



REPUBLIC OF TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

REPORT TO PARLIAMENT

by

THE INTEGRITY COMMISSION

on its activities for the year

1990

*(Pursuant to section 10 of the Integrity in
Public Life Act, 1987)*

ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

INTEGRITY COMMISSION

FOR THE YEAR 1990

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT

INTEGRITY COMMISSION

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	5
ACCOMMODATION	6
STAFF	6
SUBMISSION OF RETURNS	6
PERSONS IN PUBLIC LIFE	7
HOLDING FORMAL ENQUIRIES	7
PROJECTIONS FOR INTEGRITY LEGISLATION	7
DECLARATION OF ASSETS	11
PUBLIC SCRUTINY OF DECLARATIONS	12
PUBLIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT	13
AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT	14
PUBLIC OFFICERS	14
MEMBERS OF STATE ENTERPRISES	15
THE MAIN THRUST OF INTEGRITY LEGISLATION	16
Conflict of Interest	16
Insider Information	17
Influence	17

INTRODUCTION

The Commission of appointment signed by His Excellency the President on the 31st December, 1987, created an Integrity Commission to take office for a period of three years as from 1st January, 1988, so therefore the mandate of this Commission expired on the 31st December, 1990.

However, having regard to the provision under section 10(1) of the Integrity in Public Life Act, 1987, whereby the Commission is required to report to Parliament not later than 31st March in each year, the life of this Commission was extended to 31st March, 1991 so as to enable it to present its report to Parliament concerning its 1990 activities within the deadline stipulated by the Act. If, therefore, this Commission is to continue in existence after 31st March, 1991, new commissions would need to be issued.*

During the year 1990, the Commission held 40 sittings, in the majority of cases, with its full complement of members. The Chairman was out of the country for a period of approximately four weeks on a private visit to North America, during the course of which he held talks with the Honourable Mr. Justice Gregory Evans, a former judge of the Supreme Court of Ontario, and now the Commissioner under the Members Conflict of Interest Act 1987 of Ontario, Canada, and also with Mr. Gary Davis, the General Counsel in the Office of Government Ethics in Washington.

From both contacts copious documents were received concerning the operation of the institutions in Ontario and Washington for the monitoring of ethics in government affairs, and from our study of these documents, in conjunction with our own experience over the past three years, we offer hereunder our considered views on the future development of integrity legislation.

His Excellency the President has recently renewed the Commissions of the Chairman, George Collymore and members, John Martin and John Ottley, with effect from 1st April 1991 to 31st March 1994. The Commissions of the other two members, J. O'Neil Lewis and Brian Des Vignes, will come up for renewal on 14th July 1991 and 5th September 1991 respectively.

We wish first of all, however, to refer to certain other matters

ACCOMMODATION

We have been pursuing our efforts to secure a permanent home for this Commission, and we now have hope that by the time this report is presented some concrete steps would have taken place to achieve this end.

STAFF

The clerical establishment as reflected in our 1989 report has remained the same, but we have not had our complement of staff. No Secretary has as yet been appointed and the present incumbent in the post of Administrative Officer IV, Miss Angela Brathwaite has carried out the duties of Secretary.

We envisage that if our proposals for updating the operations of this Commission are carried into effect, then our staffing needs would have to be re-examined.

SUBMISSION OF RETURNS

Once again we are pleased to report that the response by 'persons in public life' to their requirement of submitting Returns has been, in the main, good. We have once more received a high level of co-operation and the response to our queries whenever that became necessary, was satisfactory.

At the end of 1990, our record for the receipt and certification of Returns was as follows:-

Declarations filed and certified	-	91
Declarations filed and not certified	-	5
Declarations not filed	-	5
Declarations not due by 31st December 1990-		2

Since that date the record up to the time of the filing of this Report is as follows:-

Declarations filed and certified	-	97
Declarations filed and not certified	-	1
Declarations not filed.	-	3

We are hopeful that it may yet not be necessary for us to invoke our powers under section 22 of the Act in the case of the few outstanding defaulters.

PERSONS IN PUBLIC LIFE

Our record of 'Persons in Public Life' who were required to make declarations in respect of 1989 stands as follows:-

Members of the House of Representatives	-	37
Ministers of Government (who are not Members of the House of Representatives)	-	8
Permanent Secretaries	-	53
Chief Technical Officers	-	3

HOLDING FORMAL ENQUIRIES

We are pleased to record once more that we have not found it necessary to advise the President to establish any tribunal for the purpose of holding an enquiry under the provisions of section 23 of the Act.

PROJECTIONS FOR INTEGRITY LEGISLATION

In both our previous reports we addressed the topic of Projections for Legislation on integrity, and in this Report what we wish to do is to re-inforce and enlarge upon our previous comments.

Our starting point is the Report of the Constitution Commission so far as it affects this Commission, and its report is set out 'in extenso' as follows:-

"In keeping with our views, we would recommend in the first instance the abolition of the Integrity Commission.

In the alternative we would recommend as follows:

- (a) Insert in the Act a provision to vest in the Commission a duty to promote and secure integrity in public life and all necessary enabling powers to discharge it effectively.*
- (b) Insert provisions in the Act to empower the Commission:*
 - (i) to subpoena persons to testify before them;*
 - (ii) to require the production of documents;*
 - (iii) to pass on to the Director of Public Prosecutions any material in their possession which in their view might support prosecution; and*
 - (iv) if they consider it appropriate, to report to the House of Representatives through the Speaker on any member of that House or any Minister or Parliamentary Secretary who has been the subject of an investigation.*
- (c) expand the jurisdiction of the Commission to include within its purview at least:*
 - (i) Chairman, Executive Directors and/or Chief Executive Officers of State enterprises and Statutory Corporations;*
 - (ii) Mayors and Chairmen of Local Government Bodies;*
 - (iii) Chief Technical Officers, Chief Administrative Officers of Municipalities and officers of similar rank who perform equivalent or similar duties;*

- (d) *disclosures in inquiries should be dealt with in accordance with the following guidelines:*
- (i) *where an inquiry into a lack of integrity discloses evidence of the commission of a crime the matter should be referred to the Director of Public Prosecutions;*
 - (ii) *where an inquiry discloses no crime but a lack of integrity can be inferred from any declaration made and no acceptable explanation is forthcoming the matter should be made public and protected as a privileged publication;*
 - (iii) *where an inquiry discloses an inconsistency or discrepancy in the declaration made, the person concerned should be given an opportunity to explain it. If no explanation is given or one is given which is incredulous or incredible this should also be made public and guarded as in (ii) above;*
- (e) *whether or not the Integrity Commission is abolished, the antiquated corruption laws of the Country should be comprehensively reviewed in the light of local, regional and international developments for the purpose of repairing and improving them and where necessary introducing new legislation, inter alia:*
- (i) *to give investigative powers which would enhance the possibility of detecting and prosecuting corruption subject to the necessary safeguards;*
 - (ii) *to improve the quality, increase the number and expand the resources of those charged with the duty of obtaining evidence of corruption; and*
 - (iii) *to provide for severe punishment of convicted wrongdoers."*

The Minority Report of the Constitution member, Mr. John La Guerre, however recommended the following :-

"I do not agree that the Integrity Commission should be abolished. Its present performance is due, in my view to the fact that it lacks teeth. Instead, I would propose that its powers be enlarged and that it be provided with an investigative unit to enable it to enquire more critically into the affairs of those engaged in public life. At a time when corruption threatens to overwhelm the entire society I think it is urgent that those who are involved in important areas in public life should set an example of probity in public affairs. The basic problem of the Integrity Commission is one of structure and perspective."

To put this matter in its proper context, it must be borne in mind that Act No. 8 of 1987 under which this Commission was established was passed pursuant to sections 138 and 139 of the Constitution of 1976, by virtue of the enabling powers reflected in those sections.

In the record of the debate in Parliament on the passing of the Integrity Act, it is to be observed that the limitations on this legislation did not go unnoticed and the perception seemed to be that this legislation was no more than an initial step.

This view was echoed in the previous reports of this Commission and now by the very forthright comments of the Constitution Commission as shown above.

Our first comment is that the functions of an Integrity Commission should not be seen as being capable of encompassing all aspects of fraudulent and improper behaviour, and that there is a role to be performed by the normal law enforcement agencies which should remain independent and separate from that of the Integrity Commission - though, as we shall point out, there can properly be an area of linkage and co-operation between the two agencies.

Our point then, is that the updating of the laws of Fraud in all its aspects, together with the strengthening of existing procedures for eradicating fraud are matters that are more properly within the province of Law Reform.

Integrity legislation, on the other hand, targets areas of behaviour that are usually outside the ambit of the criminal law as demonstrated in the North American experience, and is aimed at achieving morality in public affairs by providing the sanctions of law against acts contrary to public morality.

The comments we respectfully make with regard to integrity legislation therefore reflect our cumulative experience over the past three years as reinforced by our observations of such legislation in other countries.

DECLARATION OF ASSETS

We are of the view that the provision in our law with regard to the declaration of assets is adequate, and accords with the practice observed in other countries with similar legislation.

Our reservation on this subject, however, is not with regard to the substance of the requirements of disclosure, but rather as to the persons whose assets should be disclosed.

We are of the view that the targeted areas of scrutiny for integrity standards should be towards those persons in public life who are concerned in the decision making process. This, in our view would embrace not only members of Parliament, but members of the Municipalities and local government bodies.

Our revised list of Persons in Public Life would therefore contain the following persons :

- Members of the House of Representatives
- Ministers of Government
- Parliamentary Secretaries
- Members of the Tobago House of Assembly
- Members of the Municipalities
- Members of Local Government Bodies
- Full time Consultants and Advisers to Ministers
(i.e. persons who are excluded from being holders of an office in the Public Service by virtue of section 3(4) (e) of the Constitution).

We consider that the assets of the spouses and Minor Children of such persons should also be disclosed.

PUBLIC SCRUTINY OF DECLARATIONS

While we uphold the principle of confidentiality as to the contents of returns, yet we consider that where persons offer themselves for public service, then the public has a right to know of any financial activity on their part or on that of their spouses or minor children which might impact upon any political decisions they may be called upon to make, which might create a situation of a Conflict of Interest.

The extent of their private finances is their private business, which should be disclosed only to the Commission, but any areas of financial activity about which the public has the right to know, should be made open to public scrutiny in the form of a Public Disclosure Statement extracted by the Commission from their Declarations.

We adverted to this matter in our 1988 Report in which we noted that there already exists a practice in Parliament in the form of Guidelines for a declaration of interests to be made.

Our view, however, accords with the North American practice where such matters have been enacted into law and fall within the jurisdiction of an independent and impartial body such as the Integrity Commission.

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Our recommendation on this aspect therefore, is that, quite apart from any Guidelines which Government members may lay down to regulate their own conduct, the Integrity Commission should prepare and make available for public scrutiny a Public Disclosure Statement of every declarant. Where therefore, the Commission is satisfied that a Return has been faithfully made, then the Commission should, without placing any value on any of the undermentioned items, extract therefrom the following information for public scrutiny:

- (a) Non -government employment.
- (b) Trade, profession or vocation.
- (c) Gifts in excess of \$100.00.
- (d) Real Property (other than property that is owner-occupied).
- (e) Personal Property (other than property used for family transportation, household, educational, recreational, social or aesthetic purposes).
- (f) Directorships of Companies, public or private.
- (g) Associations in any Partnerships, Joint Ventures or other business enterprises.

- (h) Financial interests in any Companies, Partnerships, Joint Ventures, or other business enterprises.
- (i) Interests in any Trust, whether beneficial or not.
- (j) *Liabilities to any creditor in excess of \$10,000 at any time during the year.*

Any interest or involvement of the declarants or of their spouses or any minor children in the above should be disclosed, whether any income or benefit is derived therefrom or not.

AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

A copy of the public disclosure statement certified by the Secretary, of all persons in public life in Parliament should be forwarded to the Clerk to the House of Representatives and that of persons from the Municipalities and Local Government bodies to the Town Clerks and Chief Executive Officers of those bodies.

Any member of the public wishing to view the public disclosure statement of any person in public life, should be able to do so by applying to the Integrity Commission for that purpose, when the Secretary would supply a certified copy thereof, on the payment of a small fee to defray the cost of copying.

PUBLIC OFFICERS

It is to be noted that Permanent Secretaries and Chief Technical Officers who now are included in the list of persons in public life have been excluded from the new category of persons in public life. The reason for this is that -

- (a) public officers, per se, are not strictly speaking policy makers, but rather are the executors of the policies of the elected representatives;

- (b) these persons are already subject to the control of the Public Service Commission, which has exclusive disciplinary jurisdiction under the Constitution; and
- (c) their financial activity can now be subject to such restraints as their Commission can impose.

Furthermore, there is no logical reason why integrity scrutiny should be limited to Permanent Secretaries and Chief Technical Officers, since infractions can occur at all levels of the Service. The same reasoning will apply also to exclude Executive Officers of State Enterprises, and all those other officers now subject to the disciplinary control of the Statutory Authorities Service Commission and all the other Commissions under the Constitution.

It seems therefore that the various Commissions can, and should lay down their own procedures for the monitoring of the financial activities of all the persons within their purview.

The Integrity Commission considers, nevertheless that it should exercise a supervisory role over such persons, and the details of those proposals are adverted to hereunder.

MEMBERS OF STATE ENTERPRISES

It is to be observed that the functioning of State Enterprises falls under the supervision of the Public Accounts (Enterprises) Committee under the provisions of s. 119(5) of the Constitution, which body is vested with wide powers of supervision and control over the financial affairs of these Enterprises.

Persons appointed to State Enterprises are all nominated to their office, and so are accountable to their appointors, who would have an inherent right to remove them if dissatisfied with their performance.

We have come to the view, therefore, that the inclusion of such nominees among the list of persons required by law to disclose their assets would not be justified, and might have the negative effect of serving only as a disincentive to some persons to accept nomination.

We propose, nevertheless, that all members of State Enterprises should properly be under the scrutiny of the Integrity Commission in pursuance of its supervisory jurisdiction, as elaborated upon hereunder.

THE MAIN THRUST OF INTEGRITY LEGISLATION

Quite apart from the obvious instances of Fraud and allied criminal offences (which should engage the attention of the normal law enforcement agencies) there lies a wide field of dishonest and improper conduct which does not now attract any sanctions of the law at all; and it is in this latter area that we consider that the main thrust of integrity legislation should lie.

Basically this area may be defined as being that field of endeavour in the conduct of public affairs, where a person may find himself in a position where his personal interests can be said to conflict with the duties of his office.

Our recommendation, therefore, is that comprehensive legislation should declare illegal the following acts -

- Conflict of Interest

Where a person makes or participates in the making of a decision capable of or calculated to further his or her private interest or for any oblique motive;

- Insider Information

Where a person uses information gained in the execution of his or her office, not available to the general public, to further or seek his or her private interest, or that of a third party;

- Influence

Where a person with a view to furthering his or her private interest uses his or her office to influence a decision by a third party;

- Acceptance of Benefits

Where a person accepts any fee, gift or personal benefit (except as authorised by law) that is connected directly or indirectly with the performance of his or her office;

- Carrying on Business

Where a person engages in employment or business that is incompatible with his or her public office;

- Disqualification of Former Government Members and Employees

After relinquishing office, a person should be disqualified from acting on behalf of members of the public in their dealings with the government for a period of say two years where such dealing involves information and expertise gained while in public office.

SUPERVISORY ROLE OF INTEGRITY COMMISSION

Our observation of the operation of integrity legislation in other countries is that perhaps the most crucial role which such Commissions can perform in maintaining standards of integrity lies in its power to supervise the due adherence of the provisions of that legislation.

In the Washington legislation great emphasis is laid upon the need to guide and educate persons as to the pitfalls that can lie in the paths of a person in public life; and the role of the Commission is perceived not merely as an Enforcer but more appropriately as a Counsellor and Guide

Furthermore, there is a role which a Commission can perform in the evaluation of legislation on the effectiveness of standards of morality in public affairs by providing a forum before which such matters can be aired and pronounced upon.

We have observed in the North American experience that there has developed a formal advisory opinion service in matters of integrity - matters which are not always simple and straightforward - and such matters are occasionally pronounced upon by the courts of law, thus providing a new and important field of jurisprudence.

ADVISORY OPINION SERVICE

- A 'person in public life' should therefore be able to seek an opinion from the Commission as to his own proposed conduct or as to whether a breach of the Act has been committed by some other person.

The Opinion of the Commission should be referred to the enquirer if it is made with respect to matters which concern him. If the matter relates to the conduct of some member of parliament or other body, then the opinion should be relayed to the Speaker of the House or to the appropriate officer of municipal and local government (on the assumption that this legislation may be extended to such bodies).

In the exercise of this power to give opinions, it would become necessary in some cases, for the Commission to have available to it the facility of some investigatory agency. We re-iterate our previous recommendation in this regard, therefore that for the effective carrying out of this function, the Commission should be able to call upon any agency of government to render such information as may be required in order to bring all available information before it.

It should be noted in passing that the existing legislation, already gives to the Commission the wide powers of exercising a commission under the Commissions of Enquiry Act.

So far as concerns matters which arise from the Commission's own observations, there should be likewise the same provisions as to investigating, holding an enquiry and reporting the findings to the appropriate body.

In summary, therefore, the functioning of the Commission under its supervisory role should lie in

- giving opinions and ordering corrective action for any breach of law;
- reporting infractions of law to the appropriate authorities;
- providing information on and promoting an understanding of ethical standards, so that by counselling and admonition, standards of integrity can be maintained.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION FOR BREACHES OF THE ACT

Breaches of the Act

The existing legislation provides the penalties of criminal prosecution for breaches of the Act; but we would wish to refine those provisions, bearing in mind that different breaches might call for different treatment. Basically, breaches may fall into two distinct categories, viz:-

- A. Offences which can be said to undermine the whole purpose and intendment of the Act; and
- B. Offences which go to constitute misconduct in Public Office.

Of the first group, we cite the offences of

- Unlawful disclosure of information;
- Non disclosure of assets;
- Failing to file a declaration in accordance with the Act;
- Making a false declaration; and
- Refusing to attend an inquiry.

We consider that the Act now provides sufficient and proper penalties for these breaches; and we would endorse the existing procedures for enquiring into such breaches.

Of the second group we would cite as examples of Misconduct in Public Office the following offences -

- (a) Situations which give rise to Conflict of Interest.
- (b) The unlawful use of Insider Information.
- (c) The unlawful use of Influence.
- (d) The unlawful Acceptance of Benefits.
- (e) The unlawful Carrying on of Business.

For allegations of breach of any of the above, the Commission considers that its first role should be that of counselling the member and advising remedial action. Thereafter we should be empowered to invoke the provisions of section 23 of the Act for the holding of an enquiry into these offences.

We consider that after an enquiry has been carried out into allegations of Misconduct in Public Office, this Commission should be given powers to make the following orders -

- (a) That assets be placed in a Blind Trust; or
- (b) be placed with the Public Trustee until the person has ceased to be a person in public life; or
- (c) be disposed of; or
- (d) that assets be forfeited to the State; or
- (e) otherwise dealt with.

Such orders should thereafter be registrable by the Director of Public Prosecutions as orders of the High Court and be capable of enforcement under the Rules of the Supreme Court.

AN ORDER OF ENQUIRY

Under the Commissions of Enquiry Act, Chapter 19:01 the Order of the Commission is to

"...report to the President, in writing, the result of the enquiry, and also when required, furnish to the President a full statement of the proceedings of the Commission and the reasons leading to the conclusions arrived at or reported." (s. 7)

In the case of a Tribunal appointed under the Act we consider that the purposes of the law would be better served if, in addition to reporting to the President, the report of the Tribunal into an enquiry into an allegation of Misconduct in Public Affairs were forwarded to -

The Speaker of the House
The Mayor of the Municipality
The Chairman of the Local Government body; and
The Director of Public Prosecutions

THE DISCIPLINARY ROLE OF PARLIAMENT AND OTHER BODIES

The image of an Integrity Commission which should be projected however is that it should be seen as the Servant of the bodies under its purview and not their Master.

Its examination of instances of misconduct in public affairs is such that it would be undertaken on behalf of those bodies, whose concern it is to maintain morality in public affairs.

It is for this reason that we consider that the sanction for such misconduct should not be that of fine and imprisonment, but should be within the disciplinary powers of those bodies.

The assistance which the Integrity Commission can render in this regard is to find the facts, and make recommendations as to how the matter might be dealt with. It would thereafter rest with the Parliament or other bodies as to what action should be taken.

We recommend that Parliament and the other aforementioned bodies should be empowered to make the following orders on the recommendation of the Integrity Commission -

- (a) That a member be reprimanded;
- (b) That a member be required to vacate his office;
- (c) That a member's seat be declared vacant for gross misconduct in public affairs as defined by the Act.

It should be borne in mind that any finding of a Tribunal established by the Commission, would be subject to Judicial Review in the normal way under the Rules of the Supreme Court.

Supervision of Public Officers, State Enterprises and Statutory Bodies

In the case of this category of persons, we consider that any reference to the Commission for the exercise of its supervisory powers should emanate only from:

- the Public Service Commission
- the Statutory Authorities Service Commission
- the State Enterprise concerned or the appropriate Minister of Government.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The 'Persons in Public Life' who should be requested to declare their assets and liabilities should be:
 - Members of the House of Representatives
 - Ministers of Government
 - Parliamentary Secretaries
 - Members of the Tobago House of Assembly
 - Members of the Municipalities
 - Members of Local Government Bodies
 - Full time Consultants and Advisers to Ministers (not being the holders of Public Office)
 - The spouses and Minor Children of all the above persons.

2. Declarations should remain confidential, but there should be a Public Disclosure Statement extracted by the Commission from the declarations, which would disclose any areas of :

- non governmental employment
- trades, profession or vocation
- gifts in excess of \$100
- real property (other than owner occupied property)
- personal property (other than property used for family transportation, household, educational, recreational, social or aesthetic purposes)
- directorships of companies
- associations in any partnerships, joint venture or other business enterprise
- financial interest in any company, partnerships, joint ventures, or other business enterprises
- interest in any trust
- liabilities to any creditor in excess of \$10,0000 at any time during the year.

No value should be shown on any of the above items.

3. Public Disclosure Statements should be forwarded to the

Clerk of the House of Representatives

Town Clerks of Municipalities

Chief Executive Officers of Local Government bodies

Any member of the public on request to the Integrity Commission.

4. The following acts by government officials and persons in public life should be declared contrary to law:
 - Acts where there is a Conflict of Interest;
 - Using confidential information for private gain;
 - Using official position to influence a decision;
 - The improper acceptance of gifts or benefits;
 - The improper carrying on of business;
 - Acting on behalf of members of the public towards government within 2 years of relinquishing office.

5. The Integrity Commission should exercise a Supervisory Role to ensure the due observance of the provisions of the Act by:
 - educating and counselling persons within the ambit of the legislation;
 - providing a forum for the evaluation of the effectiveness of restraints on morality in public life;
 - providing an Opinion Service whereby advice can be sought by a person either as to his own conduct or that of any person under the Act.

6. Permanent Secretaries, Chief Technical Officers, members of State Enterprises and Statutory bodies should not be required to file declarations of assets and liabilities to the Integrity Commission but all such persons including all public officers of whatever degree, should be subject to the supervisory jurisdiction of the Commission.

7. Penalties for Breaches of the Act

A - The offences for which the Act now provides the penalties of fine and imprisonment are -

- the unlawful disclosure of information,
- the non disclosure of assets,
- failing to file a declaration,
- making a false declaration,
- refusing to attend an inquiry.

We recommend no change to these provisions.

B - The new offences to be created constitute Misconduct in Public Office. These are instances where there is:

- a Conflict of Interest,
- the use of unlawful Insider Information,
- the unlawful use of Influence,
- the unlawful acceptance of benefits,
- the unlawful Carrying on of Business.

For this category of offences, the Commission , in addition to its powers of giving Opinions under its supervisory jurisdiction, should be empowered to make the following orders -

That assets be

- placed in a Blind Trust
- placed with the Public Trustee (until the person has ceased to be a person in public life)
- disposed of
- forfeited to the State
- otherwise dealt with.

Such orders should thereafter be registrable by the Director of Public Prosecutions as Orders of the High Court and be enforceable under the Rules of the Supreme Court.

8. The report of a Tribunal appointed under the Act should, in addition to being forwarded to the President, be sent to -
 - The Speaker of the House
 - The Mayor of the Municipality
 - The Chairman of the Local Government body; and
 - The Director of Public Prosecutions.

9. After a finding by the Commission of Misconduct in Public Office or a conviction at law for a breach of the Act, the Parliament or other body under the Act should be empowered to make the following orders, on the recommendation of the Commission -
 - (a) That a member be reprimanded,
 - (b) That a member be required to vacate his office,
 - (c) That a member's seat be declared vacant.

10. For the effective carrying out of an investigation, the Commission should be able to enlist the support of any agency of government to make all information in its possession available to the Commission.
11. References to the Commission for the exercise of its supervisory jurisdiction over public officers and members of State Enterprises and Statutory Bodies should emanate only from
 - the Public Service Commission
 - the Statutory Authorities Service Commission
 - the State Enterprise concerned or the appropriate Minister of Government.

SUBMITTED TO PARLIAMENT

this day of March, 1990

GEORGE COLLYMORE
Chairman

J. O'NEIL LEWIS
Deputy Chairman

JOHN MARTIN
Member

JOHN OTTLEY
Member

BRIAN DES VIGNES
Member