

X

THE
HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 18th January, 1967

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 10.30 a.m. o'clock today.

PRESENT

His Honour J. E. T. BRANCKER, Q.C., F.Z.S., (Speaker); Mr. L. E. SMITH, J.P.; Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Minister of Health and Community Development); Hon. J. C. TUDOR, M.A., (Minister of Education); Mr. J. W. CORBIN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE; Hon. N. W. BOXILL, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. B. YEARWOOD, (Chairman of Committees); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance); Mr. C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P.; Mr. L.S. CRAIG; Mr. H. B. ST. JOHN, LL.B., and Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A.

Prayers were read.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS, Mr. HINDS and Mr. HOLDER entered the Chamber and took their seats.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that there are no Minutes available for confirmation today.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Bank Holidays Act, 1905.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. HOPPIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of an amendment to the Censure Motion. It reads as follows:-

AMENDMENT TO CENSURE MOTION

Delete all the words appearing after "this House" and substitute therefor the following words:

"notes with extreme pleasure that the honourable senior member for St. Lucy, having first entered this Honourable Chamber on the 26th day of January, 1937, has continuously retained his seat herein;

recalls that during this thirty-year period the same honourable member has at different times served as Deputy Speaker, Leader of the Opposition, and as Speaker since 1961;

recalls further that the same honourable member has been elected Speaker with the consent of the whole

House on two occasions, the latter as recently as November, 1966;

records herein profound appreciation of the honourable member's long and distinguished parliamentary service;

congratulates the honourable member on the occasion of his thirtieth year of continuous membership; and again renews its pledges of unswerving respect for the dignity of the Chair.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the text of this Resolution be suitably engrossed on parchment and handed over to Mr. Speaker as a tribute from this Honourable House."

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, a Bill to amend the Bank Holidays Act, 1905, was read a first time.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

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

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 2) ORDER, 1967

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 on today's Order Paper be the first Item under Government Business.

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

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

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave of the House for this Item to be dealt with by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking the indulgence of the House for this matter to be taken

charge of by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted for the Hon. Minister of Agriculture to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1967.
10.50 a.m.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, for over three hundred years the mainstay of the economy of this country was agriculture. Today, it is still agriculture. It is true that the Tourist Industry is growing by leaps and bounds, but it is the intention of us concerned with agriculture to see to it that agriculture remains the mainstay of the economy of this country; because one instance of Yellow Fever could wipe out the entire Tourist Industry and hence we should place our confidence in the sort of economy on which we can depend. In that agriculture has been for years the mainstay of our economy, emphasis has been placed on sugar. Hon. members are aware of the world situation where sugar is concerned. Hon. members are aware of the fact that the over-production of sugar in the world today is resulting in a low price being paid for sugar. For years there has been considerable research in sugar not only in Barbados, but all over the world. As a result of the research carried out in this branch of agriculture, there has been this over production resulting in a new low where the World market price of sugar is concerned. The world market price of sugar today is far below the price of production; it is something like £12.10s. on the World Market per ton. In order to produce a ton of sugar in Barbados, it costs us over \$200. If there had not been a Commonwealth Sugar Agreement by which we, in Barbados, get a guaranteed price for sugar up to a certain tonnage, we could not grow any sugar at all. It is therefore absolutely necessary for us in Barbados to concentrate on other crops. In order to do this we must have a strong research unit; we must have a well-equipped Extension Service.

It is true that we have an Extension Service, but today this merely reaches as far as the small peasant proprietor. As a matter of fact, before it reaches the Ministry or the Extension Service it is stated that little attention is paid to the Extension Officers or there is little co-operation with the Extension Officers where the large farmers are concerned. That is understandable. For years the large farmers have placed their confidence in sugar. The Barbadian community is such that it takes quite a lot in order to change a man from his views. The large farmers have done reasonably well over the years with sugar, and you have to prove to them that it is economically feasible for them to diversify. How are we going to do this? How are we going to encourage the large farmers to diversify? We must have first of all, the necessary research findings, we must be able to convince these farmers that if they diversify, the new crops which they are going to grow will be more remunerative to them than the present crops which they are growing. At the same time we do not want to reduce our production of sugar because we still have a guaranteed market for a certain tonnage today; but what we can do is to increase and improve the production of sugar by further research. We feel that we can produce the same amount of sugar which we are producing today on two-thirds the acreage which is currently planted in sugar, by a further intensive research, and at the same time we can use more of our land in order to diversify - or for the diversification of other crops. It is not in the interest of the country economically for us to be importing into this country thousands of dollars of vegetables and other foods per annum, which we can produce here; but we must have the knowledge available to us to produce more food. How are we going to do it?

Mr. Speaker, the staff proposals which we have now brought before this Honourable House is a step in that direction. If you were to look at the proposals you will notice that we are asking this House to give us additional staff such as Senior Agricultural Officers and other Agricultural Officers, a Deputy Agricultural Officer together with other Clerical Staff, *et cetera*. That is all set out in the Addendum to the Resolution. At the present time there is the post of Deputy Chief Agricultural Officer and we are asking for a second post.

Why is it necessary for us to have a second post? The answer is simply this.
11.00 a.m.

It is proposed to divide the work of the Ministry of Agriculture into two sections; one dealing with research and the other dealing with extensions. One of the duties of the Agricultural Officer would be to specialise in research, he will have a research technical section to the Ministry and he will be responsible for the research. The other Agricultural Officer would be responsible for the research extension and he will be responsible for extensions.

Why we have these two sections? We have these two sections in order to advise on the economic feasibility of growing certain types of crops. We must be able to satisfy the farmers that we have carried out the necessary research, and that we are satisfied that under the present programme, it would be better to grow the particular type of food crop rather than the type which we are growing today.

Mr. Speaker, to do this we must have a strong research unit, and I should like to quote from the Soil and Land-use Surveys, No. 8, instituted at the Regional Research Centre at the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture. On page 35 it is stated, and I quote:-

"There is little knowledge of the agronomy of crops other than cane in Barbados and results of research in other parts of the Caribbean cannot easily be extrapolated to Barbados. It must be emphasised that research problems are great for such a small island and the resources devoted to research should not depend solely on the arable acreage. Soils form the most important natural resource of Barbados.

"The agronomic programme should not be spread too thinly. Many areas of Barbados will never be agriculturally economic and can support only the poorest form of subsistence farming. Other good areas are producing less than they should. In a country like this, the aim must be to use all good land as intensively as possible, and there are other more intensive forms of land-use than the virtual monoculture of sugar-cane.

"The most pressing problem in Barbados Agriculture results from the overwhelming dependence on sugar-cane. Diversification is urgently required but this need not mean the decline of sugar production. Much of the research effort should still aim at improving and increasing the present cane crop. However, the guaranteed price paid under the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement has resulted in the unnecessary importation of foodstuffs for local consumption and the neglect of the possibilities of other export crops. In some areas, land at present in cane could be employed more usefully in crops that give a greater return to the farmer and a greater income to the country. The search for alternative crops should not be confined to soils for which sugar-cane does rather badly and on which other crops are unlikely to give spectacular results, but should also take into account the best cane land.

"Much agronomic work is also required on short-term root crops. Each estate is compelled to plant a certain proportion of its land in food crops and for some soils this should be profitable, but not for others. The soil map could be used as a basis for modifying the inequalities of the compulsory planting system and for planning the experimental work necessary to promote the most efficient production of these crops."

Mr. Speaker, when you read that section of the Survey on Barbados it can be clearly seen that we can do better in agriculture only if we have the necessary research carried out. We must therefore be prepared to carry out our own research, because research in the other parts of the Caribbean does not necessarily apply to Barbados; and if the work carried out in diversification must go ahead, we must carry out our own research.

We are asking for six Senior Agricultural Officers, one Senior Agricultural Assistant and six Agricultural Assis-

tants. The six Senior Agricultural Assistants would be used in our research and extension service. These are not all that are needed. We need nine. We need seven additional ones for research and two for extensions. For example, we need an additional Entomologist who would deal with pests. There is one Entomologist now dealing with pests in sugar cane but we want one to deal with other crops. This man deals with the various types of diseases in agriculture. We also need an Agronomist and this man deals with new varieties and he advises on fertilizers and various types of manure. He also advises on the time of planting and type of crops. It is to be noted that whenever there is a new crop planted, the development of new diseases accelerates. We had recently the situation where we started to grow some melons, and these melons were destroyed by new diseases. In order to deal with new crops we must have an Agronomist to advise on diseases, to advise on manures and types of fertilizers and the times which we should plant our new crops and the variety. We do not need only an Agronomist; we need an Agricultural Economist. Some people argue that there is no need for an Agricultural Economist because we have an Economic Planning Unit and, therefore, you can get advice from the Economic Planning Unit.

11.10 a.m.

An Agricultural Economist must firstly be trained in agriculture, and then trained in Economics. This is the type of man we want, and we want him to advise on costings, the types of crop which it would be economically feasible for us to grow in Barbados, and he must also carry out surveys for us so that he will be able to tell us what our pig population would be in five years' time, what our milk supply would be in two years' time, and if we are using x+y pounds in fertiliser on a certain plant and receiving so much results, whether we could use x pounds and receive a more economical result. These are the things we need an Agricultural Economist for.

We also need an Agricultural Engineer. If we are to diversify, we must irrigate. There are certain crops which cannot be planted in this country without irrigation if we want to get results from them; therefore we must have someone to advise us on irrigation. We must to some extent mechanise, and therefore we must have someone to advise us on mechanisation. His advice will not be limited to the small farmer alone, but will reach as far as the large farmer.

We have tried to promote co-operatives in this country. We have found in the past that farmers dug wells for irrigation which are no longer operated. This is because there was no expert to advise them; they did it on their own; but we feel that if in certain areas we are to diversify, common wells could be dug, the costing of this could be done on a co-operative basis, water could be measured going to the particular farmer, and we could have a sort of co-operative movement, where irrigation is concerned, in certain areas. This is why we would like to have an Agricultural Engineer.

Next we come to an Animal Husbandryman. In recent years we have tried to increase on our annual production of not only cows for dairy purposes, pigs, etc., but we find that too much money is leaving this country for the purchase of commodities which we can produce here, such as meat and other products from livestock. It is our intention to reduce the outflow of money and to keep as much money circulating in this country as possible, because it is one of the few means of improving the economy of the country. If we are promoting the livestock industry, it is not enough to say that the Government has a Veterinary Surgeon and there is provision for a second Vet. I may say here that that post will be filled soon. These people are doctors and they advise medically, but we need someone who can advise Government and farmers on production, breeds, feeding methods, general care of livestock, and the type of buildings in which the livestock should be housed, rather than have every Tom, Dick and Harry put up any type of building which may be too close and too hot for the particular type of animal. In order to do this so that our livestock industry will continue to grow, and so that we can reduce the amount of meat and other products from livestock which are imported into this country, we must have an Animal Husbandryman.

Next we come to the Extensions Service. We must have an Extensions Officer for information. It is not enough to say that we have a Research Section, but the findings of the Research Section must reach the farmer. How is this going to be done? As it stands today, there is an Extensions Service. You may hear on the Government Programme an Extensions Officer giving some sort of lecture to the community or passing on some kind of information, but this type of information can only reach about twenty percent of the farmers in this country. Therefore we must have other means of reaching the farmers, and the best means would be to have a man going to them on the spot, and not only lecturing to them but actually guiding them along the best lines of agriculture. Hence we need two men to carry out the findings of the Research Section to the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, that covers the technical aspect of these proposals. Next we come to the Clerical Staff. It is to be noted that we are upgrading the post of Assistant Executive Secretary to the Post of Senior Executive Officer. This is in keeping with the recommendations of the Salaries Commissioner in 1966. This is absolutely necessary since the Ministry is an integrated Ministry, and because of the increased work-load and the amount of finance involved, we must have a high-powered person as Accountant. It is to be noted further in the proposals that the Irrigation Board is to be abolished, and the Ministry will be directly responsible for irrigation. Two Officers of the Irrigation Board will become redundant. Provision has already been made for one, and provision is being made now in these proposals for the inclusion of one of these Officers on the Staff of the Ministry as an Agricultural Assistant.

Hon. members will note that we are making a change in the Laboratory Section. The post of Messenger is to be abolished and the post of Laboratory Assistant is to be established, because there is going to be a greater work load because of the research programme, and we must have further assistance there.

11.20 a.m.

It is also to be noted that there are certain changes in the nomenclature of the Ministry of Agriculture. The Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries now becomes the Ministry of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance and provision is made in the Establishment for that. Also the Ministry of Trade, Labour, National Insurance and Tourism is now changed to the Ministry of Trade, Tourism, Co-operatives and Fisheries and in this Order provision is made for the changes and transfer of the various subjects and, in some cases, the transfer of staff from one Ministry to the other. It is not my intention to keep hon. members listening to me for too long, and I would like to let hon. members know that I am willing to answer any question or questions which they should like to ask in respect of these proposals. In these circumstances, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House recognise and appreciate the importance of agriculture to the economy of this country. In looking at these proposals, especially after we have heard the Hon. Minister introducing them and in particular that part of his speech where he dealt with the needs, I am at a loss to understand how it is that the Government can recognise the needs and then fail to make adequate provision for them at this stage. As I listened to the Hon. Minister, I heard him say that we need an Agricultural Economist, a Specialist in transmitting information and an Animal Husbandry Specialist. If I heard him correctly he said that although they were making provision for six new Agricultural Officers, they still needed nine in all. It seems to us on this side of the House that, agriculture being of the importance which even they recognise it is, it should be a matter of the utmost priority.

In this Civil Establishment Order there is no provision for an Agricultural Economist. Looking through this Order, I fail to see any provision for an Animal Husbandry Specialist or a Specialist Economist. It may be that they hope in the future to increase the number of the Senior Agricultural Officers, and to designate one of them as an Agricultural

Economist and Specialist. My understanding of the situation with respect to these officers is that these people are regarded as Specialists and in other Establishments in the Caribbean area like Trinidad, Jamaica and Guyana they are designated as such Specialists. It is only two nights ago that I was listening to a programme on the Government Information Service on farming, and the Government Information Officer and large and small farmers were taking part. When it came to the question of growing foodcrops the Government Information Officer was extracting from the small growers if these things would pay. One is doubtful whether they understood what is meant by payment. They asked the Agricultural Officer whether they paid and he had to duck and hide. The reason why nobody knows if these things pay or do not pay and why they could not demonstrate whether they paid or did not pay is because of the lack of a proper Agricultural Economist in this country.

The Hon. Minister recognised that, but he seems to have failed in persuading the Cabinet as to the urgency and necessity for this Officer; otherwise in this Order a post would have been created specifically for this office of Agricultural Economist. The matter of marketing too should be emphasised. In the same programme they seem to have disclosed quite clearly that there is a lack of liaison between the Marketing Corporation and the farmer, big and small. It was said that the Marketing Corporation had created a number of Field Officers in an endeavour to transmit their requirements to the farmer in the field; but I think the general consensus of opinion even from the Marketing Officers on the programme themselves was that the staff was inadequate to cover the whole Island and to make the farmers aware of the markets which they have developed for suitable crops and the period of time when they needed them and the varying production needed. This is a very serious defect in the programme because this diversification programme cannot succeed unless there is a proper liaison between the two aspects of production and marketing, and I hope that the Hon. Minister, if he did not listen to the programme himself, would have that programme replayed by the Government Information Officer or those who are in charge of it in his Ministry, and endeavour to take steps immediately to rectify what seems to be a basic complaint which is recognised on all sides.

The Hon. Minister mentioned the question of co-operatives. As is well known, Sir, I am one of those who, for years, have been taking interest in co-operatives and I believe that I have a fair knowledge of the workings of the co-operative department in Barbados and the workings of co-operatives as a whole throughout the island. I think that one of the reasons why progress has not been made in the building up and development of co-operatives in Barbados is because of the inadequacy of staff of the Co-operative Department. There are four officers, I understand, who are designated to deal with co-operatives. The Registrar is the chief administrative officer, and there are three other co-operative Officers; and one must take into consideration the fact that they have to deal with Credit Unions and Agricultural and Fisheries Co-operatives. It must be taken into consideration that under our law the responsibility for auditing accounts for Co-operative Societies is vested in the Co-operative Department of Barbados.

11.30 a.m.

Now, there are a number of Credit Unions, Agricultural Societies and some Co-operative Societies. The position is this. With the work load there is an inadequate number of officers to carry out the work. The Co-operative law has to be amended and the Agricultural Bank Act. There is nothing in this world which creates a lack of confidence more than the failure of these officers and members to satisfy the members of the organisation that their funds are properly accounted for, and I believe that unless there is a speed up in the working out of the accounts, it is going to stultify the growth in this country.

Co-operative movement would have to play its part in the increased production in Barbados and the better production of the products of Barbados.

Therefore, Sir, we as a whole are in favour of this attempt being made to improve the efficiency in the Agricultural

Department, but we do feel that a greater amount of money should be devoted to these specialised officers, and the expansion of the officers in the Co-operative department. We hope that in the near future we will see an increase in the Establishment to keep pace with this matter.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (No. 3) ORDER, 1967

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I ask that Order No. 3 be the next Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the Hon. and Learned Prime Minister.

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I am also asking leave of the House for the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance to deal with the next Order of the day.

There being no objection, leave was granted the Hon. Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order of the day now stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Labour and National Insurance, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1967.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, it was stated in the Speech from the Throne delivered by the Duke of Kent that the National Insurance and Social Security Scheme would begin in April of this year. This was also stated in the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party.

At present there is temporary staff attached to the Department of Social Security. There are a Director, Assistant Director, a Senior Accountant, two Executive Officers, one Secretary, one Stenographer, four Clerical Officers and one Messenger.

The proposals here before us increase the staff of that Department from 12 to 58. This is necessary at this stage and I am very sorry that hon. members did not see fit to deal with this Resolution yesterday because it has set back the work of the organisation of that department. If we did not deal with it today, it would mean that the work would be set back by a week, and the people in this country would be denied the benefits of this department for another week.

However, Mr. Speaker, these proposals, as I said are the minimum proposals for the establishment of this Department. This is the minimum amount of staff on which the Department can operate at this stage if National Insurance is to begin as early as possible after the 1st April this year.

It is to be noted in these proposals that provision is made for thirteen Executive Officers. These are very important. Why 13 Executive Officers? Really, these are ten Inspectors and three Executive Officers. The reason that we did not say thirteen Inspectors or ten Inspectors and three Executive Officers was that we would be in the position since the post of Inspector is so important that if a person was appointed as Executive Officer and did not measure up, or was the type of person to deal with inspections, he could be brought back into the office rather than be an Inspector at the same executive grade, and some other officer, would replace him as Inspector. An Inspector must be the type of person who understands human nature. He must be the type of person who can get on with employers as well as with workers.

11.40 a.m.

He is supposed to see to it that employers shoulder their responsibility where the worker is concerned, because after all the onus is on the employer to see that the contribution for the worker is made. He must be given certain authority whereby he can prosecute the employer for not fulfilling his duties. The post of Inspector, therefore, is a very important post.

I remember that the last time I dealt with National Insurance, hon. members wanted to find out what were the likely benefits or the quantum of benefits to be paid and what contributions would be like. I am now in a position, after having a policy decision on it, to let hon. members know what would be the level of contributions and the quantum of benefits under Social Security. Now the contributions to Social Security approximate to six per cent of the notional income; that is beside the additional contribution which is to be made by the employer for employment injury benefit. The total contribution would be 7 per cent of notional income; that is to say, if a man were working for between \$15 and \$19.99 a week, the notional income would be \$17.50.

Now hon. members will remember that I pointed out that employment injury benefits will not come into the scheme at the beginning; therefore the employee's contribution initially will be three per cent of his income and the employer's contribution would be three per cent of the notional income of the employee, which amounts to six per cent. As soon as employment injury benefit is introduced into the scheme - and if we can introduce it initially, we will - the employer pays 4 per cent of the notional income of the employee and the employee pays 3 per cent. It means that the employer makes a bigger contribution to Social Security and employment injury benefit than the employee. Now the level of contribution rates from \$1.00 to \$9.99 where the first rate of contribution is paid. The second is between \$10.00 and \$14.99; the third between \$15.00 and \$19.99; the fourth between \$20.00 and \$29.99; the fifth between \$30.00 and \$44.99; and the sixth between \$45.00 and over per week. It means that a person working for over \$50 a week pays his contribution on the notional income of a person working for up to \$50 a week. The contribution will not be higher than 7 per cent, that is 3% plus 3% plus 1% of \$50 a week.

With regard to the benefits, a person is entitled to sickness benefit which will be 60% of his weekly wage, that is 60% of his insurable income. If a man was working for \$75 a week, he makes a contribution on the notional income of \$50, therefore the sickness benefit would be on the insurable income which would be 60% of \$50.00 because he is contributing at the rate of a notional income; so 3% is his contribution of the notional income of \$50 a week.

There is also maternity benefit which is equivalent to 60% of the insurable weekly earnings, invalidity pension equivalent to 40 percent of the average annual insurable earnings rising to a maximum of 60% of the insurable earnings from 50 contributions paid or credited. Let me explain the difference between the invalidity grant and the invalidity pension. This scheme makes provision for a man who is, say 60 or 62 years old to be covered under national insurance, but to qualify for a pension as is the case in the Government Service, a man must have ten years of service; but we have said further that if a man is too old so that by the time he reaches the age of 65 he has not made contributions for ten years, he is still brought into the scheme and is given credit for a certain amount of contributions which entitles him when he reaches the age of 65 to a grant from the National Insurance Scheme. All workers under the age of 65 years can be covered, but the only difference is that if these people were paid a pension according to the contributions made, the weekly pension would be so low that it would be better to give them a grant. Provision is therefore made that those who come in at a late age would still have some benefit from National Insurance and Social Security by means of old age or invalidity grant, 11.50 a.m.

Of course, all people covered by this scheme will be entitled to a death grant. That is to say, if you are a pensioner if you have passed the age of 65 years and you are receiving a pension or national insurance and you live until you are a hundred years of age, although you are contributing you are still entitled to a funeral grant or the estate is entitled to it, and the level is \$100.00 whether you are paying contributions on the higher rate or at the lowest rate.

Now, Sir, I come to one of the most important parts of the benefits under Social Security and that is the survival benefit. That is divided into two groups; you have survivals who will benefit under employment injury or survivals re-

sulting from natural causes of death. The persons who qualify as survivors under the employment injury are those people who qualify as survivors according to the Workmen's Compensation Act. Let us take it that a man dies and he leaves six children and a widow. The widow is entitled to one-half of what his pension would have been and the other half will go to his survivors. How is this going to be done? The children get survival benefit of one sixth of what the pension would have been. If there are six children, the first three of them would be entitled to pensions until they reach the age of sixteen years. I want hon. members to follow me clearly. If one child is six years old, another is ten and another is nine, then these children will have pensions until they are sixteen years, three of them will always be receiving one-half of the pension. They would receive that amount until they reach the age of 16 years. In the case of a widow who is invalid she will receive fifty per cent of the pension to which the man was entitled until she dies. If she has passed the age of 65 years she receives it for her life. If she is a young woman or will soon be marrying, she is given this portion of the pension for a year and the children will continue to receive pensions until they reach the age of sixteen years.

What happens in the case of children of common law marriages? These children are entitled to benefits under this scheme too. That is to say, if a man had two children from his wife and he was like some of the honourable friends with six or seven outside (SIR GRANTLEY ADAMS: Order!)

Mr. SPEAKER: All of whom I gather are hon. members. (Laughter)

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Yes, Sir, hon. members. Hon. members may ask me what happens in this case where a man was friendly with a woman with two children and had six children and then he got fed up with her and married another woman who has children also. What happens with these children who are from the woman whom he did not marry? The National Board will carry out a means test and on every occasion three children will benefit from the pension, whether they are children of the man's lawful wife or widow or whether they are the children of the common law wife. A man may have died and left two houses rented out. His widow receives the rents from these houses, but the woman from whom he had the six children gets nothing. She does not have houses or does not work and therefore in these circumstances the survival benefit, instead of going to the children of the lawful married woman will go to the children who are in poor circumstances. Therefore all the children of a man will benefit where they are within the scope of these provisions as long as it is established that they are his children, so that lawful children do not have any privilege which is denied the illegitimate children.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I am satisfied that all hon. members here would like to see this scheme off the ground. I know that they are not going to raise any objection to this scheme. I know that the scheme has the blessing of the entire House as well as the blessing of the entire community of Barbados, and everybody is looking forward to the day, some time in April, when the scheme will come into operation. It must be on a Monday, not necessarily the first of April, when the scheme will get off the ground and 80,000 people will be covered under the scheme. There are other factors of the scheme. Hon. members may want to know what will be the means of financing this scheme. Unlike Jamaica, a person is entitled to benefit under the scheme after contributing for thirteen weeks. 12.00 p.m.

In Jamaica, he has got to make a contribution before he is entitled to benefit under the scheme. When he makes a contribution, it does not necessarily mean that he stands to benefit. Eight out of thirteen contributions entitle you to benefits under the scheme. The regulations are now being drafted by the Crown Law Officers. There are seven relevant volumes of regulations; so you can appreciate the amount of work which was put into this scheme.

In some countries the implementation of Social Security has taken as long as forty years after the Report was handed

in. We have had the advice of Mr. Jenkins from United Nations on Social Security for just under two years. The bulk of work was done by this man. We could not have done the work on social Security without the necessary expertise. We had to get advice although routine matters could be done by us; but when we came to the complicated aspects of Social Security, we had to get advice from outside. We had to depend on actuarial advice from outside. We got the Report actually in July last year. It is true that the Bill was passed early last year, but the Bill could not be drafted without the actuary's advice because we would not know the level of contributions. It is true that we know the contributions which we were making, but we did not know what level of contributions the scheme would carry.

The contributions of Government to this scheme is by way of administrative staff. It is also to be noted that Civil Servants will come under this scheme. The annual contributions by Civil Servants under this scheme is \$60,000. It is estimated that 60,000 people will be insured at the inception, but 80,000 people will be covered by the scheme.

Hon. members will remember that I pointed out that not all employers would be incorporated in the scheme at the beginning, but eventually all would be brought under the scheme. It is estimated that over a fifteen-year period there will be \$34 million in the scheme to take care of the commitments under the scheme. That is why it was necessary to include under these draft proposals here before us provision for a high-powered Accountant because this is a lot of money for an Accountant to deal with. I might point out that in these proposals we are asking Government for approval to spend approximately \$200,000 on administrative staff per annum.

Provision here is made for the minimum of staff we need and so as not to retard the work of the Department we are having provision of \$24,000 placed in the Estimates to employ temporary staff as the occasion arises. Then we will come as we have done before with the necessary Civil Establishment Order to cover the amount of staff we need. We feel provision should be made on the advice of the Chief Establishment Officer. Additional Staff would be brought in eventually, because this is a very important department and we do not want National Insurance and Social Security to fail for the want of the necessary staff. We do not want what happened in Jamaica to happen in Barbados. It is true, right now, the scheme in Jamaica is going reasonably well after going through its teething stages. I may point out that both the Director and the Adviser would be visiting Jamaica shortly to see how this scheme is working before our scheme is implemented here.

The total amount which we are now asking for is \$181,940. The additional amount which we are putting in the Estimates is \$24,000. That is not all, and I know hon. members may feel that Government should make some contribution. This is the contribution which Government is making.
12.10 p.m.

We estimate that the staff in this Department over a period of time will be over 100 employees, and if on 58 employees we are spending over \$200,000 a year, the Government's contribution to the payment of salaries for the Administrative Staff will be almost \$1 1/2 million per annum; so no one can say that we are not contributing something to the scheme. Over and above that, Government will have to be putting into the scheme over \$600,000 per annum as their contribution on behalf of the Civil Service.

There is one final point, Mr. Speaker, and it is this: contributions will be made by the purchase of stamps and a provisional order has been placed. These stamps will not be the type used for the postage of letters. It is a special type of stamp and a decision has been taken on the type of stamp we are going to use and they will have on them "Barbados National Insurance and Social Security" with the denomination of the stamp. There will be a stamp for \$1.00, for 25 cents for whatever the case may be. (Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Whose portrait?) There will be no portrait unless the hon. member would like to suggest his.

Mr. SPEAKER: That answer might have caused disappointment.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: These stamps are on order, and we hope that we can persuade the Crown Agents to send them down for us in time to begin on the first Monday in April. The only thing that will stop us from beginning the scheme on the first Monday in April is if we do not get the stamps in time from the Crown Agents. We have all the machinery in action, and the reason why we have come for the staff today is because it has to be trained in National Insurance and Social Security, and we want to give at least two months' training to those that it is necessary to train, which accounts for the urgency of the matter.

If there are any questions which hon. members would like to ask, I would be pleased to pass on any further information I may have.

I therefore beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, a remark was made by the Hon. Minister at the start of his introduction to this Order that we on this side of the House have been holding back Social Security by objecting to debating this Order without notice. Well what is in fact holding back Social Security or what could hold it back is the lack of Regulations, and not the lack of staff of whom there is an abundance on a temporary basis if I understood the Hon. Minister correctly during his speech.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, I did not make the statement which the hon. member alleges I made.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the point of order then?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: My point of order is that the hon. senior member for St. Thomas misrepresented what I said.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I think I stated that I understood the Hon. Minister to say this. If the Hon. Minister would like to correct my understanding of what he said, I should be obliged to give way on a point of explanation; but nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the point which I am making is still valid that what can hold back Social Security will be the question of the Regulations, and we have heard here today in introducing this Order a speech about Regulations which are not yet before this Hon. House, because we have heard about the level of contributions, we have heard about who will be included, and that outside children will or will not.....

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of explanation, I mentioned Regulations during the course of my address. The Regulations are not to be approved by the House; Regulations are made by the Cabinet and laid on the Table of the Legislature. When they come here, they are Regulations already, and I was courteous enough to tell hon. members what the Regulations provided.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point of explanation made.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am obliged to the Hon. Minister, and therefore we can say something about these Regulations at this stage. Mr. Speaker, obviously we on this side of the House are not going to be opposed to the establishment of staff for the purpose of administering the National Insurance Act. Obviously there has to be staff. We have heard what the Minister has said about it and we have observed that it is a minimum staff. Perhaps we would even agree with that, although we will have to reserve judgment until we see how much more staff is required. The Minister said something about a high-powered Accountant required to deal with these sums which are very large indeed. I do not know what sort of high-powered Accountant works at the Grade which these regulations suggest namely G.3-2, a salary of \$6,129 - \$7,320 per annum. I do not know what type of Senior Accountant they are going to get for administering a scheme that runs into millions for a salary of \$600 a month. If the Government can do it, we on this side

of the House will congratulate them on getting an Accountant of that calibre at this price.

In relation to what has been said about the form which these provisions are going to take when they appear in the Regulations which will already be law in so far as Regulations are law when they appear on the Table of the House, after going around the bush and getting back, we understood that the contribution is to be 6 per cent of the employee's national income. Again, Mr. Speaker, I may have missed the definition of "national income", and I have no clear picture of it in my mind at the moment. I trust that the Minister has, but we understood that \$3.00 a week will be what is in fact the maximum contribution per person on \$50 and above, because that is the standard level. You can fall lower than that, but you will not go any higher than that, and it is suggested, as if it were something unusual, that the employer's contribution at some stage will be greater than the employee's contribution. This, of course, Mr. Speaker, is normal in all Social Security Schemes, but there was something disquieting on this side of the House which appears in the Minister's speech.

Now the principal Act, Mr. Speaker, provides that Workmen's Compensation will be replaced by the provisions of the National Insurance and Social Security Act. It provides that as from the appointed day, no further Workmen's Compensation will be payable and that all claims for injury at work for employment injuries will have to be made under this Act, and this is the basis on which we on this side of the House and the general public have been proceeding - that Workmen's Compensation will be taken over, that it will no longer be necessary for private employers to insure with private insurance companies, that an amount will be paid in respect of national insurance by employers, and we have heard that this amount will be paid by the employer to cover his present liabilities under the Statute Law for Workmen's Compensation. It therefore comes as a shock to us to hear that it is not immediately envisaged that employment insurance by the Government may not come into force immediately upon the coming into operation of the National Insurance and Social Security Act.
12.20 p.m.

I do not know at what stage the additional amount of 1% payable by the employer will in fact take place. We, on this side of the House, would certainly like to know something about that in due course. As to the self-employed persons, I do not know that there are many hon. members in this House who have lived in a country where Social Security was in force, but those hon. members will readily recall that where you are unemployed, you will get your eight shillings, it may be more, and you are paid a substantial sum per week. Self-employed persons are particularly and peculiarly persons who qualify in national insurance for sickness and pensions. The Civil Servants are already covered. There are Regulations dealing with such positions. There are self-employed persons like Barristers, Doctors, Shoemakers and Tailors - and they are not necessarily to be taken in that order. I know that there are self-employed persons who are looking forward to the possibility of making their contributions and sharing in the benefits of the Social Security Act. I observe that there are 20,000 self-employed persons, according to the statistics which we have been given, in this island and this may well be so. It may well be that anything like one-quarter of all the persons who are employed in Barbados are self-employed. This may be a unique percentage, but it may be that there are figures which will justify. If 25% of the persons in this Island who have to support themselves are self-employed, it could be suggested that the Act will not cover them in the initial stage. If the Regulations are not making provision for self-employed persons, then this would be a serious omission in the matter before us.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has said that the Regulations are not making any provision for self-employed persons. I want to say that the Bill makes provision for self-employed persons, but they will not be included because of complications which have to be decided as to the level of

the contributions which they will have to make. This is a greater exercise for the self-employed persons, and we can only implement it when the experts say that they are ready for that; but all workers will be included in the scheme.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the Hon. Minister has said that. The point which I was making was that we were alarmed that the Regulations were not providing for self-employed persons to be dealt with at the commencement of national insurance. Obviously, the Act makes provision for self-employed persons. There is no doubt that the Regulations will refer to self-employed persons, but we regret that self-employed persons will not have the opportunity initially, and we cannot have a date on which these self-employed persons will know that they will have an opportunity of being included in the National Insurance Scheme. Shoemakers, Tailors, (A MEMBER: Lawyers). Yes, Lawyers; all of them need some aspect of National Insurance and Social Security. I was very pleased from time to time when I resided in another country to know that my spectacles could be replaced and my teeth fixed on the basis of 16 shillings or 17 shillings a week which was paid for National Insurance. We will not be having that, but that is another matter altogether.

We have heard something about how some other countries have taken from four to five years in bringing forward a scheme of National Insurance. My information is that before 1961 the first steps to bring down experts to report on Social Security were taken. That is our information. There was a gentleman called Mr. Stockman and now we have heard about Mr. Jenkins. We have heard about the Manifestoes of political parties, and this is not the first Manifesto in which a political party referred to Social Security. Our records in this House will point back to the start of social security in Barbados. What is now needed in Barbados is a wage stage because that is something which is pointing to the varying levels of contributions under this Act. We have heard about actuarial status but we need a proper wage stage in Barbados. To take the United Kingdom as an example, the administrative difficulties in enforcing an Act of National Insurance where the contributions varied with the income, were so great that it was preferred to have one contribution. You will have to have much more staff to administer a percentage scheme than a scheme in which there is only one contribution. In the United Kingdom you pay a higher contribution, not according to your income but according to your category under the Act, there are categories of self-employed persons and employed persons, of men and women. There are six categories.
12.30 p.m.

You pay one contribution, and this was one of the major and hard decisions which was taken. With a scheme intended to cover the island's population, to have various scales of contributions and having to have all these Inspectors, is so expensive that it is better to strike a single contribution and strike a figure which is a uniform figure for all. In England £9 a week is the set figure, and dock workers pay the same contribution as chauffeurs. This is not because they get the same rate of pay, but the administration has discovered that having to deal with all employed persons, you have to deal with various categories of salaries; therefore you would have to have many more staff.

The National Insurance is to be provided under specific amounts which would be payable to stamps. For every category you have, you would have a different stamp. All these categories would have to be classified at great denominations. All that is expense and would be more difficult than if you have a single contribution and it may account for the probability that the stamps may not be ready in time. I think that if the stamps are not ready in time it will create a bad reflection on those who had the foresight to introduce it.

The point was also made by the Hon. Minister, though it was not necessarily a point which we of the Opposition intended to debate, that the Government's contribution to the National Insurance Scheme is \$600,000. It is not a point

which we would have raised but the Minister said that the Government would be making a contribution to the Civil Service of \$600,000. The Government in its relation to its Civil Servants is in no different position under this scheme than the other employers are to their employees.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I rise on a point of order. Some people cannot even speak the truth by accident.

(A VOICE: Order).

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am not out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand that to be a generalisation.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I said that the Government's contribution is by way of payment for the administrative staff of National Insurance and Social Security. I did not say that the Government was making a contribution on behalf of its workers. I said that the Government's contribution was by way of the salaries to the administrative staff on National Insurance and Social Security.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in due course the Regulations would be laid before the House, and the Opposition would have further opportunity of discussing this and other related matters. There are statutory provisions to be made for the review of the work of the National Insurance Scheme, and in due course members on this side of the House would have the opportunity to comment on the Act and on any particular point which may arise, whether worthy comments or otherwise.

All we have before us is that staff would be provided for National Insurance and Social Security and we look forward to this staff doing its work and bringing National Insurance and Social Security into being by the appointed date.

There are one or two omissions. There is the omission of including self-employed people into the scheme from its inception. However, at this stage we would not be opposing the Resolution.

Mr. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak but I hear a lot of noise over on the other side.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. SMITH: I did not want to say anything on this Resolution, but the Hon. Minister made some remarks that when the Regulations come before us, they will be finished, in other words, I take him to mean that we would not have the chance of saying a word.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of explanation. I said that when the Regulations come here, they will be law. According to the Act, Regulations would be made by the Cabinet and they are not changeable by members in here.

Mr. SMITH: Well, Sir, I would like to know arising out of the contributions which are to be contributed by the employees and the employers, if the employees are being protected.
12.40 p.m.

We know that most employers give their employees an annual bonus, and I am wondering if the employer gave an amount of \$10.00 as bonus and the contribution now by law is \$5.00, whether the worker is protected from the employer taking this \$5.00 from the \$10.00 and giving him only \$5.00 as annual bonus. That is a point you should consider because if I give my employees an annual bonus and I am now called upon to contribute 3%, I could contribute the 3% and save the remainder. I should like to know if protection along these lines is being given in the regulations. Without the Regulations which we are awaiting, we cannot do justice to this Resolution, because the Regulations may come down in such a way that the whole Bill should be torn up.

I should like to find out, too, from the Hon. Minister in charge when public assistance will be taken over from Local

N. W. BOXILL: Are you afraid? Mr. Speaker, you heard that yourself; that is the Minister talking. The only thing that would make me afraid is he; he is so ugly. The Minister has told us that it will be taken over in April, and at other times he is not sure when this will be done. I should also like to know if photographs are going to be taken now because he has made no mention of the photographs. He should tell us whether they will be ready to start that off in April, 1967, or April, 1980. It is time to let us know definitely when public assistance will be taken over, because I will not say what I know. I do not want to go any further, but he should not try to pull us around here and tell us one thing when he knows it is another.

In the absence of Regulations, we cannot do justice to this Resolution; so I hope the Minister will tell us about the photographs, and definitely when public assistance will be taken over from Local Government. The hon. senior member for St. Thomas made mention about the staff and what he has seen by way of a start for certain members. He seems to think the salaries are small, but from what I have heard, you can offer anything to the people who are being selected for these jobs, because I have heard that quite a few of the D.L.P. pimps and lackeys are waiting for these jobs. You can give these people any sort of money, but if you want a conscientious worker and one who knows his job, you will have to pay him adequately. I know that if you want a high-powered Accountant and people of that calibre, you cannot insult him by starting him off with bird feed. We will live long enough to see who will be appointed to these posts, because the Government is very hasty in bringing them about even before they are ready to start off; if you do not have the stamps, photographs and all these things, you are not ready to start. I should like the Hon. Minister to reply in connection with the photographs, when public assistance will be taken over from Local Government and the protection for these workers.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, any layman would be amazed to hear that the Legislature would give power to the Executive to make Regulations for the effective carrying out of an Act and have no power whatever over those Regulations. That is a pronouncement which the Hon. Minister made twice, and it struck me, and I thought that something extraordinary seemed to have happened in the last five years; but that that could happen outside of Spain or Cuba was amazing to me. Now I have looked at the Act, I see the usual section that you will find in every Act. If the draughtsman knows his job, or even if he does not know his job, some member of the House will see every Act affecting the Regulations. If we pass a Bill which must have Regulations in order to be effectively carried out, how can we delegate to the Executive authority to make these Regulations without having the right to change them? The Minister said this twice and I would not have got to my feet in this debate for obvious reasons if that had not been said, because there are other members on this side to deal with this matter. What do we find when we look at the Act? From all I remember through reading or having to do with the passing of Bills, there is a clause which speaks of annulment, and it has been held that annulment means all the Regulations and not just one. Here we have a side note to section 50 which, though it is not part of the law, explains what the law says. The side note reads: "Regulations to be approved by Legislature." If you pick up any law book or any Act that deals with something which insists on having Regulations to say how it has to be carried out, you will find word for word what I am going to read now.

"All regulations made under this Act shall be laid before both Houses of the Legislature as soon as may be after they are made, and if within a period of forty days beginning with the day on which any such regulations are so laid before it either House of the Legislature resolves that the regulations be annulled, they shall thereupon cease to have effect but without prejudice to anything previously done thereunder or to the making of new regulations."
12.50 p.m.

I believe that one hon. member over there is well versed in law - I refer to the hon. junior member for Christ Church. I believe that the hon. member who is sit-

ting on his left attempted to be well versed in the law. I wrote a letter of recommendation when the hon. member left Barbados to go out with the intention of becoming a member of the Middle Temple.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that that reference is outside the scope of this Resolution.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I am making my point, Mr. Speaker. I am saying that there is only one person versed in the law over there. The Legislature would know that when you put in this Section, you make provision by saying that this does not prejudice the making of new Regulations, and thereby you imply that although you cannot amend one of the Regulations and leave the rest, the House can only think of giving a chance to make new Regulations, changing the one to which objection has been taken.

The only other contribution which I would make to the debate is this: I regret that I mislaid this morning the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party in the 1940's in which we pointed out that we had a National Insurance Scheme in the embryo stage. We called on the then Conservative Government to take account of the National Insurance Scheme which we had in draft outline, the National Security Scheme which we would introduce in good time. A Conservative Government was in power. Those noisy remarks have been made and that Government will remain in power as long as people like the hon. member who made those remarks, remain in power. However, Sir, we could only call on the Government to bring down a National Security Scheme. In our time we considered this, that and the other and it was a question of finding money to bring forward this Scheme having regard to things like the construction of the Deep Water Harbour and the building of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and we had to go slow on the matter. We had to bring Professor Richardson out here and he advised us as regards the Scheme, the contributions which would have to be made and we considered that, along with other matters, the bringing down of the National Security Scheme did not have the priority like that which the Deep Water Harbour and the New Hospital had.

Hon. members should try and shake their memories as to the Hospital and the National Security Scheme as they think fit to do. They can pick up the files which we have left behind and which they can read. They know the truth, they know about the Hospital and they know about the Social Security Scheme. They can go back and look up what the Barbados Labour Party had started. I have honoured hon. members on that side by taking notice of their rude interruption.

Mr. SPEAKER: No hon. member has risen on a point of interruption.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I should not be surprised to see an hon. member rise on a point of interruption knowing that a point of order is not being made. However, Sir, we have not in any previous House passed any legislation which has prohibited this House from saying what their views on Regulations were. That would be absolutely abandoning one's functions as a Legislature. The Hon. Minister may reply making it impossible for me to say anything more, but he cannot question the law as I have read it out. If it is a question of what I have said about Social Security, let the Hon. Minister go back to his office and read the files and he will see that everything I have just said is gospel truth.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no other hon. member who proposes to speak on this matter, the Hon. Introducer of the Motion may exercise his right of final reply. *(After a pause)* There being no other hon. member who wants to speak on this Resolution, the Hon. Introducer may exercise his right of final reply.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am replying firstly to the remarks of the hon. member who spoke last. The hon. member was beating around the idea that I was

wrong in the statement which I made in connection with the power which the House had to change regulations. He toyed with the idea that I am not qualified to understand the law. I may say, Sir, that I am not suffering from "senile psychosis" and therefore my understanding of anything that is in the law or of anything which is written in English has not been impaired. I can read and understand. I still have youth before me. I repeat, I am not suffering from "senile psychosis" and therefore I can understand. If it is a question of reading a section of a Bill or an Act and understanding what it is, your humble servant can read and understand. 1.00 p.m.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph has introduced arguments in here on what I said. He quoted from the Act referring to some section - either section 15 or 51 - which by that section he said the House cannot amend, only change regulations. The House itself cannot amend or change Regulations, unless the hon. member does not understand what is meant by the word "change".

I said that the House can only accept or reject. They can reject in toto. The Regulations are made by the Cabinet and the House can either accept or reject Regulations in toto. The House has no authority to change Regulations. That is what I said. How can the hon. member get up and say that I do not understand; "we have lawyers over there and I do not understand law?" That is the height of ignorance. What ignorance and dog tripe that is? What greater profound ignorance is this?

The hon. member tried to defend the hon. senior member for St. Thomas who made - I would not like to say he made a fool of himself - but the exercise by the hon. senior member for St. Thomas today on Social Security is significant of a three-year-old mentally retarded child. He has given this Party and myself grist for our political mill more than we had for all these years.

The hon. member made the mistake of asking what occasioned the delay of Social Security. Then his point was strengthened by the folly - what can only be considered as folly - of another member. There is the saying that the sins of the fathers would go down to the third and fourth generation.

The hon. junior member for St. Joseph talked about National Insurance and Social Security being introduced by the Barbados Labour Party in Barbados in 1940. He went on to say that the building of the Deep Water Harbour is what stopped Social Security from coming into being. What has the building of the Deep Water Harbour to do with the delay of Social Security? This only came out of the mouth of a person suffering from senile psychosis.

Sir GRANTLEY ADAMS: I take strong objection to that. Anyone who is suffering from senile psychosis can only be mentally deformed, and I do not have to quote the authority, Mr. Speaker, for you from May's on that point.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I did not say that the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is suffering from senile psychosis. I said that can only be expected to come out of the mouth of a person suffering from senile psychosis. If the hon. junior member for St. Joseph takes offence at that, I would withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member withdrawing it?

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. junior member for St. Joseph said that it was a priority; therefore, it took precedent over something for the people of this country. The hon. member said that since 1940 they were talking about Social Security, but nothing could be implemented because of the building of the Deep Water Harbour here. What were they doing about Social Security then?

Mr. Speaker, you would remember that in 1962, Professor Richardson came to this Country and sent in a report on Social Security. Nothing was done about it. On the eve of the General Election in 1961, the Barbados Labour Party with another political gimmick of theirs asked Mr. Stockman to come here and make a report on social Security. Professor Richardson's Report was an excellent report. He recommended the simplest form of Social Security. When the hon. junior member for St. Joseph is talking of delay, he must bear in mind that for seven long years the Barbados Labour Party sat on Professor Richardson's Report and did absolutely nothing about it. The only thing about Social Security on the file was that the scheme by Professor Richardson was not to be continued with.

If the Barbados Labour Party was interested in the implementation of Social Security we would have had a Social Security Scheme in 1950. They should be ashamed of themselves. They took all that time and then in 1953 Mr. Stockman brought in his report and it was tabled in this Legislature.

In 1954, a Committee comprising of a member of the Barbados Workers Union and representatives of all interested bodies was appointed to sit on Mr. Stockman's Report and make recommendation to the Government. When this Committee reported to Government, the advice of the International Labour Organisation was sought. They sent us an expert, Mr. Jenkins. 1.10 p.m.

We have had actuarial advice from the International Labour Organisation, and ever since the Report of the Committee appointed by me as Minister of Social Services at the time when the Stockman Report came in, we have come up with the scheme we have now. We were awaiting the Actuarial Report which came in July, and ever since then we have been working, because we could not get ahead with the Regulations without the Actuarial Report. Could you want more speedy work on the implementation of Social Security than has been made manifest here today? I did not take seven years to implement Social Security. My Government did not wait from the 1940's to the day of Resurrection to implement Social Security. The expert came down, and in two years of his being here, we have been able to bring this down. With the Barbados Labour Party running this country, Barbados would never have had a Social Security Scheme. I thought that the person competent to deal with National Insurance and Social Security would have been given an opportunity to speak on it, and I refer to the hon. senior member for St. James who would have made a better display of it than the hon. members who spoke on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no question of any hon. member not having been given an opportunity.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I should have said "afforded himself of the opportunity", Mr. Speaker, but I feel that some people like to make fools of themselves, and this perhaps is why the hon. senior member for St. James might not have been allowed to speak on the thing for which he is an authority.

Mr. SPEAKER: Again he is fully entitled to speak. There is no question of him not being allowed to speak.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I do not mean by you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: No one else could have stopped him in here.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: But some people like to display ignorance, and if they get the backlash, it is a matter for them. I would like to serve notice now that I do not trouble trouble until trouble troubles me.

Now I forgive the hon. senior member for St. Joseph. Forgive them, oh my Father, they know not what they do!

Mr. SPEAKER: That sounds as if the hon. junior member for St. Andrew is speaking.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: The hon. member has asked a question about public assistance and when it will be taken over from Local Government. In the first place I feel that the hon. member was out of order to have mentioned public assistance in this debate because public assistance is a non-contributory scheme. This is a contributory scheme, and there is no provision in Social Security for public assistance. Since they are two separate schemes, the hon. member should have waited until we are dealing with something to do with public assistance and ask a substantive question, or come in and ask a normal question in the House. But the hon. member went further and talked about bonuses and whether this is going to stop employers from giving a bonus to their employees. I would be very disappointed if a person who had to pay contributions towards Social Security refused to give people a bonus at the end of the year.

The hon. member also inquired about photographs. As far as I know, photographs will be taken. We feel that identification cards must be had in this country and they will be had. Hon. members will have noted that on every occasion on which I dealt with Social Security in this House and on the air I implored employers not to allow contributions to Social Security to stop them from carrying on any sort of Social Security scheme for the workers which they now enjoy. The hon. senior member for St. James would bear me out that there are employers in this country who hold group insurance for their staff. This is the sort of thing we have told them which they now enjoy. We want to see additional benefits accrue to the people of this country, and we have asked them not to discontinue the payment of insurance for their staff; and if employers want to have maximum co-operation from their staff, it would be in their interest to continue all the other fringe benefits which the workers get from them. If they want maximum production, because dissatisfied staff cannot give you maximum production, and if they deny their staff the privileges which they are given today because of the implementation of social security, they are telling them to adopt a go-slow policy in their work. I cannot therefore see any employer trying to deny workers of the privileges and fringe benefits which they now enjoy, because it would not be in the interest of the employer.

Now the hon. senior member for St. Thomas talked about self-employed persons. Now I understand that he is supposed to be the shadow Minister for National Insurance and Social Security, and he has spoken and given the impression that he was an authority on it, but he has not spared himself the time to go back and look up the debates in this House over the past year on National Insurance. Either he did not do that or if he did, he does not have any sort of memory, because if he had done it, he would have noticed that it was stated from this side that self-employed persons would be brought into the scheme within a year after the commencement of the scheme. The hon. member came here today asking when they will be brought into the scheme. If he had read the debates of this House, he would have noted that that was said about six months ago when the Bill was being debated. It was said that self-employed persons could not be brought in at the beginning of the scheme because of their varied types of income, and the work which had to be carried out in order to determine the national wage. You may have a fish vendor making \$10 a week and another making \$40 a week, and yet another making \$7 a week; so you have got to investigate and find out what generally fish vendors work for in this country before you can determine the level of contribution which has to be made by the fish vendor, because we must have a national income for the fish vendors. Also as self-employed persons we have fishermen who use their own boats, and other types of self-employed persons, and you could not run overnight and decide, according to the hon. senior member for St. Thomas that self-employed persons must make this or that contribution.

1.20 p.m.

The hon. senior member for St. Thomas has said that in England, according to the type of employment, you have, you pay a flat contribution and that we do not need six or seven different types of contribution in this country but we need one type of employers' contribution; and that the person whose income is \$10.00 per week paid the same thing

as the person whose income is \$50.00 a week. The hon. member is comparing a man in Barbados with a man in the United Kingdom who works on a much higher level than a man in Barbados. The situation in the United Kingdom is completely different from the situation in Barbados, and if we had the mentality of the hon. senior member for St. Thomas, we would have accepted the United Kingdom scheme. We did not find that this was commensurate with the wishes of the people of this country or in their interest. Are you telling me that a man who is working for \$10.00 a week should make the same contribution as a man who is working for \$50.00 a week to a National Security Scheme? If a man is working for \$50.00 a week and his contribution to National Security is \$1.50 a week, are you telling me that a man who works for \$10.00 a week should make the same contribution? If you do not have any commonsense you will make that sort of statement.

Finally, the hon. member who is Shadow Minister of Social Security, has played himself into a trap. He forgot that on several occasions in this Legislature we talked about a National Insurance Scheme. Hon. members of my Party who were then in the Opposition, asked the Barbados Labour Party to enact a system of Social Security in this country. They laughed at the idea and now we are told that the Barbados Labour Party was interested in National Security since the 1940's; but on every occasion that we asked them to institute a National Security Scheme, they laughed at us. I would say that if it had not been for the Democratic

Labour Party, we would not have Social Security in Barbados in April, 1967.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye", (MEMBERS: Aye.) but hon. members who are of a contrary opinion will please say "No". Methinks the "Ayes" have it. I now declare this Resolution duly to have been passed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS CONCLUDED

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, the consideration of that Resolution concludes Government Business for the Day.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. J. C. TUDOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 24th January, 1967 at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next, 24th January, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

1.30 p.m.

