
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 29th November, 1977

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P., (Speaker); Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., LL.D.; Mr. R. StC. WEEKES, J.P.; Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Labour and Community Services); Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning); Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B., (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Leader of the Opposition); Hon. H. deB. FORDE, S.C., M.A., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of External Affairs); Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. M. C. C. WARD; Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Caribbean Affairs, External Trade, Industry and Tourism and Leader of the House); Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Culture); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, M.Sc.

Prayers were read by Father F. A. Cayless.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday 15th November, 1977.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, subject to any errors, I beg to move that the Minutes be confirmed.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection, the Minutes of the meeting of 15th November, 1977 stand confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to announce that I have received copies of the Accounts and Statements for the months of September, and October, 1977, as prepared by the Accountant General.

MESSAGES, PETITIONS, PAPERS, ETC.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this item be postponed as the necessary papers have not reached here yet.

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South Central, his Question with respect to the Royal visit.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, before we get on to that.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am going to explain.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is completely out of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the hon. member to take his seat.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am not giving up my privilege. Two weeks ago I handed in some Parliamentary Questions.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Leader of the Opposition take his seat. (Pause) The hon. member for St. Michael

South Central, his Question with respect to the Royal visit to Barbados.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Question as you have altered it....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is completely out of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: But you have altered it; this is not the question I originally handed in.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Have the Standing Orders of the House that provide that the Speaker may alter Questions to make them conform with the Rules been in any way revoked or does Your Honour still have the full power to alter Parliamentary Questions if in Your Honour's opinion they are not in order?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: You mean showing them to the Government for the Government to prepare answers to them? Does the Standing Order stand for that?

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Leader of the Opposition withdraw that remark immediately.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am saying categorically, and I can tell you who told me my questions were shown to the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Leader of the Opposition withdraw the remark?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: What remark, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw the remark immediately. There will be no argument.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I withdraw, but the Leader of the House told me.....

Mr. SPEAKER: And take your seat.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, is there any rule forbidding Ministers to prepare the answers to meet the questions?

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Prime Minister, if the House of Assembly is not a primary school, is not my fault.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, my Question on the Royal visit:

To enquire of the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning:

1. What is the total cost to Barbados of the Royal visit from 31st October, 1977 to the 2nd November, 1977?
2. What is the cost of each function held by any Government department during the visit?
3. From what source will the cost be met?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member, his Question with regard to one-armed bandits.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Question as put in order by you....

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Leader of the Opposition take his seat and discontinue.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Under what rule, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: I so rule.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: You can't rule so!

Mr. SPEAKER: You cannot be offensive to the Chair.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, did not the Prime Minister say a moment ago that you put these questions in order and that the rules allow it?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition must take his seat.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Is the Opposition going to be throttled like this all the time.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition must take his seat.
12.25 p.m.

*Statement by the Minister of Finance and Planning Relating to the
Annual Report of the Barbados Development Bank*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams: Mr. Speaker,

The Annual Report of the Barbados Development Bank for the year ended 31st March, 1977 was noted by the Cabinet on 3rd November, 1977, and laid in the House of Assembly today.

Revenue and Expenditure

2. During the year under review, total Revenue amounted to \$747,207 and total expenditure amounted to \$1.48m. This resulted in a deficit of \$736,140 which can be attributed mainly to the fact that Bad Debts totalling \$655,750 had to be written off. Other factors contributing to the deficit were —

- (a) the increase in wages and staff during the year: and
- (b) the provision for interest payment on the Second Bond Issue which commenced in March 1976.

Loan Port-folio

3. The Bank approved loans totalling \$6.8m in the period under review. This figure represents an increase of \$3.0m or 81.6% over loans for the previous financial year. The number of loans approved increased by 37, a figure, which represents a 68.5% improvement over loans given in the previous year. Of the \$6.8m approved as loans only approximately \$3.0m was disbursed within the review period. The amounts disbursed were distributed among the various sectors as follows:—

	\$
Tourism	1.9 m
Industry	0.69m
Agriculture	0.16m
Small Business	0.1 m
Fisheries	0.09m
Small Manufacturing	0.06m approx.

Operations — Long Term

4. The rate of disbursement has improved since the end of the review period and significant employment opportunities continue to be created. The Bank has acquired long-term financing during the year which adequately covers its long-term debts. Net long-term loans for the year amounted to approximately \$18.6m while total long-term debt amounted to approximately \$17.4m. The Bank has also widened its investment port-folio by the acquisition of Government Debentures valued at approximately \$1.4m. Total investment for the financial year 1976–77 amounted to \$1.98m which reflected an increase of \$1.7m over investments for the previous year.

Employment

5. The Bank is aware of the need to increase the level of employment and has to this end extended its loan port-folio to provide for projects which will make major contributions to increasing the level of employment. It is envisaged that the

projects approved during the financial year 1976-77 will lead to the creation of 286 permanent additional jobs, mainly in the tourist and manufacturing sectors, in addition to the much larger number of jobs created for the construction of the projects. The most up-to-date figures indicate that since October 1976, 1700 construction workers have been employed on Barbados Development Bank financed projects.

Exports

6. Finally, an increase in export earnings is expected to emanate from the manufacturing sector mainly through the operation of "Structural Systems" — a project which was approved during the last financial year.

PAPERS LAID

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I should state that it was anticipated this Statement would be given after the laying of the Accounts, and, due to the postponement of the item Papers, it has, unfortunately, been delivered before.

I, therefore, now beg to lay the Statement of the Barbados Development Bank for 1976-77. That is the Statement to which I refer.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the Papers have now arrived, and we can revert to the laying of Papers.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I should also beg to lay The Public Officers Loan and Travelling Allowances (Amendment) Regulations, 1977.

I beg to lay the Statement of Accounts of the Sugar Export Levy Fund for the year 1976-77.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve of a guarantee of a loan amounting to \$4,000,000 at interest rate of 5 per centum per annum from the Central Bank of Barbados to the Barbados Development Bank.

I also beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$6,200 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1977-78, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1977-78, No. 20, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

I beg to give notice of a Resolution to advance the sum of Two million five hundred thousand dollars from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government for the purpose of making advances of

salary or wages to public employees on the terms and conditions set out in the Schedule thereto.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to amend the note to Item 2, Other Facilities, under Head 11(2) — Port Management, of the 1977-78 Capital Estimates.

Also a Resolution to approve the rates of postage on postal packets transmitted from Barbados to a place abroad otherwise than by air mail.
12.35 p.m.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the sum of \$75,000,000 as the sum which, for the purposes of section 11 of the Mortgage Insurance Act, Cap. 233, the aggregate amount of all loans in respect of which insurance policies have been issued under the Act may not exceed.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Consumption Tax Act.

I also beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Landlord and Tenant (Registration of Tenancies) Act, 1977.

I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Income Tax Act.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Consumption Tax Act be now read a first time.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Landlord and Tenant (Registration of Tenancies) Act, 1977 be now read a first time.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Income Tax Act be now read a first time.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the instant order of the day.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 4) ORDER, 1977

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is really a very simple Resolution, and the Addendum sets out very completely and precisely what is the matter at stake.

As is known, Mr. Speaker, the Government Savings Bank has become part of a new National Bank of Barbados and in future will be conducted along commercial lines. As a result of this there is a great deal of staff re-organisation taking place. The Manager of the Government Savings Bank is at present a public officer and is seconded to the service of the Bank and therefore cannot benefit from any emoluments which are fixed for the post of Manager of the new commercial bank. However, it has been thought

appropriate to pay the Manager a salary more suitable for his position during the transitional stages of the changeover from the Government Savings Bank to the new National Bank of Barbados, and for this purpose it has become necessary to amend the Civil Establishment (General) Order of 1976 to upgrade his salary slightly to the amount of \$22,584 annually.

It is this that the Resolution seeks. This was the salary selected by the Board of Directors of the Bank for the position of Manager, and I move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. DeL. BRADSHAW: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise at this stage to make an appeal to hon. members to let us — to the Leader of the Opposition, I might as well make it clear with whom I am dealing — to appeal to the Leader of the Opposition to climb down somewhat from the plateau of ill-humour which has so far characterised today's debate.

I have sat in his seat for many years and laboured under disadvantages with which I think he has never had to endure. The Leader of the Opposition, since the change of Government, has been treated with every respect, every encouragement and every courtesy. I would respectfully say that I think sometimes he gets greater regard, is possibly treated with more dignity from this side of the House than from his own side, and again I say to him with great diffidence that he must understand that while it may not yet have happened to him, that the occupant of the Chair has made alterations in the questions he asked, that it is the prerogative of the Chair, given to the Chair by the rules, to ask that questions be put into such form as conforms with the Standing Orders.

It does not reflect well on anybody that he should appear to speak to anybody else as from a great height and to be insulted if somebody else corrects his draughtsmanship or demonstrates a knowledge of something that he perhaps may feel he had some peculiar command over. All of us who have sat in the House before have known what it is to submit a question in a form that did not meet with the favour of the Chair.

12.45 p.m.

You yourself have sat on the Opposition benches, I believe more than once, and submitted Questions and submitted yourself to the discipline and authority of the Chair in respect of those Questions without demur or quarrell. I will therefore appeal to the Leader of the

Opposition not to appear to be trying to treat Your Honour with contempt, and that he knows better what the Rules of the House are; and that he cannot be spoken to and that he cannot be disciplined. I do not think that any of us can conduct our business in here unless we accept the authority of the Chair; and I do say in a spirit of diffidence that I am appealing to the hon. member on this particular occasion not to let down the dignity of the office that he holds by giving anybody the appearance that he is trying to play that he is above authority. All of us submit to your authority. Everybody has to obey the rules. I am hoping that in the circumstances the Leader of the Opposition is willing to do so in relation to what on reflection he must know are improper remarks. If he is willing to ask the questions, I am appealing to the House to accept it. We are perfectly willing on this side of the House to resume Notices of Questions and proceed with the business of the House in the form in which it should proceed.

As the Chaplain has said we are the eye of this year of Independence. We have had during the last few days to put up with a lot. We in Government are ever patient, Sir, but we have had incitements to violence — not that the Leader of the Opposition was in any way involved in that — but we have had to put up with insults of people's motives, incitements of violence and attempts to try to set the minds of those who are disadvantaged in our society against those who are trying to do something for their welfare. We have had to put up with all of that; but the Leader of the Opposition has not so far, unlike, perhaps, some of his colleagues, involved himself in these devices; and I am appealing to him in this Chamber to resume that main stream of harmony and good conduct which we all expect to inform our deliberations.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Notices of Questions be resumed.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have listened very attentively to what the Hon. Prime Minister has had to say. I have said already from this Chair that I do not intend being a hypocrite; and whilst the Prime Minister was making what I might consider a plea on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition, I heard from the mouth of the Leader of the Opposition "You are wasting your time." While the Prime Minister was pleading on his behalf — (Hon. F. G. SMITH: On my behalf what? I am not in the dock.) The Leader of the Opposition is interrupting the business of this House. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am sorry, Sir.) I believe that while I would be willing to accommodate the hon. member, it is not he who will

be wasting his time, but I will be wasting my time and the time of this Hon. House.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: It is a motion made by the Hon. Leader of the House and seconded by the Hon. Prime Minister that Question Time be resumed. It is a motion before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am willing to hear the Leader of the Opposition.

The question that Question Time be now resumed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. member for St. Michael South Central — his Question concerning one armed bandits.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, in the circumstances I am not prepared to ask that question.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South Central — his Question concerning 1,700 new jobs.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, it is only fair to say that I have had a discussion with the Leader of the Opposition about these 1,700 new jobs. (ASIDE: There is no Question) I know that there is no Question but I am just saying that a question has been raised about 1,700 new jobs and I have arranged to circulate to members of this House the list of the new jobs, ranging from Lady Sobers' two employees right up to Golden Horizon Hotel — 135 jobs — because I do not want the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to go outside and say that we tried to suppress something; that we talked about 1,700 new jobs and we cannot prove it. He will get the list. There are 1,702 new jobs to be precise.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South Central — his Question concerning the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central — his Question concerning the contracts for the supply of meat to the School Meals.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central — his Question respecting the retirement of persons over 60 years of age.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central – his Question concerning the visit of the Minister of Communications and Works to the United Kingdom. 12.55 p.m.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central, his question concerning dissatisfaction amongst minibus drivers.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central, his question about 12,000 acres of agricultural land being brought into agricultural cultivation.

I understand there are five other questions handed in by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. Three of those questions are out of order and two have been deferred.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, it is only fair to say, if the hon. member says that the Government has seen those questions beforehand, that I would like to confirm that. There is absolutely no reason why in the interest of good Government Government could not prepare answers to Parliamentary Questions as at early a time as possible so that the public can get the answers nearly extemporaneously with the questions, and I would like to state on behalf of the Government that answers were prepared to a number of those questions and we were prepared to deliver them today, and I believe he has not asked them because he is afraid of the answers. I believe what was wanted was for some of these questions to be on the Order Paper for people to read, some of them containing malicious and poisonous innuendos. I do not think I can say that. I withdraw that. But the questions related to the general cleaners, R. L. Seale and Co. It was hoped these would be on the Order Paper for some time, but now that it is known that the answers are ready and can refute any suggestion of improper dealings, the hon. member refuses to ask the questions. He is afraid of the answers.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to inform hon. members, however, that at this stage I can only entertain from Ministers respecting those questions, only matters that pertain directly to the public's interest. If concerning those questions any Minister has anything to say which concerns the public's interest which comes first in tabling any question, that and only that can the Chair entertain.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

RESOLUTION CONGRATULATING THE GOVERNMENT ON THE PROPOSALS CONTAINED IN THE THRONE SPEECH

Mr. SPEAKER: When further consideration of this Resolution was postponed, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was addressing the Chair.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, that was not quite accurate. At the end of the speech by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary, I asked, since we had a funeral to attend, for further postponement. I certainly was not addressing the House on the Throne Speech. Be that as it may, I should like to say that when I listened first to the hon. member for St. Philip North, it was good for the Government that he could at least talk about housing, because I think he concentrated his fire on what little achievements he had up to now obtained in the sphere of housing. As to the hon. member for St. Michael South East, I do not think his remarks need worry us very much because I do not think he made much of a contribution to the furtherance of the debate. Of course in his inimitable style he took the opportunity to further his party's interest, and with that no one can have any quarrel.

But let us look at this seventeen minute speech which was delivered by Her Majesty the Queen with her graciousness and the Opposition has already supported the Resolution of thanks; but certainly from the point of view of asking Her Majesty who comes here more often perhaps than she visits her other Dominions to read a speech of this quality and nature, is certainly, even although she is compelled to do it by protocol and by the constitutional provisions which she accepts, not fair to Her Majesty the Queen, because when you look and compare the manifesto of a party and try to win votes and did win votes in a general election with what they are promising the country after fifteen months, one must indeed be sadly disappointed. I find in this second session of Parliament some very notable omissions and very little hope or promise for the man in the street.

Now I would like to read first a very significant omission from Her Majesty's Speech and I would like to quote from the manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party which shows quite clearly – I do not want it to be said it is being considered because if it is ready to come down to Parliament it should be ready almost to be mentioned – that Her Majesty certainly was not advised by Her Ministers on the other side that this was anywhere near completion, and this is what the Barbados Labour Party said.

"After a long debate in the last session Parliament agreed to appoint a Select Committee on the Leader of the Opposition's Resolution who is now the Prime Minister, calling for introduction of integrity legislation for Ministers and members of Parliament. However except for the Speaker, D.L.P. members failed to attend its meetings and it was unable to form a quorum. The Barbados Labour Party thus remains alone" — I do not know where they got that from — "as giving wholehearted support to the principle of such legislation which is increasingly being passed in other Commonwealth countries.

1.05 p.m.

"The Party therefore represents and expands the pledge contained in the 1971 Manifesto" — so that five or six years have already passed, this is 1977 — "That it will pass legislation providing for members of Parliament and politically appointed members of Statutory Corporations to disclose their finances — assets and liabilities — on assuming office." Fifteen months have passed and we have no word in the Throne Speech about this, whereas one would expect Her Majesty to have been advised about this piece of legislation, but it is not mentioned in the speech.

Again, "As a matter of principle no salary increases will be voted by members of the House of Assembly except after an independent review by a properly qualified outside body." Also "A code of proper conduct will be laid down for Ministers, Senior Civil Servants and political appointees to Statutory Corporations."

Now from this Manifesto it seems to me that since 1971 the Government now in power has been concerned about corruption and other things affecting the proper political and Parliamentary functioning of this country, and I would have expected that if any legislation was ready or in the process of being ready for Parliamentary approval, this to me would be a vital matter since it would be for the first time in the history of Barbados that legislation calling for this type of control would be reaching Parliament; and I would not have imagined that this would have been omitted from the Throne Speech. Of course, you might say it was ready but you did not put it in the Throne Speech and I would have to take that. But I would have expected Her Majesty to make mention in her speech of this monumental departure from established procedure. But Mr. Speaker, you will read all the pages of the Throne Speech and not see a word of this. And I am wondering what is the reason, for according to their Manifesto they have been thinking of it for fifteen years. They indicated that this Resolution would be introduced into Parliament on their assuming office, but after fifteen months nothing has been done and there is no inclination given in the Throne Speech as to when this legislation will be

introduced. There is no mention at all about this vital piece of legislation.

As regards the code of conduct, perhaps the Prime Minister will advise us that they have drawn up one and the public need not concern itself about it. But, as I said, this was a promise made to the people and I cannot find anywhere any mention of it. I mention this omission, because I would have thought that this Government which is so keen on setting up Commissions to enquire into the dealings of the last Government would have taken steps before many months had passed to see that this promised legislation was placed before Parliament.

Of course, the Throne Speech need not contain everything the Government proposes doing, but in my opinion, this was more important than having in the Throne Speech about a round-about in Halls Road and such things.

About other notable omissions, one would have expected a Government concerned with the plight and hardships of old people to intimate in the Speech if and when these old people would be getting various increased benefits promised them; because, do not let us fool ourselves, it is because of these rash, pie-in-the-sky promises that the Government won the election in 1976, and the public was expecting to hear that some of these glorious promises would be fulfilled at least in this session; but for the man in the street it is like the song by Frank Sinatra "Ram bursting the dam".

With that look at the Throne Speech, I would like to say that Government could rightly stop singing a song that the Treasury is empty; they cannot keep this up for five years; they will have to get a new tune. In 1981 we will hear that the Treasury is full and everybody will be getting a share around election time. It is said that Barbadians have short memories, so that if you can keep up this tune, the time will come when this would be the only way to dampen the expectations of the people of this country. But I hope the time will soon come, in spite of the taxation imposed on the people by the last Budget, that that tune will be too old for the people. The Government has now been in power for fifteen months, having produced one Budget and have on the eve of introducing another. The Budget introduced last April was to fill up the Treasury, and I have been following the amount of revenue received by Government, and up to September the Government had received in revenue over \$98 million with a possible forecast of another \$25 million; so money is coming in; you can't say therefore that the Treasury is still empty after the imposition of the taxes made in the Budget last April.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to anticipate but the hon. member is presenting a misleading picture. It is not enough to say that there has been \$98 million in revenue; the Leader of the Opposition must also say that \$105 million was expended. The hon. member must not mislead the House; expenditure is exceeding revenue.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I said Government received \$98 million in revenue; is this not a fact? However, be that as it may, I will pass on. Now when you look at the promises by which this Government got into power in 1976, let us deal with the plight of the old people of this country and let us look at the complete absence to the old people of any benefits whatever; the old people whom everybody regard as the senior citizens of our community and who have contributed to the economy of Barbados and for whom nothing is indicated in the Throne Speech that Government intends to do anything to increase the plight of the old people of this country.

1.15 p.m.

I would like to refer to the Manifesto again, because either these things are coming, or.....

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Does the Leader of the Opposition expects a Government to increase the plight and the hardship of old people?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Not to increase it, but to decrease it. It is *lapsus linguae*. It is certainly not *lapsus memoriae*. If I said it, I meant to decrease it. I thank you very much. I like the camaraderie that exists between the members of the legal profession, except in one case which is not too far from here. Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal with this question. To me it is accepted on all sides that the \$16.00 a week which the Democratic Labour Party promised — not which the Barbados Labour Party gave anybody. The Debates of the House will show that, before we went out of office, we promised old age pensioners, in spite of an attempt to make the old age people think that it was a gift from the Barbados Labour Party, an increase ourselves.

In their own Manifesto they mentioned it. The Throne Speech does not contain any hope or promise for the old people of this country. Now, tomorrow is independence. Whatever you may say about the Democratic Labour Party, we made it a point of giving the old people some little benefit at independence time. I have not heard anything about this. I do not know if it is being done administratively, but I have not heard that this new Government, concerned with the plight of the old, is determined to better their condition and bring, at least, temporary happiness before they are

called to their creator. I do not know if this Government is giving them anything at independence time. I may be wrong, and I speak subject to correction. Of course, they may give them a dinner at the Almshouse or at a District Hospital, but we used to give the old age pensioners a grant however small. It was the Democratic Labour Party's attempt to show to the old people that at independence time we were still conscious, even although it may have been token, of the contribution which they had made in the past to enable Barbados to reach a stage where we could be celebrating independence year after year. I speak subject to correction, and the Government can correct me on this, or the Minister responsible for Social Welfare can say that they are contributing something to the old pensioners either by an *ex gratia* extra payment or something else at this time of the year.

What did the Government say to the old people to get their votes when the time was right for vote-catching?

"The BLP believes that some sacrifice must be made by Barbadians to take care of Old Age Pensioners through the years until the National Insurance Scheme takes up the main burden of looking after our Senior Citizens. BLP Parliamentarians have repeatedly taken up this theme in the House of Assembly and called for a pension increase to at least \$20.00 weekly."

They are in power now. When they were in the Opposition every cry was for \$20.00. I have to repeat that because, Mr. Speaker, this is vital. They are the ones to give the \$20.00 now. I heard the Prime Minister say to the young socialists in his Party that he cannot give the old people anything because the money is not there, but when we were in the Government they were crying for \$20.00 from this side. Repeatedly, as he says in his Manifesto, have BLP parliamentarians taken up this theme in the House of Assembly and called for a pension increase to at least \$20.00 weekly.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is misquoting me. I said you cannot give yet because the money is not there. He must not misquote me, Sir.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I accept yet. I will accept the Prime Minister's yet, but if yet was in this session I would expect the Prime Minister to make the promise, at least, in the Throne Speech that it is Government's intention to increase old age pensions. I do not know when yet is, but I would expect, if he is really serious, that he would have at least, said to the old people: "Hold on. Do a little more praying. I am coming to your financial rescue by giving you \$20.00 in this particular session." That is a vital matter to which old

people would be looking forward. This Government, who spoke during election time and in the House and admitted in their Manifesto, were crying for \$20.00 for old age pensioners, and the \$16.00 a week that the old age pensioners are getting today is what the Democratic Labour Party promised them before we left office. They have not got an extra cent in 15 months under the Barbados Labour Party. Those are facts which cannot be denied. The money was paid out by you.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is misleading the House. The increase in pensions took place within the session of this Government's life. The point is it was a Government's measure. It was brought down to the House by the Government.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General knows, from reading the Debates, that the last Minister of Finance did say that they would get \$3.00 then from \$10.00 to \$13.00, and \$3.00 within a certain time. All the Barbados Labour Party did, as the Attorney-General knows, was to honour the promise in the Debates in the House. There is no magic about this. They honoured the promise and the statement made by the then Minister of Finance. Those are facts, and it is not sense saying that it happened in your day. You can claim that Her Majesty opened the John Beckles Day Nursery, but you did not start to build it. You can say that she opened the Community College, but those are things which come to fruition in your time just as the old age pensioners got their \$3.00 extra because you won the Government. It was not your initiative that gave them the \$3.00, and you know that too. We know the money was paid out in your time. It is a good thing we had said it before, and it is there in black and white for anyone who cares to read and see that we had promised them the extra \$3.00.

Now, you were arguing for \$20.00 when we were in the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please address the Chair.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am sorry, Sir. Now that you form the Government, you are saying that you cannot afford \$20.00 yet. The Manifesto goes on to state:

"The Party will accordingly reduce the age of qualification to 65 years....."

You have done that. You have reduced it to 65 years for the simple reason that it does not cost you anything more because nearly everybody in this age group has got pension from the National Insurance; so by reducing it you have not added many to the roll.

Hon. DeL. BRADSHAW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. This Government, by reducing the age from 68 to 65, has added 5,000 new pensioners to the list.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: They do not get the money. You have the numbers and the age. Mr. Speaker, they added the numbers and the age. Those people at the age of 65 are getting pension from the National Insurance.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member does not understand the position. Those 5,000 people are net additions to the old age pensioners and it has nothing to do with National Insurance.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, if those are the statistics, which the Government likes to trot out, I will accept them. I would also like to say that this same Government is now going around checking out who has \$15.00 a week and who is getting old age pensions and taking them off the roll. It is right in law, but it is also reducing the old age pension roll by checking out those who were drawing two pensions and, rightly, if you want to pursue it, you cannot draw a pension in this country.....
1.25 p.m.

Hon. DeL. BRADSHAW: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I want to refute a statement made by the Leader of the Opposition. This Government has not taken one person off the old age pensioners' roll. He must learn to tell the truth in this Chamber.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Be that as it may, this Government said in its Manifesto about the old age pensions, "The Party will accordingly reduce the age of qualification to 65 years and increase the Old Age Pension to this level with provision for further periodic increases."

"The Party will keep these pensions under constant review with the aim of eventually reducing the age of qualification to 60 years and providing for annual periodic reviews of the weekly amount of pensions which will take account of periodic increases in the cost of living."

The cost of living has gone up, you promised them you were going to give them an increase, as you said in your Manifesto, "taking into account periodic increases in the cost of living." I am reading this Manifesto to say that a Government puts something on paper, the people have voted for that Party expecting them to honour what they said. They have not done so yet, unless this Government is holding back these sweetmeats until 1980 or 81, and these people will be gathered unto their fathers by then.

We are coming to the school uniforms just now. I am dealing with old age pensions first and I am coming round to Education secondly. When you read this Throne Speech and you relate it to what they promised and what they got this Government on, and relate it to what they have done after 15 months, the man in the street has every right to be dissatisfied with their performance, because you have not come up with anything whatsoever. Instead of setting up Commission after Commission of Enquiry costing the Government when all is finished nearly \$200,000, you should be in a position to take that same money and help the old people by repairing their houses, even for \$1,600 per house.

You have to have priorities, you have to know where suffering is, and the Throne Speech is in the second session, not even the first where we were prepared to give you time to read the files and adjust, but we will expect you to embark on positive action and put into practice all these promises you made to the people. If this Government was prepared to honour the promises, to have foresight and forward planning, the Government could have forecasted in the Throne Speech to let the people of this country know what type of benefits or what type of plans would be implemented in this session for the betterment of the masses. Instead of that, you hear about wage restrictions of 5%, which means a person getting \$60 a week will only get 5% increase. If the Union agrees to that the people there will need to have their heads examined.

This Government got into power by promising the old retired people that they would get their pensions brought into line with the pensions of people who retire today. This is what I understand it to mean, and the man who retired understood this Government to mean, that if you retired as Commissioner of Police 25 years ago and you are still alive and getting \$200 as pension, and the present Commissioner gets \$800, this Government promised people that they would bring up that pension from \$200 to \$800 or near in line with what the present Commissioner would get today. This is what they said in the Manifesto:

"Adjust the pensions of retired public officers to take account of the salary being currently and from time to time paid to the relevant office holder rather than pegging the pension to the salary paid to an officer at the date of his retirement."

If you cannot even give old age pensioners \$20, I do not know how these public officers who went to the polls relying on this will get their pensions upgraded.

If this Government were really serious, and if they were really interested, in the coming session they would at least have indicated to the public and to the people whom they represent what plans they have.

Another point where the average old age pensioner is suffering considerably is that this Government promised in the same section of the Manifesto to ensure full implementation of the proposals to pay the water rates and electricity bills for old age pensioners. There is no forecast in the Speech, no forecast that this Government knowing the price of water has gone up, increased by that Government from \$6.00 to \$10.00 for the lowest rates, imposing this extra burden of at least \$16.00 a week more on the old age pensioners, has taken one step to relieve the plight and the hardship which the old age pensioner is suffering in this area, and you made the promises to them.

I can see the old ladies in moth balls going to vote, telling themselves they are going to get their electricity bills paid, but either in Heaven or the Other Place they will get that, but they are certainly not getting it from you because you have not promised them that in this session, you have not said that the Government in this session will do anything which has anything to do with the working class man in this country. You have talked a lot about a scientific this and a scientific that, and this committee and that committee, but all that means nothing to the man in the street who is suffering.

Let us go on, Mr. Speaker. Free uniforms. I suppose if I ask a question on this I will hear that they will get them when they are ready. That is the answer to that. If the Minister of Education agrees that the absence of any mention of free uniforms is that they will get them when the Government is ready, that they might keep them till 1980 or 81 when they are ready, then, but I cannot see the average man in the street relying on these promises, that he will get free uniforms for his children and save him a considerable sum of money.

When we were in the Government they said that the civil servants should have got a greater increase, that it was too low, when we were looking at the economy. They have so many brains over there one would have expected that they would at least have known that the Democratic Labour Party was acting within the limitations and the possibilities of the economic position of Barbados. Oh, no, but you yourself stated when you were in the Opposition that you wanted \$20 for the old age pensioners. You said we should have gone back to the bargaining table because a 35% increase was not enough, now you are telling the working class of this country you will give them 5%.

1.35 p.m.

When the last Minister of Finance proposed to give them 35%, and when you would have known of the oil crisis and recession throughout the world, you said that 35% is too little; give them 80%. The first thing that this Government did was to coach the man who wanted \$100

million for Civil Servants. The people of this country must understand that they have to pass over what people say on platforms and use their brains. The Civil Servants and teachers believed from what they heard you say when you were in Opposition, that when you got into power you were going to give them even a 100%. Two years have passed, and not one Civil Servant or one teacher has got a penny.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member is misleading the House. It is not two years. He is supposed to be a responsible man.

Mr. SPEAKER: A responsible member.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Thank you. It is 15 months and a quarter. Everyone knows that the Government was operating on the 2nd September. Let me say one year and seven-eighths, if you want me to be accurate. Everybody knows that I am not that illiterate that I do not know that from the 2nd September to the 29th November could not be two years. All right. It is one year, 3 months and 27 days. Do you want me to calculate it to the nearest figure?

What I am saying is that in spite of your promises in Opposition and your saying that 35% was too low, and the present Minister of Finance who is supposed to be a financial genius, and who could have analysed the report from the Central Bank and other reports which he had in his possession, could still tell the Government that 35% was not enough. We will see what you will do when you come next year to discuss wages with the Civil Servants. We will not be as irresponsible as you and ask for 100% or saying 35% or any other per cent. That is a matter for the unions and for you.

When you are in Opposition you can say anything. Fortunately for me I have been in that position before; but now that you have to run the Government...

Mr. SPEAKER: Not the way in which the Chair is presently constituted.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: When I say "you", you know what I mean. As I was saying already, in the Throne Speech what has the Government promised to anybody that is going to benefit them in any way? After all, the people in any community are concerned with a standard of living, with their basic needs, a roof over their heads, shelter, food and clothes. They want to be able to meet their commitments. In Barbados everyone wants to be in a position to educate their children and I think that in this regard Barbados has everything to be proud of.

Indeed, last night when I was lying down listening to the Prime Minister — because I do not watch him any more — I heard him talking to the Young Socialists. I heard him saying that Barbados has more cars than

Russia, more this and that than Russia, more telephones, etc. than Russia. I wondered who gave Barbadians these things. You could not do it in 15 months, so somebody else must have given them. The Prime Minister in his address to the Young Socialists said that this country had a lot going for it. I laid down and offered a prayer to God because he at least would see what we did. The Prime Minister can now admit to the Young Socialists that Barbados has more of certain things than Russia. Somebody had to give them, and I took credit quietly lying on my bed. There is no one in this country who can deny that the Democratic Labour Party in the last 15 years have contributed immensely.

At least tomorrow when we celebrate our independence, we in the Opposition can hold our heads high and proud because it was our party that led this young, vibrant country into independence. Some of them over there cannot say tomorrow that from the beginning they supported independence in its entirety. They had reservations. They wanted it within a Federation; but tomorrow as the Anthem is played when the radio comes on I will feel a sense of pride and joy that I belong to the party which took this country into independence.

Let us go on. The man in the street has his aspirations. What does the present session promise him in terms of material benefits? I know what is promised him next year. National Insurance is going up early; and the health service will be going up more. I do not mind. I have to pay \$60 a month now, and if I live to 65 I will collect it; but at the same time this increase will mean a lot to them. What does the Throne Speech promise? The National Health Service will not be free although it was free in the manifesto because votes were around the corner; but now we are told that the only thing free is air — not even water. Thank the Lord that we have the sea, and light from the stars at night and from the sun by day and not from the Barbados Light and Power Company; but I have reasons to show that when people want votes they will promise anything while the people in the community still suffer. Let us read about this Health Service. We are now hearing that it will not be free. We started with drugs first.

I read that salaries of Ministers or members of Parliament are to be frozen. I would have thought that in this open Government when we are dealing with the freezing of the salaries of members of Parliament we would be given some information. I read it in the *Nation*. Well, the Editor of the *Nation* must have a pipeline to a Government, and if it respected Parliament, and if it set up a committee to review the salaries of members of Parliament, one would have expected this open Government to make a statement in Parliament and tell Parliament about the recommendations of the committee which it set up in terms of the economic policy to freeze salaries.

Let me tell you how this came about. Because the Minister of Finance said \$5.00 for the man in the street who is working, he has got to try to fool the man in the street that \$5.00 for you is better than more for members. The release said that both sides agreed; but it has never come to Parliament.

1.45 p.m.

As Leader of the Opposition I have never seen the Report. I do not know what is in it, I do not know what is recommended; neither have my colleagues seen it. I would like to know if the Minister of Finance is going to lay it in the House. You are open Government, you are not secret Government, and you quarrelled with us for not laying Report; so let the public see that you are open. Publish the Report for the public. I dare you to publish the Report of the Review Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition must now wind up his debate.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I have unlimited time.

Mr. SPEAKER: If you would check Standing Order No. 30(7) it will enlighten you.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I thank you very much. I was under the impression that on such matters I have unlimited time.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am satisfied that within the last few months the economic position of Barbados has deteriorated considerably. I know that your answer is going to be that if the Democratic Labour Party had taken these steps years ago the present Government would not be in the economic plight in which it finds itself. All right, blame us, but let us reach the stage in economic planning...perhaps next Tuesday we may get a supplementary Budget, because I think the Government itself is fully conscious that under their administration, to use a phrase of Michael Manley, the people of this country have never been under heavier manners. We have never imposed restrictions. I am not quarrelling with them in economic terms. The Democratic Labour Party has never had to impose, curtail or in any way take the stringent measures that this great combination that you have have had to do, and of course as a true patriot I hope the time will shortly come when the Government will come out of the difficulties which are to a large extent of their own creation. I hope to wait until next Tuesday because a little bird told me that we will get a mini-Budget. I do not know how true it is; I may be wrong, but I will wait to see if my predictions are correct. When we were in power you used to get a little hint. We get a little hint over here too. Do you think everybody is on your side? We can never ask a question before you see what was coming. We have people who like us; we got 46.4 per cent. So, Mr. Speaker, I would

just like to say finally that when I read the Throne Speech — and I recommend it to the masses of this country — it does not contain one single hope or promise or prediction or intention for the man in the street who today with the increasing problems of life has got to bear the burdens in this community.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to allow any time at all to pass before I deal with the hon. member and some of the statements he has made.

The hon. member just made a statement that he is satisfied that the economy of this country has deteriorated in the last few months. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that somebody could reach the height that the hon. member has reached by accident and could make such a statement without attempting in any way to provide any kind of analytical evidence to justify such a statement. I challenge the hon. member or any member in his party to point to any evidence of deterioration, because every economic indicator that is used in any country in the world used in Barbados demonstrates clearly that the economy of this country in the last year and in the last fifteen months has improved significantly and considerably. Let us deal with it. Agricultural earnings in this country have gone up. I will bring the figures because I have thirty five minutes to deal with the hon. member. The earnings from tourism have increased. The number of visitor arrivals in this Island has increased between January and October by some 17 per cent, and what is more, because of our sophisticated analysis of the tourist industry in this country we have got new devices of monitoring whether this visitor increase in numbers is reflected in the contribution to the economy. Let the hon. member look at the hotel tax in this country between January 1976 and October 1976 and compare it after discounting the increase that took place between May and now and he will see that the rise in the amount is approximately 16 per cent. This is the sort of sophisticated thing you have got to do. We do not get on a platform and incite people. You are trying to abuse your privilege in the House of Assembly to make a lot of statements, do not provide any evidence to support them, but we know of course that your opinions are worthless, because the public in Barbados has now become educated that when you make statements you should back them up with facts and figures.

Let us go further. I have repeatedly pointed out that we did a comparative analysis of employment in the garment industry and other industries in Barbados, sector by sector, industry by industry, 131 of them, and what we have found is that there are 895 more people employed in industry in September 1977 as opposed to September 1976. Why does the hon. member not produce his own survey to contradict these facts? You don't have the resources to do it, you do not have the sense to do it; you do not understand that we have reached the stage in

this country that when we are going to make statements that they are going to be backed up with factual evidence so that they can be supported. (A VOICE: The manufacturers contradict that.) The manufacturers contradict what! These are facts. No Manufacturer has contradicted us. I have been reading the newspapers and all around there is no statement by any manufacturer published in any document contradicting us. What nonsense are you talking? Because you have one or two manufacturers in this country who belong to the Democratic Labour Party? The point is that we have 2,000 odd more people working in the garment industry than we had last year at this time.

What is more, there is other evidence. Our exports in this country have gone up by 13% between January and September if you compare January to September last year. That confirms that the other evidence we have produced is true and accurate. Why doesn't the hon. member produce his own estimates of exports in this country. This is the methodology that we believe. We do not come in here and make foolish statements. The evidence is there. I challenge the hon. member or any member of his party to produce evidence to dispute these facts. We are dealing with agriculture, tourism and manufacturing, and in all these areas the evidence is clear that the output and the numbers have increased and still we are going to have the hon. member and members of his party walking around telling people that the economy has deteriorated in this country.

Let us deal also with the question of imports to this country. We have programmed, for the first time in the history of this country — this was a sophisticated approach — our imports to suit our exports and our invisible earnings. We said in Barbados that there would be a 5% increase on routine imports this year, and we have been so successful in monitoring that that it now looks as though we will be 5% out. That is a remarkable achievement and I want to thank the public for their cooperation, because for the first time the Government attempted early in the year to programme total imports for the whole year, and we did not interfere with any food imports because the food imports would run at about \$98 million odd.

1.55 p.m.

And we did not interfere with food imports, because imports are still running about \$98 million; so what are members talking about that we have deprived the community of?

The hon. member would have us believe that when we came into power the Treasury was full, but the hon. member should recognize that every commentator on the economy of Barbados in 1976 said that the economy did not have any significant growth, and that as a matter of

fact the people standard of living instead of increasing was decreasing.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the Leader of the Opposition rise?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of elucidation. What are exports showing now?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The hon. member ought to know. What I must say of the hon. member is this, he finds himself performing a function of which he is not capable. He never had access to any of the financial reports, so he does not know.

Mr. Speaker, the position is very clear; the indicators are there. We have independent confirmation, so that when the hon. member talks his nonsense about the economy deteriorating, the review in 1977 will show the actual position.

Mr. Speaker, it is now 2 o'clock and while reserving my right to finish my remarks I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 3 o'clock.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

The question that the House be suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
2.05 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: When the Sitting was suspended the hon. member for Christ Church South Central was addressing the Chair.

(No members of the Opposition present on resumption).

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, it appears as though the content of the speeches made on this side is above the grasp of the members of the other side. In the circumstances therefore I would not detain the House any longer and I beg to move that the question be now put.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I cannot entertain that motion.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I want to exercise my final right of reply in the briefest possible time. I would like to point out for the record that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in his address made reference to the Manifesto of this party as he saw it. For the purpose of the record I wonder what he would say to the fact that

in 1961 his Party promised the people shoes at five shillings a pair, a flour mill, and sea-coast houses for workers, and these promises were never implemented. So that when we implement the flour mill I wonder if he would say we are honouring his promises made sixteen years ago.

I would like to delete from the record that I instructed the Attorney General that I was informed as recently as Sunday that he had told the Leader of the Opposition that progress has been made with respect to the integrity legislation. It is really dishonourable of the Leader of the Opposition to say this.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Attorney General cannot swear that the Leader of the Opposition heard.

Mr. SIMMONS: He was in a position to hear. Furthermore, the Leader of the Opposition must have heard because he told the hon. Attorney General that no

matter what he said, he was going to speak about it today.

With these remarks, Sir, I ask that this Resolution do now pass.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, that concludes the Order Paper for today, and there being no further business, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 6th December, 1977 at 12 Noon.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

3.10 p.m.