

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1961-66

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 24th May, 1966

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 p.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., (*Speaker*); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (*Minister of Health and Community Development*); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (*Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries*); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Mr. L. A. LYNCH, J.P.; Mr. G. V. BATSON, (*Chairman of Committees*); Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (*Minister of Communications and Works*.)

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: With continued regret, I have to apologise to the House for the absence of any Minutes of recent meetings.

Mr. WALCOTT and Mr. CARMICHAEL entered the Chamber and took their seats.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Report of the Commission appointed to examine the Structure and Remuneration of the Civil Service.

Barbados Savings Bank Statement of Revenue and Expenditure for the Half-year ended, 31st December, 1964.

Barbados Savings Bank Statement of Revenue and Expenditure of Revenue and Expenditure for the year ended 31st December, 1964.

Statement showing the amounts advanced by the Government of Barbados, and the amounts received by Her Majesty's Government in the U.K. under the provisions of the Colonial Development and Welfare Act, for the period ended 30th September, 1965 in respect of Schemes sanctioned by the Legislature.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Statement showing the sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the payment of Money Orders, the amounts repaid to the Accountant General, and the amounts due by the various Post Offices to 28th February, 1966.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Public Treasury and appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ended 31st March, 1966.

QUESTIONS

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister the following:-

1. Is Government aware that persons living in the Northern Parishes of this Island, particularly in the parish of St. James experience much difficulty in securing the services of Justices of Peace and as a result are put to much hardship and inconvenience?

2. Will Government recommend that the system of the appointment of Justices of Peace in this area be revised with a view to increasing the number?

Alternatively:

3. Will Government consider the advisability of having Postmasters and Postmistresses of District Post Offices appointed Justices of Peace?

Mr. HUSBANDS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question:-

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister.

Is Government aware of the sad plight of owners and users of property situated on the West Coast of the Island in the parish of Saint Peter, due to the inroads of the sea along the coastal area stretching from Road View St. Peter, to Six Men's St. Peter, and including stretches of land along the Queen Street, Orange Street and Sand Street beaches?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will Government seek to remedy the plight of the owners and users of such land?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Public Treasury and appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ended 31st March, 1966, be now read a first time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. MILLER entered the Chamber and took his seat.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO THE HON. SENIOR MEMBER FOR SAINT MICHAEL

Mr. LYNCH: Mr. Speaker, I beg on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Michael to ask for three weeks' leave of absence from his duties as a member of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for Bridgetown is asking on behalf of the hon. senior member for St. Michael for three weeks' leave of absence for that hon. member from his duties as a member of this House, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted the hon. senior member for St. Michael for three weeks' leave of absence from his duties as a member of this House as from today.

ACTING APPOINTMENT TO DEBATES COMMITTEE

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, owing to the absence from the House of the hon. junior member for Christ Church who was granted three months' leave of absence at the last sitting of this House, and who is a member of the Debates Committee, I think it appropriate at this time that someone should be appointed to act temporarily for the hon. member on the Debates Committee to assist that Committee in forming a Quorum.

I therefore beg to move that the hon. junior member for Bridgetown be appointed to act temporarily.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. junior member for Bridgetown is already a member of the Debates Committee, but I am very grateful to the Hon. Acting Leader of the House for deciding to recommend that some hon. member be appointed to act for the hon. junior member for Christ Church who has been granted three months' leave of absence, because we quite often have difficulty in obtaining a quorum.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. senior member for St. James be appointed to act temporarily during the absence of the hon. junior member for Christ Church.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to draw to the attention of this Honourable House that which has been drawn to my attention by an hon. member of this Chamber, and what appears in a newspaper "The Advocate" for Wednesday, May 18, 1966, on the front page. There is a headline which states:

"House gives Bill second reading. Insurance for 80,000. It's based on two reports. Barbados, with plans set for independence, is to have a system of national insurance and social security established for its inhabitants.

A Bill to give effect to this was given its second reading in the Barbados House of Assembly yesterday."

I need hardly remind hon. members who were in their places last Tuesday that that is inaccurate, obviously misleading and untrue. The Order Paper is entirely correct when it states that the second reading of this Bill was moved and duly seconded by an hon. member who in seconding stated that he reserved the right to speak, and on the motion of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown, seconded by the hon. junior member for St. George, further consideration was postponed.

It is a matter for regret if any hon. member, who was not at the time in the House when the motion for further consideration was postponed, was misled by a newspaper report. I will only counsel hon. members not to take their newspapers too seriously.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of this Chamber that this matter has been drawn to my attention, and the parties in question are very sorry that this incident did occur. It was done with no malice and it is an error on the face of it, in that instead of stating that the second reading was introduced, moved and seconded, an error has crept in, giving the impression that the House had passed the second reading. This is entirely contrary to the state of affairs as we know it, and the parties are very sorry that it occurred and have tendered the necessary apologies.

Mr. SPEAKER: I also have been assured of the deep regret of the individuals concerned, and I have no doubt of the sincerity of their expression of deep apology. The incident is now closed.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting, on the understanding that at a certain point where certain very urgent Government Business shall have been handled, the hon. senior member for St. Peter will be entitled as of right to deal with a Resolution standing in his name - which is also very urgent - under Private Members' Business.

I therefore beg to move the suspension of those Standing Orders.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: May I at this stage assure hon. members that we now have available for this day's meeting our normal complement of three Official Reporters, but may I also assure hon. members that only one of those three has had previous experience of Parliamentary reporting? So we must bear with them and be as lenient as possible in respect of those willing helpers who have come to our rescue, and in fact, to the rescue of Mr. Whittington.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

THE INTERPRETATION ACT, 1966

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 standing in the name of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance be the first Order of the Day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: This Order is the Second Reading of a Bill to make provision with respect to the operation, interpretation, citation and printing and recording of enactments and for related purposes.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this Bill has been engaging the attention of the Law Revision Committee.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it the hon. member is asking leave of the House to take charge of this Bill in the absence of the Hon. and Learned Premier.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I thought that was granted already. Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House to take charge of this Bill standing in the name of the Hon. Premier and Minister of Finance.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Acting Leader of the House is seeking the indulgence of this Chamber to take charge of Order No. 2 which stands in the name of the Hon. Premier, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted.

Let the hon. senior member for Christ Church proceed to move the second reading of a Bill to make provision with respect to the operation, interpretation, citation and printing and recording of enactments and for related purposes.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, as I attempted to say just now, this Bill which will, when enacted, replace the Interpretation Act of 1949, and bring it more in line and up to date and avoid a lot of unnecessary provisions which appear in many Acts, has been engaging the attention of the Law Revision Commissioners and sub-Committees for many long months, and this is a result of their energies and investigations, together with the assistance and co-operation of an expert who was former Parliamentary Counsel in Northern Ireland and Chief Parliamentary Counsel in Jamaica, who has consulted with the Law Revision Commissioners and with the sub-Committees who have dealt with this matter. It has received the blessing of many experts, the relevant Committees, the Law Revision Commissioners, the former Chief Justice and the present Chief Justice of this Island.

This Bill will make provision with respect to the operation, interpretation and citation, and the printing and recording of enactments and for related purposes. The existing law on these matters (the Interpretation Act, 1949, 1949-9, as amended) has been thoroughly reconsidered, and the Bill is the product of this exercise. Improvements which the Bill seeks to effect include a reduction in the number of provisions which now appear in similar form in different enactments. The Bill incorporates many of such provisions and would thus enable individual enactments to be shortened. Provisions are also incorporated which would allow more terse language to be used in drafting.

There are many Sections in the Bill which are new, and which have been incorporated for the first time, thereby bringing this Interpretation Bill of 1966 more in line with modern practice. For example, Sir, Clause 10(2) would overcome for the future the difficulties judicially experienced in deciding when the doctrine of necessary implication applies. Again Clause 12 states the recognised legal position as to the use to which preambles and marginal notes can be put in the interpretation of enactments. Clause 19(6) gives the courts a limited power of saving a statutory instrument which can be construed as *ultra vires* in some respect. Clause 21 (1)(a)(ii) abolishes the doctrine of *ultra vires* contracts made in a corporate name with third parties; this restriction has often been adversely criticised as operating harshly upon creditors; and Clause 37 seeks to clarify finally the meanings in future to be attributed to "shall" and "may". "Shall" is imperative, and "may" is permissive.

As I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, this Bill has been very properly prepared, and it is a means of bringing the Interpretation Act up to date and clarifying many difficulties

which have been experienced traditionally in the past on the Interpretation Act itself. As we go further through the various provisions, it may well be that hon. members may see some point which may attract their interest, and I would be prepared to answer any questions. The matter is of the utmost importance in that as a result of the amendments to this Interpretation Act of 1949 and the enactment of this present Interpretation Act of 1966, certain provisions and amendments will have to be made in so far as the Draft Constitution of this Island is concerned, and it is for that reason mainly that I am very anxious, and I have been instructed, to have this dealt with in all its stages today if possible, in order to expedite matters and clear up any discrepancies in the Draft Constitution.

With those few words, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

3.15 p.m.

Clauses 1 to 38 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 39 was called.

3.25 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, there are one or two typographical errors which occur in successive sections starting with Section 39. In sub-section (4) whereas the copy in my file is correct, there are mistakes in the printing and one or two typographical errors. The sub-section reads as follows:-

"(4) Subject to subsection (6) where in an enactment or period of time,"

Instead of the word "or", it should be "a".

I beg to move that Clause 39 as amended stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry, but I should like to have Clause 39 recommitted right away, because there are certain deletions to be made at the end of sub-clause (11) which slipped my attention when I spoke just now.

Sub-section (11) is a very long sub-section and reads as follows:-

"(11) Subsections (1) and (2) shall have effect in relation to deeds and other legal instruments as they have effect in relation to deeds and other legal instruments as they have effect in relation to enactments.

We will therefore have to delete the words: "they have effect to deeds and other instruments as"; in other words these words have occurred twice. The first two lines will stand. I am asking for leave to have Clause 39 recommitted to be clarified at this stage.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Acting Leader of the House is asking leave to recommit section 39, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted the hon. member.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful for the House's indulgence. Sub-section (11) of Clause 39 reads as follows:-

"(11) Subsection (1) and (2) shall have effect in relation to deeds and other legal instruments as they have"

Up to there is all right. Then it goes on: "they have effect in relation to deeds and other legal instruments as". Those words are to be deleted. We then continue "they have effect in relation to enactments." So that the Clause will read as follows:-

"(11) Subsection (1) and (2) shall have effect in relation to deeds and other legal instruments as they have effect in relation to enactments."

I beg to move that Clause 39 as amended stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

Clause 40 was called and passed.

Clause 41 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, again in Clause 41(1) on page 36, there is an amendment. The word "Act" should be in inverted commas, and it should read as follows:-

"Act" shall mean an Act of the Legislature of the Island.

Again on page 37, in the second line the word "prorogued" should be corrected to spell "prorogued" and again in sub-clause 4 in the third line, the word "statutory" has to be rectified.

I beg to move that Clause 41 as amended stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 42 to 57 inclusive were called and passed.

Schedules A and B were called and passed.

3.35 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill with amendments in Committee.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded in each case by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE NATIONAL INSURANCE AND SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, 1966

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 1 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Notice of this Bill was given on and it was read a first time the 3rd May, 1966.

On the 17th May, the hon. junior member for St. Andrew moved that the Bill be now read a second time, which was seconded by the hon. junior member for St. Michael. On the motion of the hon. senior member for Bridgetown seconded by the hon. junior member for St. George, further consideration was postponed.

If the Hon. Minister desires to continue, he may do so now.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as far as I understand, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was about to speak.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to request of you to reserve the right for the hon. senior member for Bridgetown to speak. There must be some good reason which keeps him away from the Chamber. Having seconded the motion, I think I am in order to speak on this occasion with your very sweet and kind permission.

However, this is an old walnut as far as I am concerned, despite all the beautiful things which have been said by the Minister. Prior to the Elections of 1961, I spent three active years, and I believe, not only in living memory but every member of this Parliament and the other persons comprising the population of this Island remember that some seven years ago - almost eight years ago - I got to grips as Minister of Health and Social Services with this Social Security Bill. It will no doubt be remembered that I bought with Government funds as a Minister the Moravian Manse at Country Road and constructed that two-storeyed building. You will also remember that we appointed a Committee in this Parliament, and I think I am correct in saying that Mr. Owen Smith who was then Acting Police Magistrate was asked to serve as Chairman of that Committee, the Social Security Board.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it took me a whole year negotiating with the United Nations to bring in Mr. Stockman. He came in October, 1961. After a good deal of effort and trial and about a year of correspondence through all the Committees with the United Nations, we were referred to Technical Assistance, and Mr. Stockman was sent to us from the United Kingdom. Before me at the moment is his Report. He arrived in Barbados in October 1961. When Mr. Stockman arrived for the Report which is now before us - this is almost five years ago, 1961-66, which is indeed a long time - the building was erected, the land purchased and Committee was functioning with the Councils, and the big question is

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is unfortunate that the hon. junior member for St. George has come here today to mislead this Honourable Chamber. There has never been a building constructed in this country for the purpose of housing a Social Security Office. There was a Public Assistance Building constructed in Country Road for Old Age Pensions and people to do with Public Assistance. No building was constructed to house a Social Security Office because there was never an established National Insurance Scheme in this country.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am requesting of you, Sir, during the rest of this session, that I want to respect your ruling, Sir, and that was by no means a point of order, and if he is permitted to make a second speech you will be in trouble to control me, Sir. And I want to respect the Chair. I know - I was taught this 17 years ago when first I came to this Parliament.

However, Mr. Speaker, I was saying. This Report reads Sir, "the proposed social security scheme," and this is the Report published after the last election by Stockman. They did not even grace the honourable gentleman by putting his name on the Report. I suppose that sometime in our history in the future somebody on that side of the Table, Sir, would tell you that he wrote every word of it. They are familiar with this now.

Like, for instance, the last Constitution where not one iota of reference was made, although we spent nearly three weeks to copy what was done in Jamaica, Trinidad, British Guiana and Canada. But now even in this they did not treat the man with the simple modesty - it is an honour that he deserves - he was brought here to write a scheme for you with 40 odd years of active service.

Now this is the Report I am reading, and if you should continue to bear with the folly of the gentleman who calls himself a Minister, and I make no apologies for anything I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker. As I say, I want to respect you first as a person in your Chair, but you must be exacting and see, Sir, that it competes. However, to reply to the misgivings of the honourable gentleman, the Minister, the proposed Social Security Scheme - we are discussing Stockman's scheme, and Stockman arrived at the request of your humble servant in 1961 October. It is disgraceful, Sir, that we should have these things going on in this Parliament. The little elementary honesty. These are simple truths, and you know facts are so stubborn that they come back, they reoccur, and there is nothing you can do about it.

This is the proposed social security scheme by Stockman - a man I interviewed myself in London - and this is away back, Sir, when I was a delegate with Dr. Cummins for internal self-Government for Barbados.

Well, now that we have settled this, Sir, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the ungodly thing about this is why was it delayed four and a half - almost five years? The officer was here in October 1961; you came into power at the end of 1961; and for the duration of the present Government's life Stockman and his Report happened to be with us. It has taken four years and a half to reach this Parliament, and reaches us, not as the sublime document that was the original idea of the last Government with a genius like Stockman, but it is tied now to social security and an election Registration. This gives the whole hypocrisy to all that could be read in this.

I am hoping that the honourable member remembers what happened when a similar thing occurred in Jamaica not so long ago. There was almost a riot in that country, and this is the form of political dishonesty that is seldom associated with decent people. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if we continue, there is no respectable person who will be willing to face the electorate to come into Parliament. They lose all sense of honesty, and all sense of decency; to associate Poor Relief with an election ticket is to use the very vote that you solicited from these people, and to use it against them, in the falsehood of security. All along you have been told of unemployment benefits. In this you say that the economic feasibility says "no", and probably at some future time - make your notes on this, Mr. Minister, because I am going to eat you up inside here today.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I hate to interrupt the honourable member, but on a point of order, he seems to be confusing two trends of thought, two concepts. One is a National Insurance Bill; and the other is the Social Security Scheme. The National Insurance Bill deals with a contributory scheme where each and every employer and employee and the Government itself will make contributions. One is a contributory scheme, that is what is linked - as the honourable member says - with the new system of registration. In so far as the Poor Relief section is concerned, that is the old thing which we have always had, which we will always have, because there are so many thousands of poor people in the island, and it is a different scheme entirely which the honourable member is referring

to. The Poor Relief scheme which he knows something about in contradistinction from

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That point is made. That point is duly made.

Mr. MILLER: Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, again another irregularity of the Standing Orders. There is a Minister responsible for the document before Parliament.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I said that the point is duly made.

Mr. MILLER: Did he make a point of order? I believe I am correct in saying that the honourable acting Leader of the House has already made a speech. He has just made a speech.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me remind the honourable member that I told the honourable Minister the point is duly made, and that ends the matter, as far as I know.

Mr. MILLER: But, Mr. Speaker, ...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member will continue.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not want to appear to quibble, Sir, I think you would agree, Sir, and I think you would reach the stage when you would call on him that he made a point of order. I think he is now making a speech.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to inform honourable members that I will not be entertaining points of order if a member differs on a point of opinion, and this I would like honourable members to understand, that with much scrutiny I shall be observing what is a point of order from what is not a point of order. Differences of opinion do not matter.

Mr. MILLER: Thank you very much, Sir, as long as it is a point of opinion, and not a part of another speech or irregularity. However, we were saying, Sir, whatever is likely to fall out of the lips of the honourable Acting Leader of this House could be understood by every person on this side. It is for that simple reason that he occupies his position Sir; it is for that simple reason that any member of this House and the gallery can understand anything that falls from the lips of the acting Leader of this House, and any document that is presented, whether it is national or contributory.

What he wants to get in here - or what he is hoping to save here would be reduced to calamity. But as I said, Sir, the whole idea is to tie this to an election plank, hoping as he did, for instance, with the old Tenantry Act about a year ago - he tore it to pieces in here; and, Sir, all the documents induced by the Honourable Minister here - he is very careful today, his notes could be swept up in one heap and relegated, Sir, to the garbage can. None of these relate to what we think of in terms of social security.

I would like the Minister to make his notes on this, because I am certainly hoping he will reply to this debate. The contributory scheme, as we imagine it when it was discussed in England, and the policy accepted in British Guiana, Trinidad and I believe in all the other self governing territories, is a contributory scheme where the Government, the employer and the employee make the contributions to this fund, whether you call it national or what have you. You can call it national if you are capable of nationhood, but if you are a Crown Colony in the broad sense of the word, I don't know you would be fair or correct to say it, since you would be continuing from budgetary assistance from the United Kingdom, because in whatever form it is, it is a form of poor relief. It is given to you by the British taxpayer, and at the moment, Sir, in our Treasury you have a number of Cess Funds in sugar. That is given to you over and above the world price of sugar, and you may call it any term you like, but it is an outright gift from the British Treasury which is from the British Taxpayer. Now the original idea

here is that once you really have a scheme, and it is - I was at pains to follow the Minister in this. There is no scheme envisaged for Barbados where the Government will make any contribution to it at all. The question of the thinking individual, and as I need not at this stage remind the Minister of what occurred in Jamaica, because a substantial number of the population was misled, and it almost reached the stage of riot, 3.55 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not like to speak on a point of order unnecessarily, but I think when the hon. junior member for St. George is consciously attempting to mislead the Chamber, I cannot help rising to a point of order so that we can get the record straight. In my address last week I pointed out clearly that the Government is contributing to this scheme by way of the payment of the salaries of the 100 employees who will be looking after the National Insurance administration. This is the Government's contribution, but the hon. junior member for St. George has said that the Government is not making any contribution to this Scheme, which is incorrect.

Mr. MILLER: It is either a contribution in money or in kind. He is trying to excuse himself. The folly of the new argument is that it is going to be operated by a Board of nine members which will be controlled by Government, and all the Government is expected to contribute in this is the payment of the salaries to the men, which he puts at 100. When that time will come Heaven only knows; but it is a question of making a direct contribution.

Now, the employer is expected to make a direct contribution in dollars and cents. The employee himself must be eight weeks in before he is entitled to any form of benefit. Now, see if we are not trading the old idea of the Friendly Societies. You can pay 25 cents a week and get about \$5 a year as bonus which is not provided for in this. I do not know if it will come out in the Regulations, but there is nothing from what the Minister has said that gives any indication that there will be an annual bonus; but you are going to steady sick benefits, all this for 25 cents a week, and then there are the regular funeral benefits accruing to any individual.

Now, this is the scheme we are talking about. He is telling me that the Government's contribution is what they are going to pay in the Government Service to operate the Scheme. You are appointing a Board of nine members, and the Government will top the scheme if for any reason the contributions go beyond the limits of the fund. The Government will also see to it that they be paid interest if the money is loaned. This is going to be a Loan Scheme by the Government. This is one of the Schemes for which the Government will borrow the first million dollars. This is the type of scheme the Government will want to borrow funds for just as we borrow from local or overseas organisations and monied organisations. You are asking an individual who would be a hundred times better off with an endowment policy, you are asking a lad from 15 to 65, - those are the figures given by the Hon. Minister - a lad who takes employment at 18 or 20 years to starve before he is entitled and he must be eight weeks in before he is entitled to benefits at all, and for the rest of his life until 65 before he is eligible. It is true, an emergency and other things can happen through which he can get a benefit, but he can enter the same scheme and probably pay a little less or maybe more in an endowment policy and in ten or fifteen years earn for himself. He can have a direct policy if it accrues to \$2,000, \$3,000 or \$1,000 or whatever he likes to have an endowment on for whatever period, perhaps over ten years. What benefit does this really hold out by way of hope to the individual?

Now, there are a number of other things we want to examine, crucial as they may appear, and I do not think that this really comes from the sphere of the conscience of those of us who would be thinking of national insurance. What is apparent at the moment is that you need photographs and you need all this information, but you are going to take the entire country when less than 10% of the population will go through the scheme, or would require any benefits from the

scheme. Do you mean you are thinking in terms of 80,000 souls? Now, you are going to take the whole country probably from 15 years old and annoy them by taking photographs at a stage, and those who would never be eligible for benefits in this scheme.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Again the hon. member is misleading the Chamber. I made it quite clear that initially at least 80,000 people would be involved in the scheme, and that the scheme covers all persons of the working class whether they are in the Government Service or not. If there were only one-tenth of the population in the working class, it would be sad for us.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, nothing I have said in here would even persuade you with your vast intelligence and ability to assume that I was misleading this Chamber. There is no reason on this earth to do that. Why would I want to mislead the Chamber? Every time he gets up on a point of order, he says I am misleading the Chamber. I am reading his notes together with the Bill and the Stockman's Report, and I have got a very vast and wide background of about three years of this in a Ministry. What on earth would I have to mislead the Chamber for? The Hon. Minister was reading a nice speech by the Permanent Secretary which he destroyed and brutalised, and, Sir, I think you were in the Chair - I am not sure if you were here - but I did not interrupt to remind the Chair of the Standing Order that no member of the House was permitted to read his speech. He puts the thing to death in the most cruel terms and language that he understands.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, now, you have somebody telling you how to run the Chair and how a member should stand when he is speaking. Man, sit down and read or listen or go outside! Go back to Germany and tell them how to sit down or stand. Since when do you know how to stand up and sit down properly? Where did you get that training? How can you tell somebody about how to sit and stand? Mr. Deputy Speaker, we will have all these nuisance operations and points of interruptions about how to sit and stand. You say what you like and behave as bad as you like, and talk more foolishness than anybody else too. (Mr. WALCOTT: You should not be allowed to speak with your foot in the Chair.) You talk as much foolishness as anybody else and more than a lot of us in this Parliament, and now we are going to hear about this second breed dictatorship. We were told, Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The hon. member cannot address the Chamber in this manner. If Your Honour is afraid to allow the member to understand that, I will make it clear. The hon. member has to realise that this House is not any of his proprietorships, and any time he wants to come here and address the Chamber, it must be done with decorum and in a proper manner. If he has nothing to say let him sit, but not get up in here and put his foot in the Chair, backing you and looking in the Gallery in that sort of manner.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If both hon. members would sit.....

Mr. WALCOTT: I rose on a point of order to draw to Your Honour's attention.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am asking both members to sit.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am drawing to Your Honour's attention the positive disrespect to the Chair and the House. Sometime somebody in here must bring this Place to order. If the Speaker is afraid of Hon. members, I am not. Getting up and addressing the Chair with your hand in your pocket may be good enough for somewhere in Baxters Road, but not in here.

Mr. MILLER: We are accustomed to this, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the hon. member would just sit. For the past few minutes, members have been

given a long rope. I put it metaphorically. As to the question of standing and addressing the Chair, for my short time in here, whether right or wrong, I have seen every hon. member, Minister or otherwise, addressing the Chair in all postures. I am not afraid to give a Ruling when a Ruling is necessary, but where a custom has been prevailing, I am not going to change it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, with all due respect, I just want to be clear. Did you say Ministers referring to all Ministers? I always make it my duty to be most polite to the Chair, and I did not come here to learn manners.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not talking about being polite; I am talking about the posture in which members address the Chair. I have seen all hon. members in some way or other at sometime not addressing the Chair as the hon. senior member for St. Peter drew to attention, which in my opinion is the correct one. I have seen members from both sides of the Chamber address the Chair in different forms, and therefore at this stage I will not want to change this custom.

Mr. WALCOTT: I want to say that I have never addressed this Chamber yet with my foot in the Chair. Never in my life since I have been a member of this Chamber have I done it, and I want to completely dissociate myself from this global remark that all members have addressed the Chair in some posture. It is true that members do not always face you, but I have never put my foot in the chair and addressed the Chair, and I hope I will never do it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: If I may be allowed to intervene, Sir, I am not for a moment suggesting that it is right for hon. members to address the House with their feet in the chair, but as Your Honour has observed, you have most definitely seen it in here on several occasions. I have seen the Premier do it; I have seen the hon. senior member for Bridgetown do it, the late Mr. Walter (Jubie) Reece did it all the time, and Sir Grantley Adams did it in here almost every Tuesday during the last session in here. So that you are quite correct when you say you have seen it done several times. Whether it is right or wrong is a different matter; but since no Speaker before you have ever drawn attention to it, I can quite agree with you that you might have some reservation in being the first one to do so. But this does not make it right or wrong.
4.05 p.m.

Mr. CORBIN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. What I rise to say is that hon. members of this Chamber should realise what is dignity and respect in this Chamber, and they should conduct themselves in a commendable manner and live up to the standards which are required of them at all times. It is not right for hon. members to stand up here and put themselves in all kinds of postures and positions while addressing the Chair. Members who have been in this Chamber for many years should lead and guide those who have come after them and set a proper example. I am very disappointed to see how members stand in this Chamber and address the Chair.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is nice to listen to the hon. senior member for St. Andrew.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The matter is one for hon. members to consider in the light of what has been said. While I am sitting here, no one is going to tell me what to do or what not to do. I will accept suggestions in good faith.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we were on the question of Stockman and the proposals for this Social Security Scheme, and you will remember that prior to that in 1954 we had Richardson and the Report for Social Security for Barbados, This National Scheme and all that is envisaged is expressed in simple understandable language. Only workers under contract of service and whose employment is regular will be covered. Are we still thinking of 80,000 persons from the adult population of the country

where its total is \$240,000? The casual worker need not apply even if he wants to make a contribution to the Fund in the hope of some form of security. Hitherto we had Old Age Pension and it was not fixed on age. The word 'pension' was given as a nice term because it was unfortunate to refer to it as a poverty or poor relief, and we wanted to cushion the unpleasant feelings that one derives when he thinks in terms of poverty that will forever be with us, so we are told.

The Hon. Minister said that we are an emerging society. I do not think he is really aware that this is a question of terminology here. That is a term that had been used 80 or 100 years ago, but since emancipation, and since our country's development, we are a developing territory. We have long passed the stage of emerging. What he is emerging from I do not know. You emerge from some form of slavery or from a form of colonial rule or what probably would have been in the Minister's mind, but Barbados ceases to be referred to as emerging; we can think only in terms of a developing territory. If Your National Scheme will only include those who are under contract of employment and from whom you can make sure that you receive regular contributions to this Fund, what does the word 'national' mean if you are thinking in terms of sick and poor relief? Now all these things you want to consider. You reach for the little fruit vendor on the street because he probably has an earning capacity. You talk about the taxi driver, and you are even considering the fishermen, people who will probably earn a few pence a week and bring them into this scheme, which means that you are going to demand from them a contribution; but the casual worker who may work for ten times as much as a vendor has no claim and will not be entitled to any benefits because he will not be covered by this scheme.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, last Tuesday I pointed out that this scheme covers all workers including fishermen and casual workers, but the point I made is that initially it would not be convenient to include the self-employed worker until we determine the nominal weekly earnings of the self-employed man. I made it quite clear last week that all workers will be covered under this scheme. Today the hon. member is.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member's point is duly made.

Mr. MILLER: Sir, not only released in the debate which is obviously for the sake of history and in Hansard, but released in both of the daily newspapers, and if you want me to read them for you, I can do that - I am sure I would not be in a position to have Hansard re-read in here - but we asked if there were unemployment benefits, and the Minister was at pains to say "no" and to repeat it several times; and the Leader of the Opposition requested the Minister to repeat it lest at some future date he would say he did not say that. On the question of unemployment benefits the Minister said the feasibility of the country's economy could not stand it; it was not considered for that reason, but would probably be at some future date; in which year of Our Lord and in which century he did not venture to say.

These are things we want to examine, but you were at pains to delay this for 4 1/2 years. Stockman was in this Island and writing this Report before the present Minister was elected to Parliament; now 4 1/2 years later we are told of a scheme that does not include the casual worker. This was not the dream of a Social Security Scheme or National Insurance Scheme. He wants to know how much the fruit vendor and the fisherman earn to be included in the scheme for taxation purposes. It might not be said this way. But you are tying this to taking photographs that have nothing to do with elections. You are upsetting this country, because there is so much turmoil going on, and everybody knows this. There is lack of registration and persecution of the populace of this country; all these odd promises about security, and all you need to do is to sign the form and go and get your photograph taken, when the photograph has nothing to do at all with registration for elections.

All these confusing issues you want to tie this together with, and the Minister on the last occasion did not say I was

misleading the House as he said four times previously. Now he is taking counsel and is free to ask any question on a point of anything including order in his sublime helplessness. It is with some pity that we must examine these things that come before our Parliament. He speaks of this as a mark, a phase of progress, where no monetary contribution is made by Government to this national scheme. Probably he is in trouble in a modern society to think in terms of a national scheme. When we instituted the National Health Service, although we did not attempt to put a word to it, we found that all the fees at the Hospital were multiplied by about ten, and now I suppose you will have to rely on National Insurance. Why doesn't he offer them an endowment policy in order to get the vote? Tell them, as they were promised, that plantation land which they occupied for six months would be in their possession. These were the things used in the last elections, and you are preparing this little platform thing now which I am going to tear to pieces, and God help you when you have to face up to the truth.

As I said, when we appealed to the International Labour Organisation for technical assistance, they sent this giant, and four years later with a Report in your hands and for election purposes, we are now told that this national scheme which must not include casual workers, and where no provision is made for employment.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member says this scheme does not include the casual worker, but that is at variance with the truth.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are going to be discussing this Bill for a long period, and everybody can speak on this. He can rise on a million points of order or privilege, and the Minister will wind up the debate; but all I am quoting is what the Minister himself said, and that is, that there will be no unemployment benefits; register now and get your photograph; and after the crop when you probably get two days' employment on the plantation, all you have to do is to record the number of days you worked and be entitled to some sort of benefit. That is not true. Why on earth he elected to delay this for 4 1/2 years to associate it with election registration is very obvious to the understanding people of our community, and fortunately for us they are the persons who make up the majority of the society in which we live.
4.15 p.m.

The member was at pains to point out that in this country there existed a number of similar schemes; there existed a number of insurance schemes. I do not believe he really understands how many of the working class folk in this country there are - even those in the sugar areas of this country - that are now functioning under insurance companies, and the percentage of insured persons on this island will probably surprise that Minister, unless he requests the information from the insuring companies in this country.

Now he undertakes to under-write this Government. This Government undertakes to under-write Workmen's Compensation. Well, that is what it must boil down to. You can't avoid it, and to read the first part of the Bill, it is so clear and so comfortable there. What are we to really and truly understand? There is sickness benefit, maternity benefit, invalidity benefit, funeral grant, old age pension, and there will be a contribution substituted in place of the Workmen's Compensation Act of 1963-3, and a system of insurance against personal injury caused by accidents arising out of, in the course etc. etc. etc. and blah, blah, blah, we go on, Sir.

Your Government is going to under-write in whatever language you like all these schemes, but not one coffer from the Treasury, not in coin, but in kind. You are going to pay the Civil Servants to operate the scheme. You have a number of schemes that are operated by the Civil Servants today to pay off by the Government, but they prove nothing to Government. But the only contribution you are giving a national scheme - unemployment, no.

If a family is distressed, if it is broken to the brink of hunger, and we know that the bulk of them live on sub-standard wages, but to whom can they appeal in a national scheme? What did the Statute of Liberty mean to the black man in the United States of America? Does it mean freedom to a class, or type or kind? Why 'national'? This is just a little vote-catching arrangement that will splutter and burst, as we see, from public platforms and left stagnating and dying. All the arguments could be swept up - simple emptiness - and all that you hope to incur the insurance of this country on.

All I say, Sir, and what I feel about the scheme, is that we wanted this scheme, the country needs it. Any poverty-stricken country like Barbados needs it, but it originated with me. What is the Minister laughing at? It originated with the last Government. What you want to lay claim to now? And I am signing that same ticket to take a photograph for national insurance and security benefits, when you can vote for whom? That is what is going on in this country today. What we do not want to be surprised about is that half of the adult population of this country on election day is unable to vote. You are asking for something that will probably turn out to be very ugly, and I certainly don't want to be a party to it.

Hon. N. W. BOXILL: You mean burning canes?

Mr. MILLER: Well, you can burn canes, too. That is what you learned? I thought your main job and standard was a demican boy on a schooner. And you are telling me about burning canes now!

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have been always listening to you. There comes a time when I cannot help hearing, and I will deal with that in the proper way; so I will counsel the hon. member to direct his address to the Chair and ignore all voices that may be heard.

Mr. MILLER: I agree, Sir, but we have some sawed off, cut down imagination, that even interferes with the temperance of the tempest. However, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you must understand this; I respect you. We are speaking of all workers under contract of service and whose employment is regular. They will come under the scheme. What section of the community would this represent? The Statistical Department alone; and I am not sure that the figures would be available there.

The whole idea, Sir, originated not only in the minds of the public, but this was so long played out; almost a year ago we were told of this superior scheme, and that there won't be an election until a card of national insurance was in the hand of every adult. These were things that were said, not only in Parliament, but on public platforms, that we were not likely to have an election until a card was in the hand of every adult.

I believe, Sir, at some stage you have read this or heard this like your humble servant. Now to tie this to an election vote is not only cruel, but criminal. These are things that never happened in rational, normal or modern societies. People think, and even if you want to be ugly in your outlook or manner you can do it in the secret of your own mind, if you can stand and bear your own solitude, but to come to the public and say you will do it, and then blatantly and in the open tell them that they must vote for it, they must sign this card, and we are not going to have elections till you have a security card, but when you really look at the Bill the day before elections, you will be told that you are not going to get unemployment benefits.

These are the disheartening things that our country must face. If you know, you cannot fool them all the time; but we were always told, and I believe, Sir, from the time I was a kid, that you cannot fool them all the time; you cannot fool all of them either. All I want to say about the Bill, Sir, is that it originated with the last Government, the building was bought for it, the building was constructed for it - the scheme - the man was brought here, and we talk

about Rev. Layne. Rev. Layne did not make a Report as such on national insurance nor on security; Layne was simply asked to chair a Committee to advise the Government how to administer Stockman's Report.

Now we must not confuse this. Please do not confuse this with the Report. Rev. Layne was asked to chair a Committee to advise the Government on the implementation and administration of Stockman's Report; he did not venture to write one single line of recommendation. Nor his committee. This, the Minister is bound to admit, is true, and Stockman was with you in October, 1961 - almost five years ago.

When it was two years in the waiting - because after United Nations took almost a year - they were searching, and you know they are very keen and very careful in selecting and sending the correct officer. They had made some mistakes in the early days, but then it was referred to the International Labour Organisation, the United Kingdom came in in technical assistance, and we got Stockman, 1961 October, and now we are in May 1966, and four years later you harness it with salt-laden dredging harness of the populace in your pursuit to wrench from him his greatest possession, earthly possession. It is like courting the robin, because he is in search of his pretty red feathers. You want to cheat him of his rags. Identification card, imagine, of a child of 15 years that you won't recognise his photograph 10 years later.

But at 15 and 16 years old, they ask you to take your photograph now to be eligible in order when you reach 65 to entitle you to benefit from this scheme. How farcical this is! These are the things that we want to settle here. Why couldn't you give us an opportunity to discuss this in the light in which it should have been? National Insurance and Social Security. These are the things that terrify us. We have been sitting here all day listening to this. We had a gentleman in here who attempted to correct this Chamber on attitude and manner and behaviour, with no idea at all of what it looks like, like Alleyne Arthur's time when you slip from the vertical to the horizontal.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do not refer to what happened.

Mr. MILLER: Purely metaphorical Sir. I think the metaphor is what was.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Choose another metaphor, not today's.

Mr. MILLER: Well, Sir, we were thinking of Bernard Shaw, of a period that is still very romantic in our minds; but this is tied in with social security, because we want to preserve this old body, and since God has given it to us, the least we can do by way of appreciation to Him is to save it and protect it. That is a form of security, too.

Since you admit that this was given to us by the God - and I worship one God, Sir, you want to protect it. And here, Sir, the answer to this. Here is a down-trodden and broken soul who, for circumstances beyond our control, is in need of a mercy - less than the crumb; you know a morsel - and she or he will be denied it in spite of the fact that you have a National Insurance and Security Scheme, to which the Government is making no direct contributions. Anybody would do this, Sir. For you have hundreds of persons who go all over the street and collect poppy money for poppy funds for those whom they will never see; dejected and broken souls all over the world - war victims - but this work is of a voluntary organisation, and the Government ought to make it that their contribution to this scheme as kind in place of coin is the Civil Servants that should be put to operate them.

Now, this is cruel if not ugly, and what we need to do, or need to say about this is that the Minister's vote of \$80,000 will only last as long, Sir, as the day on which you have an election, and after that you will discover that those of us who have been operating through private insurance companies, and who would derive more benefit for a

smaller contribution, would continue to remain and leave the Government's scheme high and dry as it is expected to be.

The only mercy we have is those who would remain in need of poor relief to continue in some form, and probably it might be unfortunate for us that Father Godson is not alive to agitate as he did in those days for the scheme, the same scheme from which the people now benefit.

In closing this, I was hoping, Sir, that the member in charge of the Official Opposition - we are reminded here now and again about this minority opposition - there is no such thing in Parliament, Sir.
4.25 p.m.

There is no minority group in Parliament that we are told of. It appears in the papers and was said even by the Acting Leader of the House today. There is no minority, and I wish he would do a little elementary mental arithmetic, and then he would not venture to use the term again, because it is incorrect, and I know he dislikes, with his experience, to mislead this Chamber.

All we are saying is that this thing will go through. Nobody would object to a national scheme, but the farce of it must be told, and if it falls my duty to do so, I am going to say it. The farce of the whole affair and what is bound to end in tragedy must be told. Say whatever you like, you make this a little election plank and tie it in with photographs which have nothing at all to do with registration for election with all this idle talk and questions you are asking people. People at fifteen years old must join the list and make themselves available for registration when you say here that only those who are under contract of service and regularly employed would be covered by this scheme.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I have said a lot, I said I had a lot to say on this whole affair, as the self-employed and the poor fish vendor and fruit vendor will be told for the first time that they can join the scheme. As the Minister said, they want to know the earnings so that the Income Tax fly catchers will get after them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised by the Deputy Speaker that the hon. junior member for St. George was speaking and merely resumed his seat when I was about to take over.

Mr. WALCOTT: Well when I looked at you and saw that you sat in the Chair for nearly a complete minute and the hon. member instead of rising to address you was looking at the hon. member on my right and asking him if he was speaking, I took the opportunity to address you because he seemed to have forfeited his position.

Mr. SPEAKER: No; I am afraid he has not. I was being advised by the Hon. and Learned Deputy Speaker.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am aware of that also, but I am only saying that I am aware that he was not willing to address you. He was addressing the hon. senior member for St. Philip asking him if he was speaking instead of continuing to speak. I concluded therefore that he had concluded his speech. There is no method of saying you do not want to finish; you can just bow and sit down.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, thank you again. What I did observe was that you were exchanging with your Deputy and it would have been improper, if not impolite, to address the Chair before you sat. I regard it as a courtesy; it has been my training and breeding and upbringing. This form of dictatorship is like a virus; it is so catching, and spreads like an allergy, and I appreciate your attitude on this particular occasion.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I only rise to say that the hon. member.....

Mr. MILLER: Is the hon. member on a point of order?

Mr. WALCOTT: For the hon. member to get up and say that, he is not speaking the truth, because he refused to address you, and continued to ask the hon. senior member for St. Philip if he wanted to speak. If he says other than that, he would only be an unadulterated liar.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised by the Hon. and Learned Deputy Speaker that up to when he vacated the Chair, we were still discussing a Bill intituled an Act to establish a system of National Insurance and Social Security. Let discussion on that be immediately resumed.

Mr. MILLER: On national insurance and social security. As I was saying, Sir, the interpretation was intended to be false in the beginning, whether or not that is understandable. As I said earlier, this allergy, this form of dictatorship is like the creeping paralysis of a period that once annihilated more than half of the population of the continent of Europe. It is catching, and there is the likelihood that this could probably creep down to the nine members who are likely to operate and see that the functions of this ideal of Stockman are brought into being. I am only hoping that that condition will not prevail on the Board of nine, or what will happen to this country is that people will certainly die of simple hunger. You reach this form of dictatorship where you have to subordinate yourself to somebody else, and you must accept example.

We are not an emerging country; we have long passed this - about 100 years with emancipation, and today, Sir, in a modern society and developing territory such as we are, we want to have this settled, and we want this fairly understood. You are thinking of 80,000 people; you are thinking of a Fund and of a National Insurance Scheme and Social Security Scheme to cover what could be regarded as the active and adult population of 240,000 souls. What percentage do the workers under contract of service who are eligible to be covered by this Scheme represent? The Minister did not give us any figures on this. It is true they might not be available. A good deal of work has been done in the last two years through the many organisations of Government finding out what percentage of the population is employed, and whether they were casual workers or permanent workers; but none of these things is known, and there are no means of ascertaining this even in a special question from the Minister.

If and since we are told that only those under contract of service will be covered by this scheme, will he give us an idea as to what the number is likely to be, or what he hopes this Committee will handle? We were at pains to have the Minister admit that there would be no benefits made to unemployment. That is another rather unfortunate form or condition when you use the word "national" and discuss not only National Insurance, but Social Security - call it poor relief, a gift from the almshouse or a soup kitchen in Queen's Park or the March Past on a Friday - all those unfortunate terms that more or less bring that form of slander on the down-trodden and unfortunates of our country. You want to save this by giving it a lift in terms which would carry some solace if not a beauty in terms of National Insurance and Social Security. You have to think of involuntary unemployment where somebody is pressed out of service and there are no means of carrying on his income, and any way through which he can buttress the upward to; these are things that were promised on public platforms. These are things that the man in the street understands and expects.

I need not again remind you that a similar thing happened in Jamaica and led to almost a riot. I am not saying this will happen in Barbados, because it is not likely. We have rational, thinking human beings, and in spite of the fact that they were told last year that the plantation land which they occupied would be their personal possession within six months or within a year, they will take this with the same dose of salts or a little pinch of whatever you give with it. However, Sir, it is unhappy to learn that you

are going to start a scheme where the employer will make a contribution in coin, and the employee from his earnings must make a contribution to this Fund, but there will be no contribution made by the Government. This is not usually done. As a matter of fact, the contribution made by Governments in other countries that provide National Insurance is higher than even the employee.
4.35 p.m.

What you will find in this is that you will accumulate some funds, interest will accrue to this, but the Government will borrow the capital. Whether or not they would be better off in a Friendly Society where they would get \$5 at least at Christmas on twenty-five cents, and they get funeral benefits and sick benefits, and in abnormal occasions they can make a special loan, all this is going to pieces and you had better have them revert to the old Friendly Society and insist that 80,000 persons in the Island become members of this sort of organisation, and control the profit and the dividend paid.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that this is the sort of thing we have been witnessing in the last 4 1/2 years. It is nice to be able to say that you are Speaker of this House, and naturally you have no leaning to a political Party, because you are almost without politics, since, in your discretion as Speaker of this Chamber, you are not supposed to have attachment or affiliation to any political Party. That is how I believe it is, and that is what I think you are capable of, Mr. Speaker. But you see this haphazard indifference to anything that happens within your community as long as the little paradise of the Government exists, and because they fail to understand that the state is always of the people. You should never be misled into believing - it only occurs in a dictatorship where you think of a one-Party state - that because you were elected on one occasion, and because you can push off and hope to bring in independence and hope to stave off elections for another forty years like Nkrumah - look at the millions of Ghanians awaiting his return - that it is otherwise. It is that form of dictatorship. What they will do with Nkrumah, a man I once admired, I do not know. (A VOICE: What is that to do with national security?) I am addressing you, Mr. Speaker, and we are talking about National Insurance. Nobody knows how to discuss it more than the hon. member does, because he thinks of national insurance in the form of schools, in all forms of education for the populace, but when you reach the stage that there is utter and total indifference to the masses of people of a country because you think you sit in that little self-woven paradise where you separate yourself from the people, - and the state is always of the people - then you have another name. It has witnessed public examination for more than seven centuries.

However, Mr. Speaker, we must welcome whatever we get in this, because although it might be reduced to the little morsel known as the Old Age Pension, there is no inducement for any permanent or regular worker to join the scheme. It is lamentable, but it is true and it is unfortunate from a national point of view. A man can have an endowment policy resulting in \$1,000, \$2,000 or \$3,000 in ten, twelve or fifteen years, but that is not promised in this scheme, although he is expected to pay from the cradle to the grave, from fifteen to sixty-five, and he would not be eligible for any form of benefit unless he was contributing at least for eight weeks. This is the farce and the falsehood of what could be treated and regarded as a tragedy. I believe if Stockman is still alive he will lament the debate that has taken place on this, and I suppose it should be the Government's responsibility - if not I will do it myself because I think of him as a great soul - that whenever the Hansard is made available, I will see to it that I post a copy to him, because this has been his life work. If there was ever a dedicated person whose only thought was the underprivileged and the unfortunates of society, it was the man Stockman, and it is for that simple reason he was sent to us in Barbados. Now the misgivings of the Bill will probably make him as unhappy as anyone on earth is capable of being, especially when you are dealing with 80 per cent of the population that work on sub-standard wages and sub-standard living. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, it is really somewhat unpardonable that one has to be inflicted periodically with the kind of verbiage and trash that emanate from the hon. member's mouth. Not only is it farcical, and he is not only vulgar and common, but he is one of those ordinary human beings that age has not yet brought commonsense to his ignorant mind.

(Mr. MILLER: Man, you have come from the gutter) I am glad I have come from the gutter, but I have come from the gutter and am a credit to my community. I am not one of those who have come from the gutter and still looks down into the gutter or wallows in the gutter, because those who do have absolutely no sense of pride. The hon. member is bereft of commonsense that relates to these issues, and he is just an echo and likes to hear his voice. He speaks about things in this Bill that he knows absolutely nothing about. He does not know the difference between Social Security and National Insurance. (Mr. MILLER: Where did you get your learning?) The opportunity I have of learning is that I am still alive. You have been to a Third Form and cannot spell correctly. (Mr. MILLER: You are a night school product.) It is nice to be a night school product. I am a night school product and have made a greater contribution to life in this country than you will ever be able to make.

Mr. SPEAKER: It would appear to me now that the hon. senior member for St. Peter is addressing the hon. junior member for St. George, and not the occupier of the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, if you, the occupier of the Chair, are going to permit a non-occupier of the Chair to cross it with me, I will do it until you can hear the other person. If you cannot hear the hon. member, I am not responsible for that; but I can hear him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was hearing the hon. senior member for St. Peter.

Mr. WALCOTT: And I was hearing the hon. junior member for St. George also. When it comes to a matter like this, the hon. member uses speeches in here with the means of inciting people by innuendo. He is saying that this will bring on unrest. Some years ago another speech of this character was made, and his whole mind is so obsessed with disruptive attitudes that he cannot make a speech unless he refers to riots. He cannot make a speech in which he makes a positive statement about things that would carry us on to progress, but he only thinks in terms of a riot or disturbance, because his mind is such that he glories in the idea and nothing would please him better than if a riot took place because this Government is in power for him to demonstrate with a conscience that would be filled with glee on what has taken place, even if his country is destroyed. The sort of mental phobia he possesses is that all he is looking for is danger and disaster. He refers to the Bill as being farcical, and praises Mr. Stockman who cannot defend himself. He has not read the Report, because if he had and understood what he had read, he would have seen that the Report sets out that there must be a contributory scheme, and this was not a scheme which the Government of Barbados was going to underwrite. I am going to make this positive statement that the Government of which the Hon. member was a Minister rejected the idea of the Government underwriting social insurance for the people of Barbados, and projected that it had to be a contributory scheme.

4.45 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that the honourable member for St. Peter can say this. The election took place, you remember, in 1961.

Mr. WALCOTT: That is no point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am waiting for the honourable member to develop his point of order. Many honourable members in this Chamber do not develop their points of order concisely.

Mr. MILLER: I am saying that it is not true. There is another term that we could use which might be regarded as vulgar, but vulgarity is no part of my make-up or my character. But the last Government, the Barbados Labour Party, did not reject, never thought of any form of rejection. As a matter of fact, all it did - including Stockman - was for the self-same scheme we are discussing today, and that was before the Government was changed at the election in 1961. I mean, there can be no point

Mr. SPEAKER: The point is made. No comments, please.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the Government rejected the idea of a contributory scheme. I know they rejected the idea, and that is the reason why the Stockman Report came. You do not have to get any person to ask you to introduce a national scheme if you are going to pay for it, but they were pussy-footing with this whole idea for 17 years and all they gave the country was Stockman. We must eat Stockman. They gave us a Report.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, Sir, history must be protected and you cannot change it or reword it. Stockman's Report, October 1961 - March 1962. The Barbados Labour Party was not in the Government in 1962, and after Stockman you requested Rev. Layne to chair a Committee to tell you - we did not request this - how to implement and administer Mr. Stockman's Report.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, that is a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: The point is made.

Mr. WALCOTT: You mean, he is going to be worse than the honourable Minister now, because he talked about points of order. He is going to rise because he has not read it, he does not know what he is talking about in relation to social insurance. The honourable member talks about Stockman. Who brought Stockman here? On what basis was Stockman brought here? On the basis that the Government did not want to insure people on the basis the honourable member now says. You know why? It is quite obvious. Only a fool, an ordinary ignorant fool, with the economy of Barbados, the incidence of unemployment, the incidence of underemployment, the *per capita* income of this country, only an ordinary fool would tell you to introduce a social security scheme on the basis that the Government would pay for all of the contributors - employers, workers - and therefore that is all the money that you will have. Only an ordinary fool, only a convulsed fool would ask you to do those things; but anybody who went to school, even at a night school, would know that they teach you to add above 100, and if you can add above 100, then you know a scheme of this nature that we are starting for the first time - the countries that started for the first time developed the schemes into what they are now. The British Scheme was not the scheme it was by the Beveridge Report. The Germans started a scheme in 1891; it was not the scheme that the Germans have now, but against a background of an agricultural community where a large percentage of your benefits would derive, you have the highest incidence of unemployment. But for 17 years that Government has been into power with all of the information at the disposal of a Government to know if you could start a scheme; but as the honourable member said, all they could start in 1961 - 17 years after - was to get a book, get a Report. So that was more worthwhile

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to set out,...

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, are you going to allow me to be interrupted?

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, it is necessary and incumbent on this occasion to just set out why Stockman was brought here. To say there is no scheme, and as the Government after 17 years This is it, "Following the receipt of a request from the Government of Barbados for technical assistance in connection with the possibility of establishing a comprehensive - repeat "comprehensive" - social security scheme on a compulsory - on a compulsory and contributory basis suitable to the island." Stockman

was brought in 1961. This is a comprehensive scheme. You can call it national insurance, you can call it whatever you like, but it is comprehensive and compulsory. Nothing in the Bill speaks of it. It is compulsory even to the casual worker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would counsel any honourable member who rises on a point of order - and I cannot prevent any honourable member rising and saying "on a point of order" - and I have to listen as patiently as possible to determine whether or not it is a point of order. But I would counsel honourable members, having made what they regard as a point of order, and I rule it so or otherwise, not to proceed to comment on what they have raised as this alleged point of order. Not to appear, or to try to comment on it, because that is making another speech under the guise of making a point of order. Let the honourable senior member for St. Peter proceed with his address on National Insurance.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will be forced to do that because he has made such a bad submission on this, and I am going to take time to show that he really does not know what he is saying. Even his last words, repeat them. They want a compulsory, compulsory and he emphasised compulsory. Does he know what it means in the context of saying that after 17 years we did not produce anything, but we were asking someone to have a Report or review, or go into a compulsory - to compel us to contribute to a scheme? He is talking now as if he were going to ask for a scheme to give us money; but a scheme to compel us to contribute, no matter who you are, what you do, it will be a compulsory scheme, compelling you to contribute to the scheme. Now today he has the brass and the effrontery, the brass and the effrontery to get up here and say that the Government is asking people to contribute, and the Government is doing nothing about putting a penny. His Government had absolutely no intention of making a contribution; all they had was having a compulsory scheme instituted, and that was what they asked Mr. Stockman to come and do, and that was what he recommended. Now, we are going through Mr. Stockman.

Mr. MILLER: That is not true.

Mr. WALCOTT: I challenge the honourable member to bring any statement prior or after, other than what he now said today, that the Barbados Government of which he was a member said they were going to underwrite all of the benefits that were going to be paid. Never did. They couldn't, they couldn't be such fools, they couldn't be such idiots, the country doesn't have the money to underwrite what it would need to underwrite! The last Government underwriting the equivalent benefits that if you put in 2%, the employer put in 2%, that the Government is going to put in 7% or 5% - they couldn't do it, unless you were going to mortgage the country.

Those of us who make a study of this - and we don't have to make a study of this - some people have the idea that a Minister *ipso facto* produces knowledge about these matters, but you will have to be knowledgeable about these things. You are a man before you are a Minister, you are a member of this Chamber before you are a Minister, you are not a Minister first and then a member after; and I have been a member of this Chamber long enough and involved in enough public affairs that I am as capable as any Minister, past or present, in dealing with a matter like this that is very close, and a matter that I have been forced to give study to.

Mr. Speaker, I visited the United States in 1959 at the invitation of the United States Government to make a study of the Old Age and Survivors' pension - seven years ago. The rich United States of America, the richest country in God's earth, their social security scheme is one that the employer and the employee make a contribution up to a limit of 3 3/4% of your income; that is to say, Mr. Rockefeller, if his name is down as an employee with Standard Oil, a contribution has to be deducted from his salary, because it is compulsory for him to retire from any paid job at a certain age in the United States, and draw pension from the Old Age and Survivors' Fund.

So the hon. member when he talks about 'its not happening all over the world,' it has happened all over the world! What the hon. member has to bear in mind is that in the United Kingdom, in Australia and in New Zealand they brought in a social security scheme in which it was out of tax revenue plus these other contributions that were made. You are dealing with countries that were advanced in social security many years before, and this was not their first scheme that was introduced. The first scheme that was introduced in Australia, in New Zealand, in Sweden, in Germany, in Denmark - they were not the schemes as they are today. Obviously they could not be, because they would not have the accretions to make them what they are. Great Britain could not have done what she did in relation to a social security scheme until she grappled with the problem of unemployment, and had full employment, and it came in, as you know, Mr. Speaker, in 1945 when the Labour Party won the election in Great Britain and they started to introduce an employment policy which introduced and brought in full employment. It meant then - this is the whole idea of Social Security and National Security. The employed are the ones who pay for the scheme, because you cannot have a Social Insurance Scheme in the middle of the Sahara; there is no person working there. And the hon. member talks in terms as if these benefits that have been enumerated are not first principles. These are the first principles in all Social Security Schemes any part of the world. 5.00 p.m.

(Mr. MILLER: The United States Government makes the largest contribution to National Insurance.)

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member must understand that the United States is a Federal Government. The hon. member talks about Workmen's Compensation, but it is pardonable, because he has not made a study of it. There is no such thing in the United States as a National Insurance scheme, because in the fifty-one states there is a variety of State schemes running from State to State, but the Federal scheme which is run by the United States Federal Government is known as the Old Age and Survivors' Insurance benefit; but that is not a contributory scheme as far as the State is concerned. The reason for that is simple.

If in the United States with a working population of 90 million to 100 million people the Government had to make all the contributions, you would see what their fiscal position would be. When each man is making a contribution for himself, it is not the same as when the state is making it for each person, and the hon. member should be sensible to know that even in an ordinary business when one person makes a contribution on behalf of ten people, he makes more as a single person than the ten people would make individually, because he is making it ten times while each man is making it once. That is the reason why Governments had to use various methods in introducing schemes like this, and they had to bring them in to suit the kind of economy they were operating. Now, we are operating in an agricultural economy where there is a lot of unemployment. The hon. member knows that there is public assistance. When the hon. member speaks about social security, he must understand that social security in technical terms means public assistance. Social insurance is a different thing from social security. (Mr. MILLER: I went to school.) The hon. member says he went to school, but I will ask for how long. I have been hearing them long enough to be able to digest these things. The hon. member has not heard them long enough to know anything at all about them, because he has heard them but he has not digested anything. The hon. member cannot compare himself with me for learning, because I have been credited as a representative of this country and not him. (Mr. MILLER: You were a bare-footed boy.) There were many bare-footed men in the world, and Washington Carver was one.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the hon. senior member for St. Peter to forget that there is such a person in here as the hon. junior member for St. George.

Mr. WALCOTT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will forget when you forget there is such a person also. If you give the latitude to the hon. member for him to behave that way, I will

see to it that I deal with him. If he is beyond your forces, I will have to deal with him.

Mr. SPEAKER: Actually I have given too much latitude to both hon. members.

Mr. WALCOTT: I do not want any latitude.

Mr. SPEAKER: There will be no more then, I am appealing to the hon. junior member for St. George to discontinue interrupting the hon. senior member for St. Peter. The hon. member has made his speech, and he may speak again in Committee.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member will have to interrupt, because when I have finished with him, he will look for a place other than the House of Assembly to run for. At one stage today the hon. member spoke about fishermen and these poor people, and now in a *sotto voce* remark to me he is talking about these bare-footed boys. Imagine the hon. member as a Socialist talking about bare-footed boys. This is the type of mentality we have to expose; they still believe in privilege and class, but those of us who do not belong to that school of thought will remove them with argument; we are not going to deal with class. If he is afraid of bare-footed men coming in here, more will come, and they will not vote for him either. When he goes to the barefooted people, he will know then what it is. None of the members on that side can prevent me from coming in here.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now no longer addressing the Chair.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am going to address the Chair, but I am going to pull him to pieces. In spite of all the vulgarity and abuse, I am going to show that he does not know anything about what he was talking about. He can only come with his trotted out argument, and now has the effrontery to talk about somebody bare-footed, or somebody coming from the gutter. When the Speaker allows the hon. member to do that, he does not know that those are not smiles; he is hurt, but he is trying to laugh it off. Those are the type of ignorant grins you get

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for St. George discontinue his loud *sotto voces*, and will the hon. senior member for St. Peter deal with the points in the Bill, and of course in so doing he may demolish any arguments which may have been put before he spoke?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I propose to show not only that the hon. member who made a long tirade on this Government does not know anything, but I am prepared to demonstrate from the vulgar statements he made in reference to me the type of mentality underlying them. In one breath he wants to accuse the Government for not doing something to help the poor, but we have seen this too often. They shout for the poor, but when the poor have arisen, then they say the poor have no right to rise.

I have lived long enough to examine people who say they believe in Socialism. Now this is Socialist legislation; but he is criticising the Government for introducing an aspect of social legislation which they did not introduce, and which they said they could not introduce; and the member talks about social insurance and mixes up words. Social insurance is different from social security. Social security is the big title given, and within that you get social insurance and other things; but social security in itself is not the term for every enactment you make. This Bill deals with an aspect of social security, not all, because there are certain measures in social security that are not included in this such as family allowances, unemployment benefits and children's benefits. There are legion benefits you can give under social security, but you do not come to tell a country with a budget of \$30 million or \$40 million and say you are not providing the same things as the United States of America, because that is ludicrous. If the United States of America have an unemployment rate that rises above 6 per cent, the people become afraid; but in Barbados it is nothing uncommon to have an unemployment rate of 15 per cent or 20 per cent or even higher. Can you not see under the circumstances that your social security projections cannot be the

same as in a country with full employment where the work force accelerates more money and more money is circulated in the community, and therefore you can save more, because the whole net result of social security is savings? It is a withdrawal of money from the active working community into savings for these inevitable social consequences that will come upon people.

Mr. Speaker, old age is an aspect of social security, but the Government provides for old age already without any contribution. This will become integrated within the national scheme. The hon. member wants to know why we use the word "national", but it is because there are certain things that are done now that will become part of your national scheme in process of time as you begin to accelerate and begin to grow. In the United States of America, rich as it is, there are Public Assistance Boards.
5.10 p.m.

I spent a weekend at Michigan University, and the man today who is the Assistant Secretary to the Health and Education and Welfare Department, Mr. Wilbert Owen, delivered to me a paper on the aspect of public assistance that the various states in the United States of America are providing for the community, because there are some people in the community - children who are left as orphans, widows who are left without their husbands, sometimes penniless, and people who are not in active employment; so public assistance made provision for these people, because some of them may be drawing Old Age and Survivors' benefits, and some of them may not be eligible.

The honourable member criticised the scheme on the grounds that the scheme has a starting point. Mr. Speaker, can you hear anybody tell you that a scheme would not have a starting point? Obviously, that is the same thing Mr. Stockman talked about. Stockman put in national amounts and national periods, and he has the effrontery to get up here and lie on the man, lie positively! When you read Stockman, to see the number of years, the number of contributions that Stockman says that you must make before you become eligible, so many contributions - 500 in some instances. That is what Stockman said. Now he is coming and telling us lies. I will read you something, Mr. Speaker; I have a job that make me become involved in these things every day. I have been asked to become a consultant of the ILO to deal with these matters, not the hon. member. The ILO is a big organisation, and I have been asked to become a consultant for other parts of the world. You cannot apply for these things, they do not advertise these things, you don't make an application for these things, you cannot beg your Minister to help you with one of these.

Mr. MILLER: That was luck or ability?

Mr. WALCOTT: It was both luck and ability. It was so symbolic of ability that when I left your ranks you were very sorry. It says here:

"A social security scheme will not deserve its name unless there is reasonable certainty that the benefits promised by it will be paid as they fall due. It is not enough that a Government should declare that whatever the cost may prove to be or whether its successors will guarantee the solvency of the scheme."

A Government must guarantee the solvency of scheme like this, but what do you see running through the honourable member's speech? He so wants to criticise the Government that he lies on the Government by saying that the Government is doing things that Stockman said not to do; and the Government is doing things better than what Stockman recommended.

Mr. MILLER: There is nothing or no one on earth that would give me any reason to lie. In order to lie there must first be a reason, and I have no reason to lie, I was born that way.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member look you in the face after he said what he said to the hon. senior member there. The hon. member is so pathologically and characteristically

made up that he would face you and lie without compunction and say that he is speaking the truth, and he thinks the louder he does it, that is all he needs to do.

Mr. MILLER: On a point of order, it is befitting at this stage to ask the hon. member to withdraw his remarks. His pronunciation is wrong. What it infers the hon. member does not know: if not, he would not use the term. He sets himself up as some example. He is now going to be a consultant. The elementary thing we are discussing is this Bill before us.

Mr. WALCOTT: He gets up here and lies in front of the Speaker and then says it is not true.

Mr. MILLER: I have no reason to lie to anyone alive.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable junior member for St. George has made his point and must not comment.

Mr. WALCOTT: Not only did he say it once, but it was deliberate and persistent, accusing the Government of doing something in this Bill contrary to what Stockman said, and saying in the end that if Stockman was around he would sort of hold his head in shame. This is a superior document to what Stockman recommended, an advanced - would have to be - more advanced than what Stockman recommended. Stockman recommended certain things in relation to Workmen's Compensation that this Government has improved on, but the hon. member has not read it. He is a Buffalo Bill reader - not this kind of reading. He does not read anything this length.

Mr. MILLER: When I was reading Buffalo Bill you were not even in school.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not responsible for that, if you are older than I am.
5.20 p.m.

I cannot be blamed for the biological accident that is responsible for you.

Mr. MILLER: When I was reading Buffalo Bill, you could not speak.

Mr. WALCOTT: I cannot be responsible for these accidents. They will continue to happen. You are one of the tragedies of life.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. junior member for St. George remember the standing Order which explains how an hon. member may behave when he is seated? The speaking member is entitled to speak, but of course to address the Chair on the subject matter.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member would not understand that. These elementary rules are beyond him. He wants something more involved.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that it is your wish that we have a break for fifteen minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: In respect of the staff, it is necessary.

Mr. WALCOTT: So far as I am concerned, I am a good Trade Unionist; so if you want 30 minutes, I will make it thirty minutes in order that the staff may get the rest which they deserve.

At this stage, I beg to move that further consideration of this Bill be postponed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for twenty minutes.

Mr. BATSON: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Immediately prior to the suspension of the Sitting, the hon. senior member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair. If the hon. member has not concluded his speech, he may now resume.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, those who would like me to finish will be a little mistaken. A Bill of this character or a project of this kind is something that everybody has been looking forward to, and as I said earlier, I do not think any member from that side of the House should at this stage be talking about this Bill and its form, because I can repeat things that have been stated about social security and social insurance from time immemorial. For the last twenty years people have been putting this in their manifesto, but the last Government did not introduce this Bill, and nobody can claim that seventeen years was not a long time to introduce that. Mr. Stockman came, and any of us who pay any attention to social security matters must be aware of this: that no matter how admirable the scheme is, social security must be paid for, and as I read in the statement, if you falter in one of the payments you make to people, the whole scheme is dead. You should not therefore start with a scheme in which you tell people you will give them \$500 a year, and then you cannot give them.

It is no point in people saying that you have brought in a scheme for election purposes. All of us in this House of Assembly are in here as a result of an election, and all of us endeavour to be re-elected; so you do things to satisfy the electorate. You do not, therefore, accuse a Government of acting stupidly by introducing something that would satisfy the electorate, because the electorate expects you to do it.

Now the hon. member said when he made his speech that the Government is making no contribution. Now there have been more than one investigation in this Island, and each time it was a question of how you would implement this scheme. A man from Leeds University came here and made some investigation, and he was a man at I.L.O. also. I have here a manual on social security by I.L.O., and there is a variety of schemes on social security all over the world, because the type of social security you will introduce in any country is dependent on the economy at the time you are going to introduce it. As I said, even in the rich United States of America, the Old Age and Survivors' Insurance Pension Scheme is non-contributory so far as the Government is concerned. The Government does not put in one penny. The employer puts and the worker puts up to a maximum of 3 3/4 per cent. Mr. Rockefeller can go and draw Old Age and Survivors' Pension when he retires from Standard Oil by law because up a certain amount of your salary, they take out 3 3/4 per cent. They do not take out 3 3/4 per cent of any amount. You do not get a pension which exceeds a certain amount when you retire. That has an economic reason. You would not withdraw all of a man's income in his working life time and put it into a social security scheme unless you were going to give him back with a lot of interest; but if you are going to make it notional, you take out an amount of which he may not get back all, because you are funding the money. Everybody in a social insurance scheme does not get back all he puts in; some get back more. Those who fall ill more frequently get more. Those of us who run sick schemes for people know that the ones who become ill more frequently draw more sick benefits, but you do not work on that hypothesis. You could not work on the hypothesis that everybody who is a contributor to the scheme will enjoy all the benefits, because it just could not work. It is when these things do not apply to everyone that it becomes viable.

When you accuse the Government of doing this and roping it in with identification for elections, that is purely a convenient arrangement. I do not see that that has anything to do with the validity of the social insurance scheme.

Now the hon. member also talked about Workmen's Compensation. When the hon. senior member for St. Philip introduced Workmen's Compensation, I said that it should be included in a social security scheme, because the Government should be the insurers for social insurance, because the hon. member said he believed in the Ontario Act and the Ontario scheme which is a scheme that was run in the province of Canada over twenty-five years ago. Now the Government has included it in this, but the hon. junior member for St. George does not seem to know this means that the funds that you pay into Workmen's Compensation will be included in your Industrial and Injuries Fund, and would not in any way preclude a person from getting the benefits. There is one Clause in this that I want to draw to attention, because hon. members do not do any homework on these things.

5.55 p.m.

I would like to draw Section 21 to the attention of the hon. member. The whole theory of this is that if you bring your Workmen's Compensation scheme into the compulsory character, and make everybody pay who should pay now - this is what Stockman said. You are likely to be able to reduce the premium for people, because if you had a flat rate system - Stockman recommended at one stage a flat rate in the Workmen's Compensation benefit - that is, people who work on the docks, insurance for those on the docks or in factories would be higher than insurance for those in stores - but his theory was you should increase the ones where the risk is not as great, and balance the other because had it not been for the risk-taking ventures, the ones that were not so much risk could not exist, and therefore he recommended a flat rate or an evening-up of the rates.

But to anyone of us who pay any attention to these matters, we could not do this at this stage, except as a political opponent, who is suggesting at this stage that the Government is doing nothing by introducing this, because the Government is not paying for the scheme. Now this Bill - and there was no secret about it - and this can be considerable, Mr. Speaker - it provides for workers by way of sickness benefits. Now, none of the doctors in Barbados, Mr. Speaker can give you the incidence of illness to be able to say; is it 1%, 2%, 3%; but that can be a very important thing - maternity benefit, invalidity benefit, funeral grant, old age grant, or pension. Now, I don't know - this is no secret again - I don't know what would be the attitude of the senior member for St. Philip, but when the senior member for St. Philip was the Minister, and I met him as the Trade Union dealing with the Provident Fund, I had to spend long hours to convince him or to let him know what our attitude was, that you should not take funds that are already earmarked for certain specific purposes and underwrite your national scheme, but your national scheme should stand on its own feet, and our things could be complementary, because there are lots of feeling. For example, the civil service, people working in the public service in this country, by our taxation and conditions of employment, they enjoy these things already; some of the things in here they enjoy as a condition of employment, but all the workers do not enjoy these as conditions of employment working in every section of the community; and if they are to enjoy them, now, it is a matter of what are you going to do in relation to people who enjoy these? Are you going to make them privileged classes by giving them this in addition to what they have? How are you going to reconcile these apparent and real difficult problems that are likely to arise?

Well, I feel, Mr. Speaker, measures like these have to be a question of interpretation. Are there any clauses in it that you need to have clarified? It speaks here again of maternity benefits. We have employers in Barbados that employ women and they do not give them any maternity benefit. No one on the other side - the hon. member is an employer, not the best of employers either - because it is pitiable when I examine some of the so-called Socialists, that they employ people under worse conditions than the most rapacious and reactionary employers in this island, believe in sweated labour, little cheap girls and boys, working them just as how they worked them in the old corn mills in Lancashire, or in the cotton fields in Alabama. As long as they can get rich and boast about their wealth, and

somebody else's poverty - as we heard today from the hon. member, sneering at poverty. The sneers you get at poverty come from people from whom the backlash of poverty has just been removed. But that is an aspect of colonialism that we have to live with.

Now, we have maternity benefits in this. How can anyone say this is something new to Barbados? I have the experience day by day. As big a company as Cable & Wireless is, employing 300 people, they said they were not going to have further provisions in maternity until legislation has been made. Now, this is a world-wide company that just invested \$21,000,000 in new cable systems in the Caribbean, but yet they were afraid to introduce a maternity scheme.

There is no employer in Barbados with an agreement that gives a woman maternity leave, as much as three months with full pay. Fortunately for us, I can say that we are the leaders in that in our own Union any woman working with us receives three months with full pay, notwithstanding what she gets as vacation leave, because we feel maternity is illness. Had maternity not taken place with somebody, we would not have seen the light of day; but sometimes we are so ungrateful for the biological processes which bring us here, we forget that we pass through these doors. But now we have forgotten that a man that has run the distance looks upon maternity as some wickedness that some person had performed, and therefore they must pay a penalty for their own wicked deeds, and not regard it as an aspect of illness, and that they have to rely on the new generation to carry on industry, works and all the life we have in our community. The generation before us are not here now.

6.05 p.m.

If we were not produced at the time we were produced, we could not carry on where those before us left off. Social legislation and social security is a question of emancipation of the mind. What is today regarded as a social and normal condition was before regarded as stupid and erroneous, because notwithstanding what the hon. member said about education, he does not realise that there was a time when nobody was educated at all, but you learned as fate would have it for you. It is true that in process of time light passes through some people's minds more slowly than others, and therefore it means that in matters of social legislation, it is a question of how well your mind is emancipated to accept them. Maternity leave is something that is alien to people in this Island.

Employers have the idea that if you introduce maternity leave that you are going to have more children, that you are suffering already from a population problem, and therefore the men are going to get wild or the women stupid, and you will have a higher birth rate as a result of maternity benefits. What people do not realise is that there are high social conditions in Europe. All the Scandinavian countries have maternity leave and excellent social conditions, but the population growth and the number of women having children are not as great as in Barbados, Trinidad and places where you do not have these conditions and where the benefits are not given. In these countries, the benefits are there, but men and women do not get children to line them up for more family allowances, because it takes more than that to care for children. People want higher standards of living and do not want more children than they can reasonably support, because they do not regard the allowances as complete support.

It must be admitted that in small Barbados the Government for seventeen years did not introduce this pressing need, because it was not so easy to introduce. When you examine the *per capita* income, the national income and the wage level of Barbados, then you have to know how much savings you can accumulate from persons working for wages of less than X thousand dollars per annum. I hope some time to discuss a matter in here to demonstrate the kind of economy we have. Now the money from social insurance comes from the working population, not the Government. If there is no working population, then there are no savings. There can be no savings unless there is first income. You cannot get savings and then income, and in our small community people have to understand these things.

When you talk about Government doing this to get votes, is there something wrong in doing something good to get votes? Which politician does not get on a platform and say the good things he has done, while his opponents say the bad things he has done? Does he get on a platform and tell people that they have elected him and he has done everything wrong against them? Every politician says the only thing he has not done for you is to bring you in the world, and had it not been for him you would have been dead. How stupid it is to tell a Government in power that it is doing something for political purposes! If they did not do it for political purposes, did they do it for scientific purposes? Are they going to send a man in the air? Or did they do it for biological purposes? Are they going to dig out the earth and see what it is at the bottom of the sea?

The speech which the hon. member was making was being made for political purposes, because he went so far as to suggest that the people should not register, and discouraged people from entering the scheme. So far as the hon. member is concerned, it is a nice thing for people not to enter this scheme, because it is a scheme to which they have to contribute, as if Barbados has reached the stage in its economy that it can have a social security scheme that is non-contributory, but we get what exists with the old age scheme which is non-contributory, and it turns out to \$2.40 a week. You want to make people believe that Barbados has the economy with 100,000 workers in it that can afford that. If you have 100,000 people of working age and you multiply it by \$5 a week, you will see how much money that is; and if you multiply it by a year, when you are finished, see if it is not all the money we talk about. Five dollars a week mean \$260 a year or nearly one-half of the *per capita* income of the whole population. The whole population *per capita* income is \$540 per annum, taking all the directors. Call any part of the world that can pay out a social security benefit equivalent to one-half of the total *per capita* income. In the United States of America, the *per capita* income on average is about \$3,000 per annum. See whether the United States have a social security measure where the State pays a person \$1,500 a year as a pension. Get the United Nations statistical figures and you will see. You have to relate these things to common sense. That is why you cannot in these matters begin to call for mathematical consideration, because you have to produce the money to have a scheme.

We have a Provident Fund for people when they go on pension, and sometimes a man gets \$10 a week which is \$520 per annum, and I told a man one day to see how much he would have to put in the Bank to get \$520 a year. I asked him how much he would have to deposit in a Bank at the rate of 5 per cent interest to give him an annual income of \$500; because from that he would know how much is put aside to give him that, because unless you are turning over that kind of money, you cannot afford to do it. If you put the money in a Fund, you would have to have hundreds of thousands of dollars; so you can realise that it takes more than you think. The man did not realise that and I had to explain it to him. In here you do not expect people to get up and make a speech on the basis that political significance is the only consideration you give.

Speaking for myself, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this Bill is a modest start in the right direction, because you have to start somewhere. What I want to point out is that it is going to be a start and you are going to have many difficulties with the implementation, and you will have to have some very good people to administer it, because it is a difficult scheme.
6.15 p.m.

We are starting it for the first time. One of the things you have to watch is that you have to guard against exploitation. Some of these members who run businesses - and I am a responsible man in this community; I am not one of these political idiots who want to ruin the country in which you live, because I am a believer, Mr. Speaker, that I represent workers, but the workers have nowhere to live if they have no prosperous community. The community must be prosperous for the workers to be prosperous.

I had to tell some of my colleagues - because I have the experience of these same sickness schemes. We introduce a sickness scheme with an employer where the employer was paying, not the Government was paying, but some of our workers exploited the scheme to the extent that it was costing the company and the organisation as much money more money per month by these exploiting methods than if they were paying a doctor at the rate of \$1,000 a month.

It was not done for that reason, because if you make somebody pay out \$19,000 a year in unproductive work it does not raise the standard of living of the worker, because he is not really ill; it depletes the funds from the source from which it is coming, and therefore it makes all of them poor. Now in a scheme like this that is national in character where thousands of people will be entitled to sick benefits, we have to start off and train and educate people not to take advantage of these things and believe it is something there to withdraw whether you are ill or not, because that is where the thing becomes bankrupt.

That is where you spend money day after day, week after week, month after month in unproductive sources and the workers would not be getting the real benefits they require. But do you think, Mr. Speaker, I would be afraid to tell workers in this country these things? But when you hear the junior member for St. George say, well, we wouldn't come back. They have been singing that song so long with me; in 1956 I wasn't to come back; in 1961 I wasn't to come back; I came back and they came back with less, and now with a measure of social security what did the honourable member say? This is something that he has produced.

Now, Social security has been dealt with since 1891. Imagine the hon. member for St. George has the brass to say that he is the originator of social security, as if this is something now come in fashion. Social security is as old as the hills with a new name. The old-time Friendly societies. From time immemorial mankind was taking care of mankind. That is one of mankind's blessings, taking care of each other in different forms.

In modern times we live a more conventional life every day; but when the hon. member says that this is done for political reasons, why is this done for political reasons and the hon. member said he had left it there for the last four years? The hon. member is right. Coming to the end of the elections in 1961, everybody used things for political purposes. Stockman was used as a political bait. They used Stockman, but they fizzed. As I said, I challenged the hon. member to show any speech they made that the Government was going to contribute to the Social security scheme. Show me a manifesto which said that they would put anything into social security. Show me one line, one sentence, one paragraph in any manifesto that they were going to run a social security scheme in which they were going to pay.

All who want an election, and an election will come - and now the other thing that they have been doing, the damage that they have been doing this country by making the comparisons between what happened here and what happened in Ghana! The closest thing to anything that happened in Ghana is if the hon. member and his party were in power. Is there a greater dictatorship in this country than the dictatorship that has been led by the present Leader of his Party for the last 17 years? If some of us did not have the guts to stand up to him, we would have been put in concentration camps.

We should remember, those of us who have been in public life long enough. I was told on one occasion that they would have done anything to prevent me from coming in the House of Assembly.
6.25 p.m.

Those who do not believe in where ability resides will have to face it whether they like it or not. When the hon. member says this was used as a political move, what is wrong with using it as a political move? What is wrong with introducing social security for political purposes if that is going to be regarded as good politics? Good politics which improves your community is good commonsense.

Mr. Speaker, I have one reservation to make and it is a reservation based on the Clause in the Bill dealing with industrial injuries. I should like to draw to the attention of the Minister that when it reaches Committee stage, he should give consideration to this part. Clause 21 (4) says "Subject to the provision of Part VI of this Act relating to persons on ships and aircraft, employment injury benefit shall not be payable in respect of an accident happening while the insured person is outside the Island."

There are some workers employed, for instance, with Cable and Wireless and they are employed in Barbados; but there are no riggers in St. Lucia and they would send a man to St. Lucia to work on the riggings of something, and if anything happens to that man while he is on temporary employment there, he would be worse off with the accident taking place in St. Lucia; so we feel that should be covered.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would just give way, I should like to allay the fears by saying that I have giving consideration to this matter, and I intend at some subsequent time to move an amendment to the Bill to take care of that.

Mr. WALCOTT: I thank the Hon. Minister very much. I should also like to draw to attention Section 23 which reads as follows:-

"An accident happening while an insured person is, with the express or implied permission of his employer, travelling as a passenger by any vehicle to or from his place of work shall, notwithstanding that he is under no obligation to his employer to travel by that vehicle, be deemed to rise out of and in the course of his employment, if -

- (a) the accident would have been deemed so to have arisen had he been under such an obligation; and
- (b) at the time of the accident, the vehicle -
 - (i) is being operated by or on behalf of his employer or some other person by whom it is provided in pursuance of arrangements made with his employer; and
 - (ii) is not being operated in the ordinary course of public transport service."

This is likely to create a problem for us at the Transport Board. This came about from Court cases where an accident was only regarded as arising out of and in the course of employment if it happened in the course of employment meaning at work or within the gates. Now, there have been Court cases where it was proved that a man going to or coming from work was regarded as out of and in the course of employment, but this specifically excludes public transport. It says "is not being operated in the ordinary course as public transport service", which means that if a man is driving his own motor car or riding his bicycle or motor cycle going to or from work and he gets into an accident he can claim Workmen's Compensation, but he cannot claim if he is in a bus, because that is regarded as public transport. I believe this was copied from the English Act where they feel that public transport should cover this. That is to say that if a train accident takes place, all the employers would have to pay compensation to their employees; so they feel that public transport would have to cover people by insurance in a different way. The danger here is "is not being operated in the ordinary course of a public transport service." There are some workers at the Transport Board who get a free ride back to their homes, but they would be travelling by the Transport service. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, what the lawyers would say to "is not being operated in the ordinary course of a public transport service", whether it would be regarded as in the ordinary course of a public transport service if they are being taken back home at night. It does not happen now, Sir, but we used to have dockers working in Speightstown, who were moved from Bridgetown to Speightstown in the ordinary transport service; so I do not know what legal interpretation would be given to this phrase "is not being operated in the ordinary course of a transport service." These are things which we have been advised should be amended.

In broad outline, I do not think anybody in this House could seriously object to the passing of this Bill, or could seriously state that the passage of this Bill has improper political motives, and encourage people not to register or participate in the scheme, because you would only be depriving them of benefits.

For a man to say tonight that employers are willing to pay for maternity leave and you are now going to tell them not to do it because the Government is not putting anything in for maternity leave is nonsense, because the workers are making a contribution, though when a man goes into a scheme like this, he is not going to draw maternity leave. The only men who get maternity leave are the men in Malaya in South East Asia. The reason for that is that some of them are rubber tappers and work far away in the country, and owing to their customs when a wife is going to have a baby, the husbands stay away from work.

I feel, Sir, that the charge which have been made against the Government, for bringing this Bill and tying it in with the Registration Scheme for election purposes is nonsense, because if it so happens that they coincide and you do both at the same time, I think it is a matter of commonsense if they do coincide. When the hon. member says that the Government is doing this as a means of delaying an election, let us be quite frank. Does the hon. junior member for St. George really believe that there are any of us on this side who would be afraid to meet him and his group in an election? If the hon. member believes that he can be returned in St. George, what does the hon. member think I should feel for myself in St. Peter, when he had to be scraped in in the last election and I came in with honours flying like a monarch, and he was dragged in here and for five years has been convalescing politically?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that is not in this Bill.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member said that this was done, and that we cannot get back in here. That is nonsense. That reminds me of when the hon. member sat down on the Government side with his erstwhile colleagues and used to laugh at hon. members over here when they talked about running the Government; they said "not over here!" They laughed at the idea that it could happen.
6.35 p.m.

And now this hon. member is now talking about dictatorship. I believe the hon. member has so spurned democracy by today's effort that his action alone would be one to say that, democracy really is on trial, with his behaviour.

You cannot really begin to analyse an unemployment benefit until you begin to show your employment position. Though desirable, everything that is deserving, a Government cannot carry out. To carry out sickness, unemployment and these other benefits, it would be a terrific financial problem for this country, and the hon. member spoke about Jamaica, and he does not realise what it will mean to Jamaica. Jamaica has a scheme for sugar workers of 15s. a week, and the thing collapsed in less than three years. That is what happened to Jamaica. They have had a considerable amount of experience in this matter.

Lots of people have advised a Government, and I was in Geneva last year; the hon. senior member for St. Philip should have been there. He as not, unfortunately, to hear the people's views on these things, because it was his Ministry that they were dealing with. I went along because I was a member of a Committee that went into this matter. I do not regard this as a matter for politics; I regard this as a national matter.
6.45 p.m.

The Government has put a provision in this Bill giving something like twenty-six weeks' sick benefit; so you can realise that this is the one that is going to worry these people. I am sorry I had to speak on this, because I do not believe that in 1966 anybody in his senses should be speaking on the introduction of a Bill to grant social security; but

the political opponents seem to catch at anything now. It looks to me that if you bring a Bill on Social security a Bill on independence or a Bill on anything, that they would be looking for an avenue to say you will disturb the people. When you get to the people, I hope you do not hear what you heard on the last occasion. The hon. member accused the Government of telling the people that they will buy all the plantation land and give them. The only person I heard talk of buying land and giving it to the people is the hon. member for St. Philip. He talked about cutting up all the land and putting it in saucer-size pieces and giving people a piece. The days for that kind of ignorance are over. He talked about cutting up land in 500 acre lots and giving people as if Barbados

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that cannot arise in this debate.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I presume that this reference to the hon. member for St. Philip is to me, and I would like to know when I suggested cutting up land in little pieces.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order, and may not be dealt with as such.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member said in the last election that members walked around telling people that they were going to cut up land and give everybody a piece. I said that the only person who did that was the hon. member for St. Philip.

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I object to that statement, because I never said it, and there is nobody in here or outside who can say I walked about telling people about cutting up and giving them a piece of land. I have never heard it before, I have never said it, nor could anyone say truthfully that he has heard me say it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point has been made, but it is immaterial because there is nothing in this Bill about land. I seem to be the only person who has read this Bill carefully, and I see nothing at all in this Bill about cutting up land.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I said that the hon. member in his closing remarks made this statement about using things as gimmicks, and that this is being used as some gimmick; and talking about land, I said that the only person I heard talk about cutting up land was the hon. member for St. Philip. If the hon. member says he has not said so, I might be hearing the wrong person. Of course, some people have a different way of saying things, because if you say that nobody should own land of more than a certain size, it means the same thing; but we will deal with that when the time comes.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. junior member for St. George should not regard this Bill or this issue as something for making his political platform, because he may have a better issue to make his political platform on. This is the wrong issue to choose for his platform because he will be flogged on this anywhere. We would challenge him anywhere on this, and he would not have a leg to stand on. Outside this Chamber he could not talk well enough or reduce it to any kind of language, because wherever he went we would beat him on it. This is something we must do, and the question is to try and get it done quickly and properly. Our biggest job is not to put it on the Statute Book; our biggest job is to make it work well. The hard work is not going to be a question of whether you are going to give a man this; it is getting it to work well. But do not walk about and tell people the Government is doing this for political purposes, because I would say that all of us are in here for political purposes, and when we are not here for political purposes, we can stay home. They should not believe that they can frighten anybody in public life today by these things. It is true that some people are a little afraid, but I have not been given a high proportion of cowardice.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the Government should be complimented for attempting to get a very difficult piece of legislation on the Statute Book. It is difficult, and I do not

want to minimise that it has not been a difficult bit of legislation to get so far, because as small as the Bill is comparatively speaking, it is an extremely difficult bit of legislation to deal with, because all of the experiences throughout the world have proved that social security has to be watched carefully in order that it does not fail. For that reason I compliment the Government for doing it. The comments I made about the industrial part of it I hope the Minister will give the consideration they deserve, and I hope that the Government will have the persons capable, ready and willing to carry out a most difficult but challenging task for the new work generation.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, any attempt to introduce in this Island any form of social security would naturally arouse national interest. Whether the attempt be significant or not, or whether it be as detailed as it should be, or whether the benefits proposed are of the magnitude they should be or not, this is a matter of some national importance, and therefore must not only arouse the interest of members outside this Chamber but members inside the Chamber.

I should like to draw your attention, Sir, for a brief moment, if I may, to my own interest in this matter, and when I should have done this, I think I will have made the reason for so doing superlatively clear. Back in 1950, Sir - sixteen years ago - I tabled the following Address on the floor of this House.

"The House is of the opinion that steps should be taken to provide a proper and comprehensive scheme of social security for the people of Barbados with special reference to the unemployment and sickness pay, family allowances and retirement pensions, and respectfully requests that the British Government be asked to send out to the Island an expert or experts from the British Ministry of National Insurance, who along with a representative local Committee should make the necessary investigation and draw up proposals along the line of the British National Insurance Plan."

And in the same Address, Sir, I went on to say: "In the meantime the House respectfully urges that in view of the inadequacy of the old age pension and the dire need of those in receipt of it, a cost of living allowance of \$2 per month should be provided immediately by means of a Resolution for all persons who are entitled to receive the old age pension."

And the final paragraph in that address which I need not read as it is fairly lengthy, dealt with the question of an unemployment insurance scheme.

On the 30th April, 1953, I went further. I brought in an Address then which not only suggested the actual level of benefits, but also suggested the level of contributions from the worker, and in that Address I said that the House is of the opinion that in addition to the obligation of the State to provide its citizens with maintenance in old age, and also in case of sickness or loss of capacity to work, that the comparatively prosperous position of the colony, the high level of taxation and general burdensome cost of living entitled the community to a comprehensive system of social security," and I said that "a modest social insurance plan could be provided as a beginning at an estimated annual cost of \$3 million which would furnish the following average benefits:-

6.55 p.m.

Maternity benefits to female workers, retirement benefits at 62 for married and single people, a family allowance for each child after the first, free milk and school meals to children of elementary schools," etc.

In each category, Sir, in that Address I detailed the amount which I thought should be supplied at that time, 19 years ago. Of course the level of benefits then would be lower and therefore it could have been lower. And then I went on to say, Sir, in the same Address, that in order to obtain the above mentioned benefits, the maximum contributions from the worker need not exceed 40c per week, and that in view of the fact that the average worker need no

longer contribute to life insurance and friendly societies, this amount is not beyond his capacity to pay.

At that time the employer would no longer be expected to provide retirement pensions and Workmen's Compensation insurance, and that the Government's contribution to the scheme would be financed in part by the expenditure of old age pensions, then about half million dollars a year, the expenditure on poor relief, and the existing family allowance, etc., and I also went on to say in that Address that the old age pensions should be increased immediately and the qualifying age lowered. That was in 1953.

In 1957 I came back and proposed in an Address on the floor of this House, maternity grants for female workers for six weeks before confinement and six weeks after confinement. 1957 - nine years ago. So from that Mr. Speaker, you will readily concede that my interest in this matter is neither of any new or mushroom growth. I have all along been taking a very active interest in it, and it has always been my ambition to see some legislation similar to this on our Statute Book.

In 1964 the senior member for St. John, who is the Premier of this island, came to me and said: "In view of your outstanding interest in this matter of social security and in view of the fact that on the files there are a number of memoranda by you, some of which I have just read, proposing a social security scheme for the island, would you be willing to undertake the social insurance scheme which is now in the Ministry of Social Welfare, and has always been there."

From the time the former Government invited Professor Richardson first to investigate the possibility of this matter, this matter had always been under the control of the Ministry of Social Welfare. So the Premier said to me, "I know your interest in this matter; I know you would like to see it implemented; I would like to see it implemented myself. Would you object to having it done in this section if you were in charge of it, than if it were left in the Ministry of Social Welfare?" I told him I would take it over, and around July 1964 - the date is important - around July 1964 the entire files of the Ministry of Social Welfare dealing with this question of social security were transferred from the Ministry of Social Welfare, to the Ministry of Trade and Labour.

Now, as is well-known, Sir, I resigned from the Ministry of Trade and Labour in September 1965, but the moment this matter of social security was transferred to my Ministry I immediately got down to work on it. Some time before that, the Cabinet had appointed a Committee under the chairmanship of Rev. Layne to go into the Stockman Report and present proposals for its implementation, but I did not wait for the Layne Committee to hand in its Report to me. Stockman had said that certain actuarial and statistical information was necessary if his proposals were to be implemented; so I immediately got in touch with the International Labour Organisation in Geneva to ask them for the assistance of experts to help us in this actuarial exercise, and before the year was ended, Sir, I had been promised two - Mr. Barrett, who came twice - he came first in 1964 and he came again in 1965 - and Mr. Jenkins who came last year, and who, I believe, is still here now - I am not sure. But there are in the Ministry, Sir, letters from Mr. Barrett congratulating me and the Ministry on the tremendous amount of work we had done between July 1964 and November 1965 which was the date when I think he came; he was amazed that the work had been done, and it made his task so much easier. It was not, Sir, until December 1964 that I got the report of the Layne Committee. By May 1965, Mr. Speaker, within five months, I had before the Cabinet the proposals on which this Bill is based, and the proposals in my memorandum to the Cabinet even go further, they are more detailed than the present Bill - within five months. 7.10 p.m.

You can imagine my consternation to read in the newspapers earlier this month that the Premier of this country had gotten in my constituency at a Labour Day Rally and said that for years he had been trying to get me to introduce this

Bill for social security, but that the present Minister would be tabling it in the House the next day. I know what to expect from him; the whole community does; but such falsification and such extremities from the truth are hardly conceivable. The entire matter, the entire file, the entire question of social insurance was not in my hands in the Ministry for a year before it has been disposed of to the extent that this Bill could have been drafted. I got it in July, I started to work immediately and I got Mr. Barrett here from Geneva. He extended his time between Geneva and Paris, he could only be spared for about a month, I think it was, in any given year, he did some of the work and came back last year to do some more. I do not know whether he came back this year; I am not interested, and I do not want to know either; but I know that within five months from the time that I got the Report from the Layne Committee, the Ministry was completely faced with these proposals, they were ready for the Cabinet, and in my absence the Cabinet considered the proposals which you see before us now in July last year.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. senior member for St. Philip said that when he received the Layne Committee Report the paper for his proposals for Cabinet was ready for presentation to the Cabinet. I should like to state.....

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, I said nothing of the kind.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I should like to emphasise in refuting the statement which the hon. member has made....

Mr. CRAWFORD: He cannot refute what I did not say.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am still on a point of order. I should like to state emphatically that what the hon. member said re the submission of proposals to the Cabinet by the time the Layne Committee report had been presented to him is at variance with the truth.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Let me repeat what I said if he cannot hear or needs a hearing aid. I said that the Layne Committee presented its Report in December 1964. I said I did not await the Layne Committee Report. Before I got the Layne Committee Report, I had taken steps to do a certain amount of work. I had contacted the International Labour Organisation in Geneva, I had secured two experts, Mr. Jenkins and Mr. Barrett. Mr. Barrett had come out and done a certain amount of work, and I said further that five months after the Layne Report was in my hands, the proposals were ready in my Ministry for the Cabinet. Now, he gets up and says that I say that before I got the Layne report I had proposals ready for the Cabinet. Anybody who says I said so either needs to see a doctor for hearing or does not understand English, because I distinctly said in simple English that a child could understand that five months after I got the Layne report the proposals for the Ministry were ready for the Cabinet by me. I left the Island in May, and the first week in July in my absence the Cabinet considered those proposals, and I recapitulate that the entire matter was not in my hands for a year. It was only transferred to my Ministry in the latter part of 1964. I resigned in 1965, and yet the Premier who always speaks the truth could get up in public and say I had it for four years and he could not get me to do anything about it. Of course, we have not heard the last about this statement yet neither by him nor by the organ that published it.

Now the Bill before the House by a small confession is more or less skeletal. Paragraph 2 of the Objects and Reasons says that the Bill provides the general framework of a scheme of national insurance and social security and leaves much of the detail to be provided for by subsidiary legislation. All that means, Mr. Speaker, is that although the basis of all you see here was in the hands of the Cabinet from my Ministry since July, 1965, when I left, Sir, all that had to be done was this; the legislation had to be drafted and the level of contributions and benefits had to be worked out. As a matter of fact, Sir, the Bill before us should have a Schedule attached to it now setting out the level of contributions and benefits if, as the Government wants to

claim, so much work has been done since September last year and May this year, because in the proposals which I submitted to the Cabinet, levels of contributions and benefits were proposed. In other words, if the legal department had either the desire or the capacity to do in 1965 what has been done in 1966, we could have got a Bill like this before the House since September last year.

The Bill itself confesses that it is skeletal. All the important aspects of the matter now have to be dealt with under Regulations or in any case by subsidiary Legislation, and I say that, Sir, to emphasise beyond the slightest shadow of a doubt that it was a deliberate untruth for anybody in this island to say that this matter had never before been dealt with so expeditiously, that so much ground had never been covered in so short a space of time, and that whoever was the author of any statement to the contrary was deliberately lying and deliberately trying to falsify the facts. I am not concerned, Mr. Speaker, at this stage with detailing the particular merits or demerits of the Bill for obvious reasons. Just as obvious, Sir, there is room for improvement in these proposals, but a beginning has to be made somewhere, and people who have been in the habit of contributing to their Friendly Society annually, getting sick benefits, getting funeral grants and still getting an annual Christmas bonus representing nearly their whole annual contributions, and people who are in the habit of getting old age pensions free, public assistance free, and what not are possibly going to be a bit skeptical about the introduction of a scheme under which compulsory contributions from their earnings will be made.

The point which has been lost sight of, so far as the debate is concerned, is that one of the main reasons for including Workmen's Compensation in the Act is that the private insurance companies who now benefit immeasurably from the premiums paid under the existing Pensions Act will no longer stand to benefit, and these contributions will go to swell the coffers of the Government, and assist in financing the scheme. The time will come in due course when proposals for improving the current scheme will be made, naturally. As it stands now, Sir, not one of us in this Chamber is able to be critical of the scheme itself in detail because nobody knows what is going to be the level of contributions or what is going to be a level of benefits. You pass this Act which has been hastily brought in here merely for propaganda purposes when in truth and in fact so much still remains to be done from July last year until now that one does not know when the scheme itself will actually get off the ground.

All I need say is this; from the memorandum printed in the early part of last year, if no further grounds have been covered than that indicated in the legislation before us, it will be a considerable time before the actual scheme is operating fully; and what we have to do, Sir, is to endeavour to ensure that whenever it starts to operate, it operates to the maximum benefits of the community. There is, of course, already in existence in Barbados a certain measure of social security. We used to have our public assistance; we had our non-contributory old age pensions; we had the free milk and biscuits for school children; we had the clinics and infirmaries and free hospitalisation for the indigent; so that it cannot be said that Government in the past had not taken some steps towards the provision of some form of social security. The old age pensions were started way back in the Thirties as far as I remember owing to the persistence of the Rev. Francis Godson, and implemented, small as it was at the time, by a form of Conservative Government, and the additional benefits to which I have just referred were implemented by a former Government. Be that as it may, what hon. members in this Chamber will have to do when we get the meat of these proposals, when we in the community know exactly what is going to be the level of contribution and what will be the benefits derived is to make sure - that is, those of us who have all our public life demonstrated the keenest interest in this matter - that the benefits accruing from this long awaited piece of legislation are at the level to which the community is entitled.

If the Bill were before us in the form in which it should be, we should be able now in detail to dissect, to examine all the proposals and determine whether or not the scheme is one to which we could give our complete blessing. As it is, all we can do is to accept the skeleton before the House and to pledge ourselves when the time comes to give the most careful scrutiny of the detailed proposals which it involves. I may have said very little on this matter were it not for the fact that there was this deliberate, unjustified and malicious attempt to falsify the facts insofar as my participation in this matter now before the Legislature is concerned.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have to apologise for not being here when it was my time to speak. There were circumstances over which I had no control, and I crave this opportunity to make my contribution to this debate. As a matter of fact, I feel that no time should be wasted in this matter because the most important thing about this is for us to debate the Regulations when they come down.
7.25 p.m.

To preface my remarks, therefore, I should like just to say to the Government Minister in charge that while it is extremely good for regulations to be laid on this Table - within the usual 40 days they become law and hon. members are not allowed to amend; they either have to accept or reject - I would like to ask the hon. member to so arrange that these regulations could be properly debated, because while it is hon. members' right to move a debate, the Government can in some measure give the necessary assistance, because the regulations are the most important in this Bill which is before us.

This Bill provides for social security on a much broader and contributory basis than hitherto existed. One member rightly said that a form of social security existed in Barbados long before we came into being, and long before there ever was a Socialist Government. Provision was made even before old age pensions scheme - our free hospital scheme and many other schemes in this country.

This is the most up-to-date and modern piece of legislation that can be introduced in any community. It is unfortunate, I say, Sir, that this had not come before, but I always remember during my twenty years here when Dr. Cummins would give notice that it was his intention to give in a Bill to implement the Beverage Plan in this country, but after some time now, this matter is before us. My Party readily supports this Bill right through. Although we would have liked to know something more of the actual contributions of the workers and so on, I appreciate the fact that the idea of getting the Bill before the House is the main thing; then the scheme will have to be worked out.

However, the Bill in itself, while it provides for various schemes and old age pensions and so on, the one important thing to us in this country - and I believe it must be so with persons who will operate the scheme, and to the Ministry itself - the three fears I have are for things like seasonal employment, under employment, chronic unemployment. These are things that we are going to be faced with.

I give this scheme my blessing, and I want to say that we in my Party hope that it will work, and that it will be made clear to people that these sick benefits and the like will be of great assistance to them. The bringing into this Bill of the Workmen's Compensation, the bringing into this Bill of several other schemes, to assist children between 5 years for a number of years will only give children up to 11 years assistance.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order, last Tuesday I stated that the survivors' benefits will be up to five years. This is what has been recommended for the employment entry, but under the normal social security scheme, the age at which survivors' benefits end where there are children will be 16.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I thank the hon. member; this was worrying me somewhat. I do not propose to debate this end of it here; I think that this should be left until when we are dealing with the regulations, and we should have a full debate in this House on the regulations. I would just like to say this; that the hon. member would condemn and condemn once and for all that this is true.

I am not saying it is true, but as to the question of having people registered, I do not think any of us on this side of the Table could be accused of asking people not to register. We condemn certain things that we feel are unnecessary, even for the purposes of social security, because in the United States with two hundred million people they do not find the necessity of having pictures. If you put this difficulty in the people's way of having pictures for the social security, then you are going to find some difficulty in doing this.

They have in the United States numbers - code numbers - and so on, and therefore we find that where possible we should make it as easy as possible for people to be able to register under the scheme. On the other hand, dealing with unemployment insurance, quite a number of people have been led to believe that to register under this they will get insurance whether they are working or not. There is such a scheme in the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada, but the economy of this country could not provide for that.

On the other hand, and I am saying this categorically, it is the duty of the Government to come out publicly and say that if any enumerator tells anybody this, it is untrue, because it is unfair to suggest this to people.
7.35 p.m.

I appreciate the fact that this is something which the Government has got to study very carefully, because between fifteen years and leaving school, finding work and registering today as a domestic and tomorrow as a shop assistant, and not working, and the having of children, are going to be tremendous.

When the Government was asked about their contribution, the Hon. Minister said that their contribution would be paying for the administration of the scheme. I can appreciate that the administration is going to be tremendous, and I do not propose to take this and make any political speech for the platform. I think I can do that well enough, and I know how to handle that when I come to it. The regulations, Mr. Speaker, are the main things to be discussed in this matter. Social security gives a certain amount of pride to human beings since they would not be receiving assistance in the Elizabethan or Queen Anne style, but I want Government to realise that with all that, only the people who work and those who employ people can make this scheme work, and despite what the statistics show, you are faced in Barbados not only with unemployment but with under-employment. Despite your "buy local", "sell local" or what have you, you have to face the fact that the one industry in this country which will reach down to the bottom is the sugar industry, and you have not found any means yet whereby that economy can do more than four months a year. If that economy must compete with other countries in the world, mechanisation and further mechanisation must be brought in.

I can remember well in my early days in this House when a Resolution was brought here to prohibit the further mechanisation of the sugar industry. I can remember that Dr. Springer told me that I had a lot of courage to vote against it. I voted against it then because I realized that the sugar industry of this country could not compete unless it was properly mechanised. Just as in the case of erecting the Deep Water Harbour, what stood out most was the fact that if we had to continue to ship sugar in the old way, we could not compete with other countries. Though the sugar industry reaches right down to the bottom of the economy, those of us who have made a careful study of it appreciate what can happen, especially when we see that the figure this year will be 165,000 tons as against 180,000 tons last year.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I was surprised that some heat was generated in this respect, because I do not see any reason for generating heat in this at all. Where I think we may have to clash is on the regulations if we have any ideas, because this is the most important part of this matter. This Bill brings into being in this country the right of social security where persons employed and employers will make a compulsory contribution. But do you know what is going to happen, Sir? We have in this country been accustomed to a free hospital, and we have established before any other island a scheme for old age pensions, we brought in various schemes for which there was no direct contribution by the people themselves, and the Minister knows from his experience that the mere fact that you will ask them to make a contribution at the Hospital will raise a human cry in this country, because people have been accustomed to getting things free this way. Contributions will be paid by both sections of the community, both the employer and the employee such as the domestic, the agricultural worker, the porter, the carpenter, the mason and the like.

What I am worried about, however, is this: the average master carpenter who works from place to place is not a self-employed man, and I would like the Minister to make a note of this. It is all right for the workers with Highways and Transport or those who work with big builders or contractors, because contributions will be paid by either side there, but provision has to be made for the average mason or carpenter who is on his own and goes around the country working for people. This is nothing to throw cold water on the Bill, but are you going to ask the same old age pensioner to make a contribution on behalf of this worker?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, if the hon. member would give way, I would like to allay his fears. In the case of a master mason working from place to place, it is the responsibility of the person for whom he works for two days to make a contribution on behalf of that worker for the week.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am sorry if I did not understand the hon. member, but I thank him for explaining this. I want him to make a note of these things for when the regulations come here for discussion; but I do not think it is necessary to waste time on this matter. Now that it is before the Legislature, I think it is time to get on with it and get it working.

I do not subscribe to the view that this is done for political reasons, because as long as you are in here, everything you do is done for political purposes or you are a fool. The Bill as it stands provides for a National Insurance Board, a National Insurance Fund and the like, and on behalf of my Party I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill, because it makes for better relationship between employer and employee. We therefore give it our blessing and hope that the regulations will be such that they will work in this country.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, there are just a couple of points made by hon. members with which I should like to deal. The hon. junior member for St. George in his address referred to the fact that the enumerators are asking for information on the pretext that they are seeking it on behalf of the social security scheme, but that they are getting it for taxation purposes. I explained last week that one of the main reasons for certain questions being asked by the enumerators was to be able to determine the average nominal weekly wage of self-employed persons. This would make the scheme easier, because it is difficult to bring in self-employed persons under the scheme, and that is why they are not brought in immediately the scheme begins. I pointed out that it is proposed to have self-employed persons because it is the Government's view that all workers whether self-employed or not should be brought under the scheme.
7.45 p.m.

Within the first year of the operation of the scheme, subject to the forthcoming of the information which we are asking for through the enumerators, we hope to have the

self-employed persons included under the scheme; so it is not a question as to whether self-employed people would be included or not.

The hon. member referred to the benefits of Friendly Societies, and some hon. members were ridiculous enough to refer to the scheme as nothing better than a Friendly Society scheme. Now this is utter nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the reference to a scheme such as this as nothing more than or nothing better than a Friendly Society scheme is, as I said, utter nonsense.

It is true that we have had in this country certain measures of social security already, but take the amount of \$2.40 per week that people get when they reach the age of 68. No man is expected to live on \$2.40 at the age of 68, but the position is that for a non-contributory scheme the economy of this country cannot afford more immediately than the \$2.40 a week. But under this scheme the employer is asked to make a contribution for the worker, the worker makes a contribution, the Government contributes by way of administration, and the minimum amount of retirement benefit which any worker in this country will receive is 40 per cent of what he has been working for in the past.

I am not saying that the Government is going to give 40 per cent, but what I am saying here is that no benefit under this scheme will be less than 40 per cent of the notional week's pay of the particular worker, and the benefits vary between 40 to 60 per cent - nothing under 40, nothing over 60. How can you say that a scheme like this is no better than the old schemes we have been carrying on in this country and the Old Friendly Society scheme?

A man working, say for \$40 a week, Mr. Speaker, when he retires, if he retires at the age of 68 as it stands now he receives \$2.40 from a non-contributory scheme. He could not receive less than \$16 a week - and this is the minimum - it would vary between \$16 a week and \$24 a week. According to the proportion of his weekly wage, it is finally decided - when the actuarial reports have been sent in officially to the Government, then hon. members will know what the level of benefits are. In no case will it be less than 40 per cent of the notional weekly wage of any worker, and in no case will it be over 60 per cent, but a scheme such as this is far superior to any non-contributory scheme which the hon. members are talking about.

It is the aspiration and hope of this Government to have the people in this country enjoying such a standard of living, Mr. Speaker, that not one of us - except the person who could not work at all - would have to depend on public assistance. We know that public assistance is here, and it is necessary at this stage; but we look forward to the day when at least 90 per cent of the people who are receiving public assistance will not have to receive public assistance as such, but they will be able to find themselves employment. The level of unemployment must decrease and the level of employment must increase in the country. That is why we are pushing the industrial development programme. 7.55 p.m.

If we take Puerto Rico there was a time when that country depended mainly on agriculture.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, when I am speaking and the Hon. Minister gets up, I sit as a Parliamentarian.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the Hon. Leader of the Opposition risen to something?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. When the hon. member said that the sugar industry was dying, I did not say it was dying.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, what I said is that the sugar industry currently faces a dim future, and it is for the Government of this country to encourage industrial development as was done in a place like Puerto Rico which was purely agricultural, but now its main economy rests in the industrial development programme

which was carried on from 1942. On the question of the "buy local" campaign to which the hon. member referred we are encouraging this campaign because we look forward to the day when 90% of the people who are under-employed and unemployed and have to depend on public assistance will have found employment, and therefore would not have to depend on public assistance. It is at that stage that consideration will be given to the question of including in these proposals unemployment benefits, that is, when the employment level has reached a certain height and most of the people in the country are employed. This is just the initial stage of the scheme. Rome was not built in a day.

I say finally, Mr. Speaker, that benefits which are being proposed in this Social Security Bill are far superior to the benefits proposed in National Insurance and Social security Bills in other territories.

The question that this Bill be now read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. C.E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. BATSON in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 5 were called and passed.

*Clause 6 was called; it reads as follows:**

"6. The Board shall pay to each member, in respect of his office as such, such remuneration and allowances (if any) as the Cabinet may determine and to the Chairman and to the deputy Chairman in respect of his office as such, such remuneration and allowances (if any) in addition to any remuneration or allowances to which he may be entitled in respect of his office as a member, as may be so determined."

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 6 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I said just now, Mr. Chairman, that the most important thing in this whole exercise is going to be the regulations. This clause talks about remuneration of members. While on this I am going to say that within recent months it has been drawn to my notice that the remuneration of members on certain Boards has gone up leaps and bounds out of proportion to some Boards in relation to the work they are called upon to do, and there are other people in this country who are expected to sit and do public work and not be compensated at all. I still believe that there is a tremendous lot of civic pride in the people of this country, and a lot will give service. As regards this talk about remuneration as the Cabinet may determine to the Chairman and so on, now there is a tendency nowadays to pay a Chairman a full time salary to meet once a week which is in excess of clerks in the Civil Service who go to work from 8 a.m. until 4 p.m. It is true it may be argued that some of these Boards are not directly controlled by Government and some are Statutory Boards, but this is a matter over which the Cabinet has control.

I know, Mr. Chairman that some of these Boards have great responsibility, and some are called upon to do greater work than others, but I do ask the hon. member to watch this very carefully. You will create great dissatisfaction within the Service when they realise that people go on these Boards, and some of them do absolutely nothing and draw these big salaries for meeting once or twice a week. I hope that the Cabinet will look at this, because there are civic minded people in this country who are willing to do work.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I think the hon. member deserves some reply. He said that there are some Boards on which the Chairman gets a salary exceeding that of certain Civil Servants. There are certain Boards like the Transport Board, the Housing Authority and the Tourist Board in which the Chairman's

duties are on a day to day basis, so that he is paid a salary as such and not a fee, which is normally \$30 a meeting, and there is a limit to the number of meetings for which he is paid per month, I think, not more than four; so that in the case of the ones who are paid fees, their maximum would be \$120 a month, and in the case of the ordinary member \$60 per month. There are three Boards which entail day-to-day work for which the Chairman is paid a salary of \$300 a month. To say that the Chairman is getting a big salary is really not facing the facts, because he works on a day-to-day basis and spends a lot of time, and has to sign every cheque along with the Manager. So there are three Boards which are important Boards, the Transport Board, the Housing Authority and the Tourist Board, which entail a great amount of hours every day, and for which the Chairman alone receives adequate or reasonable remuneration.

The question that Clause 6 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

8.05 p.m.

Clauses 7 to 11 inclusive were called and passed, Clause 12 was called. It read as follows:—

12. (1) Subject to the provisions of this Act, every person who, on or after the appointed day, being over the age of sixteen years and under pensionable age, is gainfully occupied in employment in the Island, being employment under a contract of service shall be insured under this Act in respect of the several contingencies in relation to which benefits are provided under subsection (1) of section 21 and there shall be payable to or in respect of any such person, in the prescribed circumstances, any benefit payable by virtue of the said subsection.

(2) Provision may be made by regulations -

- (a) for treating as employment as an employed person -
 - (i) any category of employment which, though it is not employment under a contract of service, is subject to such conditions as to make it similar to employment under a contract of service;
 - (ii) employment outside the Island in continuation of any employment as an employed person;
 - (iii) employment outside the Island of a person domiciled or having a place of residence in the Island, being employment as a member of the diplomatic or consular service of the Island or as a domestic worker employed by a member of such service;
- (b) for treating as not being employment as an employed person or for disregarding -
 - (i) employment which is of a subsidiary nature or in which the insured person is engaged only to an inconsiderable extent;
 - (ii) employment in the service, or for the purposes of the trade or business, or as partner, of the insured person's husband or wife;
 - (iii) employment by a relative in the common home of the insured person and the employer;

(iv) such employment in the service of, or in the service of a person employed with, such international organisations or countries (other than Barbados) as may be specified in regulations;

(c) for treating a person's employment as continuing during periods of holiday, incapacity for work and in such other circumstances as may be prescribed."

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 12 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. Minister said in his opening speech that a person who left the island and has been employed outside the island could also send and make contributions to the scheme. This, I take it, will have to be put in the regulations.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, as I explained to the hon. member last week, provisions are being made in the regulations for persons who have been employed in this country and they migrate - now there are certain contingencies which you would not provide for, this is why I referred to the fact last week that they would be paying a reduced contribution to the scheme whilst they are out of the island, because you would not be able to determine the next day if a person is ill, or the sort.

When this person leaves the island, he is covered for old age benefits and survivors' benefits, etc, but he will not be covered, so to speak, for sickness benefit because he is working in another country. But what we are making sure of is that a Barbadian does not lose his right to receive a pension when he reaches his retiring age, or if he dies he does not lose the funeral grant to which he is entitled. If he dies while out of the island, and he has his three or four children in this country and a wife, we are making provision that his wife would receive a pension because she is one of his survivors, and his children, whether they be 1, 3, 4, 5 years old or six months old, will receive survivors' benefits until they reach the age of 16, and this provision is being made in the regulations; so I think the hon. member's question is taken care of.

Mr. MOTTLEY: You said here provision may be made in those regulations. "A" is working here as a sugar worker. He goes to America and spends two years. There is nothing compulsory to make him pay. During that period, however, because of certain circumstances which are unforeseen, something happens to his dependents. What is the true position? We must clarify this here now.
8.15 p.m.

I do not expect the hon. member to answer me now, but for the purpose of the regulations and the perfect running of the scheme, I ask you to make a note of these things.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: There is just one point, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not expect the hon. member to rise everytime. I just want him to make a note of these things.

If the hon. member is thinking that the Government is perfect in everything, I am saying that he is making a big mistake. Both the Opposition and Backbenchers can make suggestions which in the course of things are usually noted by Ministers, and if there is anything in them, they will work, but I do not expect the Hon. Minister to answer and have parrying words like this. I do not expect that at all, and therefore when I make these suggestions, I ask him to note them because they are things that can actually happen.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the Government is aware of the fact that that can happen, but any

reduced contributions which a worker who leaves Barbados and goes to the United States will be permitted to make entitles his survivors if he dies while out of the island or on return to the island to survivors' benefits; so it is in his interest to continue his contributions. Even if he does not continue his contributions, his wife knowing that he is covered by the scheme can make contributions on his behalf in his absence.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The Hon. Minister said that the Government is aware of this, but I say there is nothing compulsory to make him make it. (Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It is in his interest). There are a lot of things in people's interest, but they do not do them. While it is in his interest, it is in your interest to look after the children here, and I am asking you to make a note of this for the regulations. There are a lot of things in my interest and there are a lot of things in your interest that you would not do; so this might be in the wife's interest, but she is not working. You are making these provisions, but you must make them to cover all.

The question that Clause 12 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 13 to 19 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 20 was called. It reads as follows:-

" 20. In relation to persons who -

- (a) are employed by more than one employer in any contribution week; or
- (b) work under the general control or management of some person other than their immediate employer;

and in relation to any other cases for which it appears to the Cabinet that special provision is needed, regulations may provide that for the purposes of this Act the prescribed person shall be treated as their employer; and regulations made by virtue of paragraph (b) of this section may provide for adjusting the rights between themselves of the person prescribed as the employer, the immediate employer and the persons employed."

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 20 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, this is in respect of persons like artisans, carpenters, masons and masons' helpers and the like who work on their own. I am sure the hon. member would not attribute to me being an obstacle in the way, because due to our peculiar circumstances in Barbados, I know you are going to have certain difficulties in working certain schemes.

Let me preface my remarks by saying this; of our 60,000 houses you know as well as I do that the great majority are houses of wooden structure and take repairs now and then, and therefore a great number of pensioners and people receiving contributions would have to employ people in repairing the houses. The hon. member says that if a man works two days, arrangements are going to be made. I believe the Government means well in this. The hon. member knows well enough, because he has gone all over this island in his short time in politics and before that as a school master, the difficulties he is going to find in working this. This Clause says, "In relation to persons who are employed by more than one employer in any contribution week....." This is a nice Bill taken from Bills in certain countries, but if a man repairs Mary Jane's chattel house and puts on a bundle of shingles and two boards, and then leaves and puts two boards on somebody's

else house, how do you expect this to work? Quite honestly I am not throwing cold water on it, but you must have somebody to put the opposite side for you to see and to make you sprain your brain to make it work, and that is why I am raising this question. If a man works for me for three days putting on some latches and some protex, I will make a contribution and he will make a contribution; but if he leaves and goes to some person who at sixty-five is drawing from this scheme, has she got to make a contribution? Let us be practical and real. I just want you to note these things for your regulations to see how practical they would work.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I would only say, Mr. Chairman, that the proposal which the hon. member has just made is engaging the attention of the L.L.O. expert who is working on the mechanics to make the scheme operative in cases like this.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This has worried me for the simple reason that I am a person who believe that if the enactment of law is to be respected, you must enact them in relation to the economic set up of the country, and I vouchsafe to say here and now that unless you revamp this entire section, it is not going to work.

The question that Clause 20 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 21 to 28 inclusive were called and passed without division.

Clause 29 was called. It reads as follows:-

" 29. (1) The benefit payable under this Part in respect of a prescribed disease or injury, and the conditions for receipt of such benefit, shall be the same as in the case of personal injury by accident arising out of and in the course of a person's employment, subject, however, to the power to make different provision by regulations as respects any matter which is to be prescribed and to the following provisions of this Part.

(2) Regulations may provide, in relation to prescribed diseases and injuries, for modifying the provisions of this Act relating to employment injury benefit and for adapting references in this Act to accidents, and shall provide for applying in relation to claims for benefit under this Part in respect of a prescribed disease or injury, and in relation to questions arising in connection therewith the provisions of Part III of this Act, subject to any prescribed additions or modifications.

(3) Without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing subsection, the said regulations may in particular include provision -

- (a) for presuming any prescribed disease or injury -
 - (i) to be due, unless the contrary is proved, to the nature of a person's employment where he was employed in any prescribed occupation at the time when, or within a prescribed period or for a prescribed length of time (whether continuous or not) before, he developed the disease or injury;
 - (ii) not to be due to the nature of a person's employment unless he was employed in some prescribed occupation at the time when, or within a prescribed period or for a prescribed length of time (whether continuous or not) before he developed the disease or injury;
- (b) for the establishment of special medical boards and the appointment of medical officers for the purposes of the regulations;

- (c) for such matters as appear to the Cabinet to be incidental to or consequential on provisions included in the regulations by virtue of the foregoing provisions of this section."

8. 25 p.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 30 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Now, Sir, I am up again. It is part of my duty. I suppose nothing the Opposition says is ever reported, because of the partiality that is seen which borders on absolute dishonesty, especially with the CBC.

"The benefit payable under this part in respect of a prescribed disease or injury, and the conditions for receipt of such benefit, shall be the same as in the case of personal injury." This is something which we of the Opposition must draw Government's attention to. This is something which we must be very careful with.

We can understand an injury. We know an injury must either come by an accident or injury by design, it is true, but we are talking about prescribed diseases. Surely the honourable member would say this is going to be in the regulations.

In this country, for instance, like in the West Indian islands, there are a very large incidence of hypertension. This can be a disaster to some people, and it might not be to others; but in my own experience, hypertension is one of the things which people in middle life find it difficult to work with.

There is no such thing as Blue Cross here, but here people have diseases which have not been able to be diagnosed in Barbados, or even at the University of the West Indies Hospital - prescribed diseases; so if you prescribe your diseases, I ask that you make regulations so as to cover if these diseases cannot be diagnosed in the West Indies, but can be diagnosed in the United Kingdom, United States, Canada and so on, that you bear in mind that these prescribed diseases be not only confined to diagnoses made in Barbados.

The question that Clause 29 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 30 was called. It reads as follows:-

"30. (1) For the purposes of this Act, there shall be established, under the control and management of the Board, a fund called 'the national Insurance Fund' into which shall be paid all contributions payable under this Act by employers and insured persons and out of which shall be paid all claims for benefits.

(2) Accounts of the Fund shall be prepared in such form, in such manner and at such times as the Auditor General may direct and the Auditor General shall examine and certify every such account.

(3) Any moneys forming part of the Fund may from time to time be invested by the Board in any securities which are for the time being authorised by law as investments for funds of the Government Savings Bank."

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, before the question is put, I would like an assurance from the Minister responsible. Probably at this late hour it might be playing to him to ask for some assurance, since we have been waiting for this for four and a half years or may be five years. It took all that time before it reached the House. We have been promised regulations; so would the Minister give us some un-

dertaking that before the elections that the regulations controlling and governing this Bill will reach this Assembly? Could we have some idea as to (a) what you will be collecting from the people, and (b) what benefits will accrue to them? The country should know all these things. This would be very important, and I would certainly like the Minister to give us the assurance tonight that the regulations will reach this House before the elections, no matter when that is going to be. Having spent four and half years on this Bill, I would be happy to know, and the people should know before they go to the polls at least what they are expected to pay and what the contributions and benefits will be.

We have heard the hon. junior member for St. Philip say on more than one occasion that the Leader of that Party said that they would win the elections on two things, - the reduction of age to 18 years for voting, and this National Insurance. There is no secret about this. This is a simple thing to ask the Minister, and he can jump to his legs and say he would accept our request that we would have the assurance of the regulations reaching us. You should know how much you are going to ask of them, both the employer and the employee, and we should have some idea of what would accrue to the individual by way of benefits and what have you. It would be too nice of the Minister tonight to give the assurance, I fear that it is not likely to come and that at least he might upset the country, but it would be the best thing, and the Government is expected to do these things. The member in all modesty and sincerity knows that this is as common place as whole peas are to the housewife. It would certainly be heartening to know, and I do not think we are asking too much of the Government.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that it has taken five years for this to reach Parliament, and the regulations that will accompany this will only be a matter of weeks now, because the delay would obviously be with the Printers. It is a simple request, and it is getting late and I think the Minister can make it possible for us to go home satisfied by saying that the regulations will reach us at some time before the elections.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I do not think the hon. member could be serious when he requests from me an undertaking that these regulations will be brought before elections, because I do not control the elections of this country. The Hon. Premier has the sole prerogative to determine when the elections will be; so the hon. member could not ask me to bring the regulations to the legislature before elections. It is nonsensical for the hon. member to ask that of me, but as soon as the actuarial reports have been sent in and my administrative officers and the adviser from L.L.O. are able to make the final recommendation to the Government, the regulations will be brought here. I cannot say the regulations will be coming down tomorrow or the next day, but I will certainly press the Officers to get the regulations ready as soon as possible.

The question that Clause 30 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 31 to 37 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 38 was called. It reads as follows:-

"38. (1) An Inspector shall for the purposes of the execution of this Act, have power to do all or any of the following things, namely -

- (a) to enter at all reasonable times any premises or place liable to inspection under this section;
- (b) to make examination and enquiry as may be necessary for ascertaining whether the provisions of this Act are being or have been complied with in any such premises or place;
- (c) to examine, either alone or in the presence of any other person, as he thinks fit, with respect to any matters under this

Act on which he may reasonably require information, every person whom he finds in any such premises or place, or whom he has reasonable cause to believe to be or to have been an insured person, and to require every such person to be so examined;

- (d) to exercise such other powers as may be necessary for carrying this Act into effect,

2. The occupier of any premises or place liable to inspection under this section and any person who is or has been employing any person, and the servants and agents of any such occupier or other person, and any insured person shall furnish to an inspector all such information and produce for inspection all such documents as the inspector may reasonably require for the purpose of ascertaining whether contributions are or have been payable or have been duly paid, by or in respect of any person, or whether benefit is or was payable to or in respect of any person.

- (3) If any person -

- (a) wilfully delays or obstructs an inspector in the exercise of any power under this section; or
- (b) refuses or neglects to answer any question or to furnish any information or to produce any documents when required so to do under this section,

he shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars in the case of a first offence under this subsection and not exceeding five hundred dollars in the case of a second or subsequent such offence:

Provided that no one shall be required under this section to answer any questions or to give any evidence tending to incriminate himself.

(4) Every inspector shall be furnished with a certificate of his appointment and on applying for admission to any premises or place for the purposes of this Act shall, if so required, produce the said certificate.

(5) The premises and places liable to inspection under this section are any premises or places where an inspector has reasonable grounds for supposing that any persons are employed except that they do not include any private dwelling house not used by or by permission of the occupier for the purposes of a trade or business."

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 38 stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, this Section is a very important one, and I am asking you to let the Clerk read it slowly for the benefit of hon. members.

Section 38 reads as follows:-

" 38. (1) An inspector shall for the purposes of the execution of this Act, have power to do all or any of the following things, namely -

- (a) to enter at all reasonable times any premises or place liable to inspection under this section;
- (b) to make examination and enquiry as may be necessary for ascertaining whether the provisions of this Act are being or have been complied with in any such premises or place;

- (c) to examine, either alone or in the presence of any other person, as he thinks fit, with respect to any matters under this Act on which he may reasonably require information, every person whom he finds in any such premises or place, or whom he has reasonable cause to believe to be or to have been an insured person, and to require every such person to be so examined;"

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am sure the Minister will tell me whether the person is to be examined by a midwife, a doctor, a lawyer, a chauffeur or whom, and for what. This is not going to work so well. There are a few other mistakes in this, but I draw the hon. member's attention to "to be examined". If a person wilfully refuses to let this happen, he would be liable to the penalty of \$100 in the first case and \$500 in the second case. If Mary Lou or Jane is at her son's home and her condition is not suitable for the Inspector to come in, he is not a doctor, but you want her to be examined by him. Are you asking him to hold up her clothes and examine her? This is a good Bill, but do not let us run these things off like this. Surely an Inspector is not a medical practitioner. If this lady is insured and is asking for money, and has to be examined, you should say by whom. The Bill says that every insured person is required to be so examined, but it does not say by whom. Is she to be examined by a steam-roller driver?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the Clause says that "an inspector shall for the purposes of the execution of this Act, have power to do all or any of the following things, namely (c) to examine, either alone or in the presence of any other person, as he thinks fit, with respect to any matters under this Act on which he may reasonably require information....."

8.45 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY: This is a good Bill, but do not let us run these things off like this. Surely an Inspector cannot be a medical practitioner! It says here quite clearly "and to require every person to be so examined". Examined by whom?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The examination is pertaining to matters under the Act by way of information. That is all the examination; not any medical or legal examination as such. The word "examine" is the one which is causing so much dismay. It does not mean medical, legal or any other sort of judicial examination. It means the Inspector is pursuing his duties in the normal course.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I usually like to accept the hon. member's explanation, but this is not good enough for me. I am thinking of the 80,000 people who will be insured under this Act. Let us say for a moment that you go into Belleplaine and you have workers there who come under this Act, and this Inspector is authorised, in the presence of any person, to enter - according to what the Hon. Minister says, I don't accept what he says. I suggest strongly to the hon. member this is absolutely in need of clarification and amendment. There can be no two ways about it.

However, he goes to a house, he thinks fit to bring in John Brown who is not on good terms with the people there, and he goes in and inspects, with any other person, with respect to any matters under this Act. Now what are the matters under this Act?

I suspect what this means, and I believe the poor must be protected in this respect. This should be worded differently. I know what you want to do, I know it is necessary to do it, and I am reasonable enough to say this. But I suggest to the hon. member that this section should be worded differently. I can only put my protest against it.

Now this is a very strong thing. You can understand 'refusing' or 'neglecting'. This is a tremendous thing. In other words, you are saying if you ask me a question and I say I don't know, I do not understand the refusal or neglect.

This is too strong. You are bringing something to help people, not to help put them in gaol.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is absolutely nothing to do with a medical examination, but the examination and enquiry which have been referred to is statistical. The Inspectors are responsible for collecting statistical data on the administration of the social security scheme, and not what the honourable member said with respect to any matter under this Act.
8.55 p.m.

The hon. member has placed the emphasis on the fact that the inspector has to examine either alone or in the presence of any other person, as he thinks fit, with respect to any matters under this Act; but I place my emphasis further in the Clause on "with respect to any matter under this Act on which he may reasonably require information", and this information is statistical information.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member says that, but I would ask the hon. member to produce anything to me in this Act which means that. It is not for us to interpret this here. We pass laws which are easily interpreted by the Judiciary, but when the hon. member tells me that the inspector's job is to get statistical information, that is not correct.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I said in this case.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member cannot say so. It is not stated in the Clause that he is only to get statistical information. I do not want to appear to be unnecessarily rude, but it is unkind to say it is for statistical purposes, because the information he may want could be in connection with a person drawing money and not being ill enough. What does the hon. member call statistics? I submit that the person should be examined by a medical practitioner, and then there would be no doubt about it. You can pass it. At one time I would have kept you here until morning, but I do not feel like doing that now. The correct thing to do is that if the Opposition submits any argument, you would raise it with the Legal Draughtsman, and he would be able to see whether it has any substance; but you should not make a personal interpretation of the Clause. After the Minister has raised the matter with the Legal Draughtsman and there is nothing in my suggestion, he can come back and say the Leader of the Opposition was talking nonsense.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, without trying to drag us on, I want to draw to the attention of the hon. member who has just sat down that this is an inspector and not a doctor. This vests certain powers in the inspector. Let us not be misled by the word "examine"; "examine" means to solicit information, to ask questions; it does not necessarily mean for one to strip off one's garments and be medically examined. The inspector is not likely to perform the duties of a doctor; so why should the hon. member read that in as soon as he sees the word "examine"? What comes to the hon. member's mind is that it is medical examination, but this is an examination for information under the terms of the Act. To examine, enquire, ask questions or solicit information - it is more in that sense that the word is used in Clause 38 (b), which says "to make such examination and enquiry as may be necessary". That is what is intended. Let us therefore dissociate our minds from reading into this the question of medical examination which is occupying the hon. member's mind. The idea of some medical examination is *ultra vires* and contrary to the facts.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The hon. member may say that, but let us just read the Clause again, "..... every person whom he finds in any such premises or place, or whom he has reasonable cause to believe to be or to have been an insured person, and to require every such person to be so examined;" The Hon. Minister is a schoolmaster and did English at Advanced Level. I am not saying it is medical examination, but it says he can go in if he feels the person is insured, carry any person with him, and require the person to be examined. Either this is wrong, or I do not know anything. If the hon. member who is still shedding his eye-

teeth in this respect would give a chance to those of us who can argue this out, he will see that it is no obstruction to the Bill.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member reads further at the bottom of the penalty Clause, he will see that it says: "If any person wilfully delays or obstructs an inspector in the exercise of any power under this section; or (b) refuses or neglects to answer any question or to furnish any information or to produce any documents when required so to do under this section, he shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars in the case of a first offence under this subsection, and not exceeding five hundred in the case of a second or subsequent such offence:

Provided that no one shall be required under this section to answer any questions or to give any evidence tending to incriminate himself."

Mr. MOTTLEY: All that is perfect; I agree with the hon. member, but he knows that when it comes to bed-rock what I am saying is correct. The inspector shall require the person to be examined, but the person does not have to incriminate himself. He need not answer the questions at all. Either this is wrong or I do not understand the English language.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the word "examine" could not connote anything more than what the penalty Clause refers to. The penalty Clause refers to what the nature of the examination will be; it is not a medical examination.

Mr. MOTTLEY: But he cannot be examined by a solicitor or a lawyer.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If he refuses or neglects to answer, the penalty Clause will cover specifically word for word every offence or possible offence which could be committed. The penalty Clause specifically states that anyone who fails to open up the place, or obstructs the officer in the execution of his duties, neglects to answer any question or to furnish any information, or to produce any documents when required so to do under this section, shall be liable to the fine as set out in the Clause.
9.05 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister at the moment is acting Leader of the House, for the Minister in charge has long surrendered. If the Opposition is going to have it about a single clause, then pass the rest of the Bill, but have the legal boys help you and advise you and finalise it next Tuesday. We are here to help you with this. There is one Clause in dispute and it has been a hitch for the last hour.

Is that asking too much? It has happened in here time and time again. All we are asking you to do is to take it to your legal boys, ask them to write this single clause and come back here with it on Tuesday.

Mr. TALMA: It is really baffling to me that up to now you haven't been able to grasp that the penalty clause makes it explicit and clear what examination and enquiry and investigation is all about. It is just if you want to give an empty threat, or if you want to walk out, walk out and the Bill will be passed next week.

Mr. MILLER: That is the sort of thing you would expect from him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I wish you would stick to the Clause.

Mr. MILLER: We are unhappy about the Clause. You have a legal block, you have a political Attorney General all we are asking to pass the rest of the clauses and next Tuesday just come back with the final thing and satisfy us. The Minister has fallen down on this Bill hours ago. He is reading some parts for the first time now.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, if the hon. member would give way, I would just like to say that I

am not postponing any section of the Bill; so if you want to walk out, walk out.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, we are requesting that this clause be deferred until next Tuesday.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will hear him on a point of order.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member is only wasting time, because this clause is going to pass whether you vote for it or not. If the hon. member does not want to vote for this clause, he can walk out. He is only filibustering to give somebody the impression that he has given any contribution to this. The nonsense he came in and talked today, the reporter could not even take it down.

I would like to challenge the hon. member - he has no contribution to make, and he is only filibustering here to make somebody feel that the member from St. George made a contribution to this debate, when he knows absolutely nothing about what he is saying. If you walk out, we will come back on Tuesday and pass it, but I would like to challenge the hon. member to vote against it. He can talk nonsense as long as he likes, and I throw out a challenge to the hon. member. The others on the other side have more sense. The hon. senior member for the City has made his point, and what he says about the Bill I will act on.

The hon. member knows that I am no legal man, and when I get back to my Ministry I will get the position clarified. The hon. member for St. George can't tell me anything; he will be talking to a stone wall. I will take the point which the hon. member for the City has made, and I will what the hon. member for the City has asked me to do. If in the opinion of the Crown Law Officers of this country there is something wrong with it, I am willing to bring an amendment to the Act, but the nonsense that the hon. member is asking me to do - to pass the Bill without passing a clause - I have not heard about this before. He has been a member of the House for many years and up to now he does not know anything about what goes on in here.
9.15 p.m.

Mr. MILLER: The hon. member, Mr. Chairman, says he has never heard of that. The Hon. Acting Leader of the House can tell him of hundreds of occasions when you can get on with the Bill and leave one Clause hanging for examination; but the hon. member says that if the legal boys tell him tomorrow that the Clause is wrong, he will come back with an amendment. Imagine the folly of that! Do you know what it would involve to bring it back here? It would cost you almost \$500 to get it through the printers to come back here with an amendment; and he says he has never heard this. The Hon. Minister is not satisfied; he himself is helpless with the Bill because he has to ask the Acting Leader of the House to take over the responsibility and direction of the Bill.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman

Mr. MILLER: Is he on a point of order again, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, anybody who can come to this Chamber and say that I have asked the hon. member to help me with the Bill is a blatant liar. I do my homework; I am different from the idiots you have knocking around the place. He is accustomed to somebody doing his work for him, but I do not ask anybody to do mine; so the hon. member can only be a big liar to say that I asked the hon. member to do something for me. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the word "liar", but I would like to say that the hon. member is a stranger to the truth.

Mr. MILLER: If the hon. member wants to engage in a little personal abuse, that might not be surprising to other hon. members. I would hear him with some shock, but I can understand why that is his attitude. I understand what influence sociology and its effect would have on environment; so to abuse me would be a normal and natural thing. All that is bound up in background and so on, and you do not take

long to see it. You do not have to ask the hon. member to take over, but in your utter helplessness anybody could help, and then you asked the hon. member who took over the Bill from you if he was going to accept that interpretation. Anybody could see that in your blatant, blind helplessness somebody had to say something on it, and that is what brought him to his feet. To say that if it is wrong you would come back with an amendment means that you would have to take it back to Cabinet, spend months in the Ministry, and then it would take probably \$1,000 to bring back a simple amendment. Everybody in the Opposition is unhappy about it; so it is folly and stupid to display presumption. The longer you remain in this Chamber, the better you will understand that it is only a political imbecile who looks on the strength of numbers for the sake of presumption. You must display the merit and the metal that you are capable of if you possess such. (A VOICE: Adams did that too). Don't call Adams' name because you could not clean his sewage. Adams is your breath in illness. You would have to be ill to call his name.

What I asked, Mr. Chairman, is a simple request; but if the hon. member is happy about it, he does not have to bring it back. As a Minister he knows it would cost more than \$1,000 to bring it back to the House, and it must take at least four months. He can pass the other Clauses and take this back and come and finalise it on Tuesday, but it is simple ignorance that this attitude is adopted because of numbers. He talks about stupidity and calls somebody a liar, but I understand the level and standard from which he has come. When those things fall out of your lips, they betray the things you want to hide - background breeding. The Opposition is unhappy about this, and he can leave it until next Tuesday and come back and say it is all right and pass it. How much are we asking? The Acting Leader of the House can tell you that it will take nearly four months to bring this back to the House with a simple amendment of one word. If the legal Attorney says this is clearly redundant and you can put in two words or another sentence to make it clear or repeat it four times to make it clear, that is all we ask, and probably next Tuesday come back and say the legal boys says it is O.K., then we would form fours, salute, sing "God save the Queen", take two steps backwards and fall out. What is wrong with that? And this full grown idiot here is laughing like a hyena in the forest. We are making a simple request, but the hon. member gets up in here and prances up

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member addressing the Chair?

Mr. MILLER: I am addressing the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It does not appear so.

Mr. MILLER: It is a simple request, and if he comes back next Tuesday and says the legal boys say it is all right, we would go home.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, before you put the Clause, I want to make it clear that the Hon. Minister of Trade, Labour and National Insurance has never solicited any aid or asked me to assist him in any way. It is merely because I am Acting Leader of the House for the time that we are always willing and ready to assist each other whenever the opportunity warrants. He never asked me, but I rose to assist him in the normal way as I would be expected to do.

The question that Clause 38 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 39 to 52 inclusive were called and passed.

The first and Second Schedules were called and passed.

The Third Schedule was called.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment I should like to make to the Third Schedule, and it is on page 59, Lines 4, 21 and 22, and page 60, lines 15,

16 and 19, I should like to substitute the words "National Insurance and Social Security Act, 1966," for the words "National Insurance Act, 1966".

I beg to move that the Third Schedule as amended stand part.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill with amendments in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, seconded in each case by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this now concludes Government Business for today's sitting, and I beg to move that this House do adjourn until Tuesday, 31st May, 1966, at 2.30 p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 31st May, 1966 at 2.30 p.m., was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

9.33 p.m.