It should always be a case of the

greatest good for the greatest number of people. That I believe, is the essence of good governance and democracy.

Mr Speaker, as you may be aware, this Bill has given cause for public debate as it relates to a plot of land owned by Toolsie Persaud Ltd. for the relocation of the street vendors. As a Member of the Government's negotiation team I wish for the record to state the following facts:

1. The Government at all times has followed due process and intends to so do until the matter is concluded.
2. A number of meetings were held between the Government and representatives of the Company with respect to finding a settlement on the issue of acquiring the land at Mud Lot 49-52 Water and Robb Streets.
3. The Government did indicate, during the negotiations, that whatever the final agreement the company must come out ahead.
4. The land was purchased at the price of \$2.7M which at the prevailing exchange rate in 1990 was approximately US\$60,000. The company submitted a valuation of the land at current market value of \$457M and also submitted a value for investment on the property to the tune of \$398M.

Under the most optimistic investment scenarios, if the company had invested the money in certain monetary instruments, the property would be worth less than \$100M today even at annual investment rate **compounded at 20%**. And 20% is putting it at a very high level because there was no way that that could have been obtained in terms of US monetary instruments.

There were discussions involving the swap of the land for other Government properties which the Company identified. That is the Guyana Stores Ltd. Garage at 13 - 14 Water Street and the Guyana

Thursday, 16th August, 2001

Stores Ltd., Berbice Branch, which were valued at current market price of \$868M.

Mr Speaker, no agreement was reached on the swap since the Government was not satisfied with the valuations offered by the Company. In fact, the Company could not provide verification of their claims of expenditure on the property. The Company and the Government explored the possibility of a conditional lease of the property and the Government offered \$4M per year. This was rejected by the Company. Mr Speaker, the Government is still committed to ensuring that the Company receives prompt and adequate compensation for the property as provided for under the laws of Guyana.

Mr Speaker, these are the facts which clearly demonstrates that the Government's approach was not based on compulsory acquisition but on negotiation and the pursuit of due process.

I therefore, commend this Bill, Mr Speaker, for the approval of this Hon House.

Thank you. *[Applause]*

The Speaker: Thank you, Hon Member.

Hon Member, Mr Khemraj Ramjattan.

Mr Khemraj Ramjattan: With your permission, Mr Speaker, I wish to rise on this occasion to make a couple of points as regards certain matters arising as a result of this amendment and certain accusations being made, especially by those who find themselves absent today, as to the implications to this amendment, and to clear the air that those dangerous implications that they have in mind, as will be the occurrence if such an amendment is passed will not really occur simply because this amendment, as my good friend Mr Anthony Xavier indicated, is going towards the clarification of a certain piece of written law that we all know as the Acquisition of Lands Act.

I, firstly, however, wish to make the point that has to do with the fact that every government in every state, has the power and has an obligation to have that power, whenever it sees fit in the circumstances, to compulsorily acquire land or property. That we know, and I know that you know it very well, Mr Speaker, ranges from India to United States of America, the whole of Europe, all of the Commonwealth, as a matter of fact, every country of the world. We do appreciate that this came about historically because of the fact that during necessitous circumstances governments of states will need that power to ensure that greater public good can be done. We need that power also in certain circumstances where there is the need for social regulation. We need that power also in certain circumstances for the purpose of ensuring that the public and people out there are made to suffer less as a result of whatever the circumstances.

This piece of amendment is going towards clearing the air in view of the recent decision we had, of a certain judge of the Supreme Court, which indicated that land under the Acquisition of Lands Act or which indicated that land there means simply unused land, that is virgin territory, once it has construction works, developmental works or something being done, the definition does not apply. What this amendment seeks to do is to incorporate into the meaning of land that which the judge indicated ought not to be incorporated. In a sense a clarification is being made because in other territories this was not needed because their courts, the Supreme Court and whatever courts they had, their legislation made it quite clear that land there means that which is simply unused or that which has buildings or construction works going on, and so on. That is all. This is but refining and clarifying to the extent that people, especially investors will know what we are doing. It is not as if this is not going to be beneficial to investors, as some persons are saying, *it is dangerous to the investment climate*. No, it is clearly clarifying because if we don't, it might be ambiguous and investors might not understand. So in relation to that implication I wish to say, clarifying for the investor is an advantage for them and this Bill seeks to do exactly that.

I wish to counter the point being made that this is going to be the precedent for the taking away of people's land. That cannot be so. We know that inherent in a state's government is this power. It is always inherent since Magna Carta days, the Declaration of Rights of Man coming right down to the United Nations Declaration of Political Rights, all of that has it quite clearly that the state has the power to take people's property but there must be just and adequate compensation. There must be certain procedural regulations where they can come to court. We have all of that in Guyana presently. So to state that indeed this piece of amendment is going to, in a sense, make dangerous implications for investment, and in a sense that people's property will be taken away willy nilly, I wish to assure this House that that is not so. It is rather hypocritical for people who are making that kind of allegation to say so. I speak of those who find themselves absent today.

We have to understand too, Mr Speaker, that this Bill is, in a way, advancing the situation which used to occur before in this respect. We have this being attached to other provisions which indicate that today we are going to, whenever there is a deprivation of property, compensate at the fair present day market rate. I think this is a big point that ought to be, at least, communicated to members of the public whom I think are somewhat confused.

We used to have situations where (and I can name some examples) land was compulsorily acquired and certain 1939 prices paid for them by those who see it fit to be absent today. In the 1970s and 1980s they used to take away people's lands. I only need to mention the DeFreitas home and sawmill, Dr Bissessar's Hospital in Carmichael Street, Sankar's place in Water Street, those big yellow busses that were owned by Mohamed Bus Service, the Soap Factory that was owned by Mr Withers and a piece of land owned by Gafours on Vlissengen Road, (they said they want it for GDF Communications Centre, it was never used). What they did was to pay 1939 prices in the 1970s and 1980s.

Thursday, 16th August, 2001

We have the Hon Member, Mr Kowlessar, indicating to you here that, yes, this Toolsie Persaud piece of land is one of the objects of this amendment. We cannot deny that, but it is lots more than that. Instead of appreciating the nature of the acquisition and the context of how fair this Administration is dealing, it has to be appreciated that it is far more advanced a situation as regards what used to unfold before. I wish to make that point. You used to have bigger sets of land with buildings and erections and all of that on them taken away, I named them, and 1939 prices used to be paid.

We had a big decision, as you very well know, the Jaundoo case, going straight up to the Privy Counsel on this issue. Compulsory acquisition of land and you want to pay me 1939 prices and all kind of strange procedural rules being used to deny the people and deny the courts to argue the merits of the case. Takuba Lodge I understand ... but I think that was consensual. In any event those indicated, indeed, suffered the disadvantage of being paid that which was obviously inadequate. And it was paid not very promptly too.

We have the scenario now where obviously appraisers and evaluators are going to argue, they must, what I regard as present day value, fair market value. That is what is done all over the world. Some people have indicated that this is only peculiar to Guyana. I have some friends who have also indicated such. Probably they do not know that this happens almost every day all across the world especially in America. I have here the Bill of Rights, A Users Guide, by Linda Monk. The Forward is by the Supreme Court Judge, commending the book. It is stated quite clearly that in America this exact law was used to make almost all the roads and the bridges because people had those lands as their private property. We go to America and we see those beautiful places. They were owned by people before. What did the government do? They acquired, but, of course, they paid prompt and adequate compensation, fair market prices. That is how you have development going on. If people are simply to say, look this can't be done, this is my private property then that concept of the government's power which the Americans

Thursday, 16th August, 2001

call *eminent domain*, (the government's power of taking property) used so widely over there (*compulsory acquisition* in England and the whole of Europe) you would not have the kind of development that we are seeing.

I wish to make the point that Mr Saisnarine Kowlessar indicated and to add to it. Not only are the beneficiaries here going to be the vendors or the shop owners but people like me and you who like to walk those paves if we find an alternative arrangement for them. And as we all know starting with the philosophers in society that government has the power to regulate socially. Government must have that power. From this same book, which is quoted even by the great Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, it states, yes, *government has the power to regulate but we must know how far is too far*. We must state exactly the compensation (just compensation they call it in America) and also for a useful purpose. What more can be a useful purpose when comparing what we are doing here as against some of the acquisitions made in the 1970s and 1980s for 1939 prices? Those who are now condemning this amendment obviously are being hypocrites. It is in that context that I wish to make this point. It is hypocrisy to come and say now this is dangerous. When they used to do it and hardly pay a cent it was okay.

I wish to make the point also, Mr Speaker, that we are always going to have problems with regard to what the owner is going to regard as a fair market value.

I have managed to come across what Mr Kowlessar indicated as works done on this land. Of the \$380M plus that they are saying that they spent there, \$240M are said to be for architectural fees. Mr Speaker, I do not know what the proprietor was proposing to build for that kind of architectural fees. That is why this administration will have to do as it is doing because if for the purposes of ensuring that there is a better place out there called Georgetown, especially for tourism and all that is going to happen in the future, getting people to come to the negotiating table and say \$240M I paid an architect to

Thursday, 16th August, 2001

do an 8-storey design ... We should find that architect. It makes me wonder sometimes if we have to do this asset calculation for the purpose of tax if he is going to say that this is worth \$800M. Funny enough it might not be worth that much as regards tax.

I wish to make this point as I am on my legs, because it was mentioned that the land was sold for US\$60,000, by my friends who choose not to be here today, in 1990. They now, all of a sudden, do not realise that it is a necessitous scenario for it to be, in a sense, bought back, for the grand purpose of ensuring that so many vendors have a better place to vend.

Mr Speaker, these are important points I wish to have recorded. It is important to know that this power is very much in accordance with our Constitution. We must also press home the point that it was those same friends of mine who find themselves fit to be absent today that used to have ... (because they amended the 1966 Constitution to oust the court of law from determining whether the price and the value of the compensation was adequate) ... they who are now making allegations against us. This is what the law used to read after they amended the 1966 Constitution:

That no one should be deprived of his right to property ... unless it be by written law and no such law should be called in question in any court on the ground that the compensation provided by that law is not adequate.

They are the preachers now of private property and they amended our Independence Constitution to say that the court cannot determine this matter.

They, in 1990, with tremendous objection from the investment world and of course the PPP, then changed that. In this administration we have even seen it fit to strengthen that with additional adequate and prompt payment provisions in the Constitution. So there must not be any fear, there are certain conditions, property can be deprived

Thursday, 16th August, 2001

as I indicated but now you have to pay promptly, adequately and you have the courts to go to. This is unlike 1968 to 1990 scenario when you could not have gone to the courts to question the compensation payment. All of this we have strengthened and constitutionalised to the extent now that investors can have no fear. If I may say, Mr Speaker, unlike what used to happen in the 1970s and 1980s we have a period now that we can bargain and negotiate. It is not as if we tell Toolsie Persaud we want your land. That is what the propaganda, especially from the PNC quarters, is, that we are taking away people's land. No this was negotiated and prompted to a certain extent.

Mr Speaker, I wish to make these points for the record and to say that this Bill is very much necessary to be passed. It clarifies a situation and whenever utilised it will obviously be for the purpose of ensuring that the grander society, the larger picture is seen and that necessitous situations can be overcome. We do not want a scenario that when this is done that we have an injunction in the court that a certain judge had made an order that land means only unused land that would stall the process for 2 or three years like injunctions do in our court system. We want to clear the air not only for the investor but for even judges so they will know that this is what Parliament means when it says land. So the judges will not in any way give an interpretation that is not in accordance with Parliament's intention. This is essentially the other point, the judges being made clear on the issue. Definitions must be clear.

The Carmichael Street Hospital was acquired for \$85,000 in the 1970s. This is a note a colleague just gave me. Of course, the 1939 price was paid.

The Minister has indicated that it is in the value of \$100M. If that is the value the courts can put whatever value they feel. They now have jurisdiction to determine what is adequate compensation. It is very much important that these points are made, so that those who feel that the public is gullible to the extent of accepting the

Thursday, 16th August, 2001

premonitions and dangerous implications of this Bill, will now know that those are mere untruths.

With those few words, I wish to, like the two other Ministers, support this Bill. Let us have it passed as quickly as possible.

Thanks very much. *[Applause]*

Question **put** and **agreed** to.

The Speaker: The Assembly will resolve itself into Committee to consider the Bill Clause by Clause.

In committee

The Chairman:

Clause 1

Clause 1 as printed, agreed to and ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 2

Clause 2 as printed, agreed to and ordered to stand part of the bill.

Assembly Resumes

The Speaker: Hon Minister of Public Works.

Hon C Anthony Xavier: Mr speaker, I beg to report that the Acquisition of Lands for Public Purposes Amendment Bill 2001 was considered in Committee, clause by clause, and was passed without amendment. I now move that the Bill be read a third time.

Question **put** and **agreed** to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon Reepu Daman Persaud: Mr Speaker, I wish to move that the

Thursday, 16th August, 2001

National Assembly be adjourned to a date to be fixed.

The Speaker: Hon Members of the House I take this opportunity to wish you, a very successful, happy, productive and conducive vacation. The Assembly now stands adjourned.

Adjourned Accordingly at 14:50 H