



And let me stress “any matter”.

“... for which a Minister is responsible, may be raised by a Member who has obtained the right to raise a matter on the Motion for the adjournment that day. The Minister responsible for the matter raised shall reply. Both the Member who has obtained such a right and the Minister replying shall each be entitled to address the Assembly for fifteen minutes and this time shall not be extended.”

Now, the purpose for this rule was to mitigate the constraints under which SO No.11 (1) has been operating and this has been developed by precedent and not my decisions alone. I am just reading this, for example, one decision here, one Parliament said, *An Adjournment Motion is not admissible, unless there is a failure of duties which has been joined by one Government by Constitution or Law.*

You might have some difficulty in finding that Mr. Corbin’s Motion qualifies under this rule. I am just drawing this as an example. These are rules which have been developed over many years and many Parliaments have prohibited or abolished this rule because of its restrictive nature and that is the reason why we can produce Standing Order No.11(4). So, any Member who wants to bring a matter before the House and who feels that it might not qualify under Standing Order No. 11.(1) has an opportunity under Standing Order No. 11 (4).

Thank you very much.

Announcements by the Speaker

23rd Sitting dated May 10, 2007

SPEAKERS’ RESPONSE TO A LETTER SENT TO HIM BY THE HON. PRIME MINISTER TO DISALLOW THE MOTION UNDER THE NAME OF THE HON. ROBERT CORBIN (STANDING ORDER NO. 26 (E) – REVIVAL OF DISCUSSION)

Preamble

The Speaker did not agree with the Prime Minister that the Motion by Hon. Robert Corbin on the Introduction of the Value-Added Tax be disallowed.



Verbatim

The Speaker (Hari N. Ramkarran): I refer to your letter of May 8, 2007, requesting to disallow the Motion under the name of the Hon. Robert Corbin intituled INTRODUCTION OF THE VALUE ADDED TAX (VAT) on the grounds that it is overtaken by time and is in violation of Standing Order No. 26 (e).

The National Assembly is moved by the Motion for:

- The establishment of an all-Party Committee to make recommendations for the reduction on the rate of the tax, for widening the range of zero rated and exempt supplies and a phased implementation of the Value-Added Tax;
- The Government to immediately implement significant levels of salary increases for those categories of workers most adversely affected by the implementation of VAT; and
- The Government to establish a National Commission on tax reform to review the tax system and make recommendations.

The first part of the Motion seeks the establishment of an all-Party Committee to make recommendations on three matters, namely reducing the rate of the tax, widening the range of zero rated and exempt supplies and a phased recommendation of VAT.

Your contention is that VAT has already been implemented and, therefore, the Motion has been overtaken by time. If your contention is correct, then only one-third part of the Motion has been overtaken by time and not the Motion.

In any event, the fact that VAT has already been implemented does not prevent the proposed all-Party Committee from recommending VAT on a range of goods be rescinded and the reintroduction be staggered.

I, therefore, do not subscribe to your argument.

Standing Order No. 26 (e) reads:

“In order that a motion may be admissible, it shall satisfy the following conditions -

(e) It shall not revive discussion of a matter which has been discussed in the same session.”



The specific issues summarised above, which the National Assembly is being moved to approve, are referred to collectively in the rules as a matter. If the matter (collectively) was raised before and specifically decided upon by the National Assembly, I should be most obliged if you would point out the occasion. Until such time, I regret that I cannot agree with your request that the Motion be disallowed.

This rule must not be confused with the general discretion of the Speaker who can properly disallow a Member from *reviving discussion of a matter* which has engaged the National Assembly in the past.

Request for Leave to Move the Adjournment of the Assembly on Definite Matters of Urgent Public Importance

40th Sitting dated February 14, 2008

SERIES OF EVENTS LEADING UP TO THE SLAUGHTER OF ELEVEN (11) PEOPLE, INCLUDING FIVE CHILDREN AT LUSIGNAN ON 26th JANUARY, 2008

Preamble

A request by the Minister of Home Affairs to move the adjournment of the Assembly to discuss the above matter was ordered to stand down by the Speaker until 16:30 hrs. when the debate on it was to commence. The motion accordingly stood over until the resumption of the Sitting, following the suspension thereof.

Verbatim

The Hon. Minister of Home Affairs (Hon. Clement J. Rohee): Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order No. 12 (1) and (2), I hereby seek leave to move the adjournment of today's Sitting to discuss a matter of definite urgent and public importance to wit the events together with the surrounding circumstances, which occurred on the 26th January, 2008, at Lusignan, East Coast Demerara.

The Speaker (Hari N. Ramkarran): Thank you, Hon. Member.

Mr. Raphael G. C. Trotman: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire only whether the Hon. Minister has met all the requirements of that Standing Order by submitting written notice prior to the commencement of this Sitting?