

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 2nd May, 1950.

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

Present:

His Honour Mr. K. N. R. HUSBANDS, (*Speaker*),
His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS, (*Deputy Speaker*),
Mr. L. E. SMITH, (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr.
H. G. CUMMINS, Messrs. D. A. FOSTER, F. E. MILLER,
R. G. MAPP, M. E. COX, F. L. WALCOTT, H. A.
DOWDING, F. C. GODDARD, F. E. C. BETHELL, and
E. K. WALCOTT, K.C.

Prayers are read.

MINUTES.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for confirmation.

Messrs. BRANCKER, WILKINSON, and ADAMS enter the House and take their seats.

MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I have the honour to present Messages from His Excellency the Governor as follows:—

MESSAGE NO. 16/1950.

His Excellency The Governor.

To

The Honourable the House of Assembly.

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to invite the views of the Honourable the House of Assembly on the recommendations contained in the Reports of the British Caribbean Standing Closer Association Committee and of the Commission on the Unification of the Public Services in the British Caribbean Area. Copies of these Reports have

already been laid on the table of the Honourable House.

L. SAVAGE,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown,
26th April, 1950.

MESSAGE NO. 18/1950.

His Excellency The Governor.

To

The Honourable the House of Assembly.

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that in accordance with the provisions of the Executive Committee Act, 1891, he has appointed the following members of the House of Assembly to be members of the Executive Committee:—

Mr. G. H. Adams
Dr. H. G. Cummins
Mr. M. E. Cox
Mr. F. L. Walcott

L. SAVAGE,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown,
28th April, 1950.

MESSAGE NO. 19/1950.

His Excellency The Governor.

To

The Honourable the House of Assembly.

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that he has considered in Executive Committee the recommendations of the Hallinan Report on the General Hospital and forwards for the information of the Honourable the House of Assembly a Schedule setting out those recommendations that have been accepted by the Government and those recommendations upon which a decision has been deferred.

Where the approval of the Legislature is required it will be sought in the appropriate manner.

L. SAVAGE,
Governor.

Government House,
Bridgetown,
2nd May, 1950.

SCHEDULE

1. Recommendations accepted in full or in a Modified Form:

Paragraph 11 (1). Provision will be made for a more suitable Operating Theatre when planning the extension or rebuilding of the Hospital.

(F) *Paragraph 11* (2). Supplementary Estimates will be submitted to provide for the purchase and erection of a lift.

Paragraph 12. Provision will be made for more suitable Out-Patient and Casualty Department buildings when planning the extension or rebuilding of the Hospital.

Paragraph 14 (1). Provision will be made for more suitable Laundry accommodation when planning the extension or rebuilding of the new Hospital.

(F) *Paragraph 14* (2). Supplementary Estimates will be submitted to provide for such improvements in disinfecting arrangements as may be recommended by the Chief Medical Officer and Colonial Engineer and approved by the Governor-in-Executive Committee.

(F) *Paragraph 21* (5). It has been agreed that the nursing cadre should be increased by 66. Supplementary Estimates will be submitted.

Paragraph 21 (6). The increase in the cadre will be of trained nursing staff provided suitable candidates are available.

Paragraph 21 (8). Provision will be made to improve the living conditions of the trained staff in the hostel when planning the extension or rebuilding of the Hospital.

(F) *Paragraph 21* (9). Supplementary Estimates will be submitted to provide for two additional Nursing Sisters which will be filled by suitable local candidates.

Paragraph 22 A. His Excellency has accepted the principle of joint consultation at departmental level.

Paragraph 22 B. The recommendation that there should be no nominee of the Hospital employees on the Hospital Advisory Committee has been accepted. The duties of the Advisory Committee are laid down by statute and do not include questions of terms and conditions of service of Hospital Staff.

Paragraph 22 C. (i). See paragraph 21 (5). It is hoped that the increase in the nursing cadre and improved organisation will make possible the reduction in working hours to 44.

Paragraph 22 C (ii). Leave regulations will be brought into line with those of the general Civil Service.

Paragraph 22 D. A revision of the Hospital rules is being undertaken.

Paragraph 22 E. See paragraph 21 (8).

Paragraph 22 F. A Nurses Committee already exists and its functions are being re-examined.

(F) *Paragraph 22 G*. Nurses will not be required to provide for the laundering of their uniforms. Pending the improvements to the Hospital Laundry the work will be given out on contract. Supplementary Estimates will be submitted.

(F) *Paragraph 23*. The memorandum submitted by the Hospital Porters and Domestic Servants is being examined in detail.

Paragraph 31. The recommendation that the Ophthalmic Hospital be utilized to relieve congestion in the General Hospital has been accepted.

Paragraph 32. Hospital diets will continue to be kept under review.

Paragraph 34. The recommendation that insulin be provided to Almshouses is being implemented. Provision was made in the 1950-51 Estimates.

Paragraph 41. (2). The scale of fees for the Second Schedule as recommended has been accepted and the necessary Order will be issued.

Paragraph 42 (1). A new scale of fees for the Third and Fourth Schedules has been prepared and the necessary Order will be issued.

Paragraph 50. The recommendation for the medical staff has been accepted:—

- 1 Medical Superintendent
- 1 Specialist Surgeon
- 1 Specialist Physician
- 1 Specialist Radiologist
- 7 Medical Officers

(F) *Paragraph 51*. The salary scales and conditions have been accepted as recommended, but in view of the provision of passages, the appointments will have to be for the present non-pensionable and contractual. Supplementary Estimates will be submitted.

Paragraph 53. (1). The delegation of disciplinary powers requires further consideration.

(F) *Paragraph 53* (2). Provision will be made for a "contingencies" vote. All items marked (F) require the provision of funds and Supplementary Estimates will be submitted.

II. Recommendations still under consideration.

Paragraph 30. The enlargement of the Maternity Hospital.

Paragraphs 54 to 59. Proposals are being considered separately regarding the number of beds.

A further examination is being made into the question of the extension of the existing Hospital or building a new Hospital on another site.

The recommendation that the Government take over the maintenance of Parochial Dispensaries and that Parochial Medical Officers should be in Government Service will be considered in the light of the Maude Report.

PAPERS LAID.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,— I have the honour to lay on the table of the House the following Papers:—

Statement showing the gross Customs and Excise Receipts for eleven months ended 28th February, 1950.
Annual Report on Barbados for 1948.

NOTICES.

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Dr. CUMMINS: Resolution to sanction the Order made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under section 4 of the Shops Act, 1945.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: Resolution to approve the Regulations entitled "The Parking and Restricted Places (Amendment) Regulations, 1950," made by the Director of Highways and Transport on the 25th February, 1950, under the provisions of section 7 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937 (1937—16) as amended by the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945 (1945—12) and approved and sanctioned by His Excellency the Governor on the 18th March, 1950.

Mr. ADAMS: Bill to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1901.

Mr. BRANCKER gives notice of an Address as follows:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency The Governor.*

1. The House of Assembly is of the opinion that all Government employees, including policemen and casual labourers of the Department of Highways and Transport and Public Works Departments, should receive an annual Christmas bonus as in the case of many private employees.

2. The House of Assembly urges that steps be taken to provide for the payment of such a bonus, as from this year, to all such employees whose salaries do not exceed three hundred pounds per annum.

Messrs. GARNER, ALLDER and MOTTLEY enter the House and take their seats.

RESOLUTION TO MAKE IT LAWFUL FOR A VESTRY TO LEASE LAND.

Mr. SPEAKER: The first Order of the day stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph,—To move the passing of a Resolution to make it lawful for a Vestry to lease land within their parish for any period not exceeding 21 years and that any such lease shall be binding on the successive Vestries of the said parish.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—Honourable members will see from the addendum the object of this Resolution. The addendum states *inter alia* that at present it is the practice to pass a special Act on every occasion when a Vestry wants to lease land for a period exceeding one year. The reason for that procedure is that a Vestry is elected for only one year and it has been held that it cannot lease land for more than a year. I must confess that I have not looked up the law relating to the matter but I take it that the senior member for St. James must have given an opinion along those lines when he was Attorney General and that any opinion given to the Government must be the result of careful searching by the Attorney General. The present Attorney General accepts that view and this Resolution is to give a Vestry power to enter into a lease for land for a period not exceeding 21 years and to make that lease binding on successive Vestries of the same parish, especially in view of the necessity to provide playing fields, in the island. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. GODDARD: Mr. Speaker,—Now that playing fields are being acquired the Vestries

are finding it difficult to obtain suitable sites in the various parishes and there are certain restrictions placed on Vestries as to the type of land they may acquire. I understand no arable land may be acquired by Vestries for this purpose. The Vestries do not wish to interfere with agricultural land that may be used for food crops and sugar but they have had to take steps to obtain such lands for the purpose of establishing playing fields. In many instances persons are willing to lease land for playing fields at a nominal rent but the Vestries can enter into contracts for only one year because they do not have the power to do otherwise. The Government could not let the Vestries know what sums are available to them for the purpose of acquiring playing fields until very recently and no headway was made for acquiring playing fields, other than in the parish of St. Michael. In Christ Church, the Committee appointed by the Vestry to recommend sites for playing fields reported to the Vestry that they had selected sites tentatively in districts of the parish that were fairly thickly populated and which sites were easily accessible to the people but no headway has been made. Everyone welcomes this Resolution as a stepping stone to the acquiring of land as playing fields and if that is the purpose of the Resolution I heartily support it.

Mr. GARNER: I am very glad that this Resolution has come to the House because the Vestry of St. Philip has had a very embarrassing time, as far as the provision of playing fields is concerned, and I think that our case, along with others, has something to do with the sending down of this Resolution to the House. For instance, the Vestry of St. Philip is willing to take over the King George V. Park in the Parish of St. Philip but due to the wording of the Vestries Act, we cannot enter into a long term lease for the taking over of the Park and restore it to the people. There is a crying need in the parish of St. Philip for the Park for recreational purposes but until it is made possible for the Vestry to be able to enter into a long term lease, we cannot take it over. I, therefore, welcome this Resolution because as a parishioner of St. Philip I am eager to see the Park get going again and I hope that everything will be done expeditiously, so that we will be able to go ahead with the restoration of the Park. It is true that the Vestry went to a certain limit but we met with frustration because the Government asked us to enter into a long term lease but when we started negotiations with the Trustees we found out that we, as a Vestry, could not enter into a lease for a longer period than year. I repeat that I am very glad that this Resolution has come before the House, so that we shall be able to go ahead and restore the King George V. Memorial Park to the people.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I want to find out one or two things about this matter. I wonder why 21 years? If a Vestry is going to have legal authority to enter into a long term lease of land for social purposes, it will relieve the situation a great deal, especially in the parish of St. Michael because in this parish there are several things which can be done. There are several instances in which owners of suitable sites do not want to sell but they would be willing to rent those sites at reasonable prices and in no time twenty-one years will have passed. I am also wondering whether this privilege would be extended to subsidiary Boards of the Vestries because a lot of the work in connection with social reform is ac-

tually delegated to the subsidiary Boards such as the Sanitary Boards. I have in mind an instance in which the senior member for St. Joseph accompanied representatives of the Vestry of St. Michael when they were endeavouring to secure sites for the erection of District Markets. I am wondering whether this could be applied to sites for the erection of District Markets because the necessity for District Markets in the parish of St. Michael is apparent. I would suggest that the period be 99 years. However, I commend the Government for its action in this direction. I think that it is a wise step because the local government must go on as part of the set-up in the island. By whatever name you call it, the running of the island must be assisted by local government and a great share of the responsibility is to rest on them. Everything cannot be done by the Central government and the easier you make it for local government, the better it will be. I think the Resolution should be readily appreciated by every member of this House.

Mr. WARD: I agree to this proposal because I feel it is not necessary for the Government or the Vestries to go to the expense of paying exorbitant prices for lands for playing fields when they could easily acquire them on the cheaper basis of paying rent. Another thing to be borne in mind is this: In acquiring these playing fields they should be located as near the villages in which the people live as possible, so that the workers, when they finish work, can walk to them for their recreation. I feel that 21 years is a reasonable period because one can never tell how the population will shift in a number of years. The lease can be renewed after 21 years. I wholeheartedly support the idea of leasing instead of buying land for playing fields.

Mr. GILL enters the House and takes his seat.

Mr. ALLDER: Mr. Speaker,— I am thinking mostly of the country parishes in this matter. I feel that because this responsibility rests with vestrymen, the great majority of whom are the owners of land in the country parishes, you are going to find it very difficult to get suitable lands in central areas for the purpose of establishing playing fields. I am also very doubtful that the landowners are more eager to lease land than to sell it to the Government. We must realize, Sir, that if we are going to establish playing fields they should be of a permanent nature like the Park in the metropolitan parish and a 21-year lease might make it more difficult, since you do not know how much it is going to cost to put such lands in a state in which the people can enjoy them as playing fields. You might find that as soon as you have spent a tidy sum of money the 21-year period has expired and then you have to look for some other site if the owner or owners of the particular site do not want to renew your lease. There is another very obvious difficulty and that is— I am speaking of agricultural areas—where the plantations do not want to sell any of their lands whatsoever unless they are located where they would not be of much use for the purpose for which you want them and with the price of sugar which is being obtained nowadays, Mr. Speaker I hardly think that a plantation owner would be willing to lease land that is suitable for the growing of his crops to be turned into a playing field unless at an exorbitant rental. I feel, Sir, that if you are going to have playing fields you should go deeper into the matter and have them as permanent projects so that no expenditure should be lost in case the period of the lease has expired. I can see the difficulties, Sir. If you leave the matter

in the hands of the vestrymen of the rural parishes who are also landowners and who have all along refused to sell their lands, they might lease lands which might not be of much use for this purpose. They might have some "rab" lands somewhere in the parishes and they might decide to let them be turned into playing fields because they would be getting something out of them in that way. But such lands would not be suitable, since the playing fields would be too far from the residences of the people and if you put your recreational centres too far away from the villages the people are going to find it difficult to travel to them unless some big sporting occasion is on. You should have your playing fields so central that the people could make full use of them. The worker going home from work at 5.30 or 6 p.m. should be able to stop in at the playing field in his parish and enjoy at least half hour's recreation. I think the Government should review the situation and before they enter into any agreements for this purpose they should see to it that they suffer no disabilities as far as these playing fields are concerned.

Mr. ADAMS: I am replying now because when I am finished it would not be necessary perhaps for any other member to speak on this proposal. The senior member for St. John is under a misapprehension. All playing fields are going to be owned by the Government. It would not be a question of any plantation owner renting "rab" land for a playing field. The Labour Welfare Fund is, by law, placed in the hands of the Executive Committee and the Executive Committee is, by law, authorized to see after the playing fields. With the knowledge of the Legislature the Executive Committee has deemed it necessary to put the maintenance of playing fields in the hands of the Vestries. The object of this Resolution is really to allow the Vestries to lease the land from the Executive Committee who will be the owner of the playing fields. Twenty-one years is arbitrary. I feel that it is twenty years and nine months too long because we hope that in the next three months the recommendations of Sir John Maude will be implemented and placed on the Statute Book. I repeat that I hope to live to see the day when the Government owns all land in this Country (Cries of "No, No" and "Are you serious?") Perhaps I am too hopeful but I at least hope that land which the Government at present owns will never be alienated in our lifetime or in the lifetime of our grandchildren. I think that in our Housing Scheme we should own the land and soon the Government intends to introduce amendments to the Land and Property Act whereby the owner of a house does not necessarily become the owner of the soil. I would like to see a Government Housing Scheme whereby the ownership of the land remains in the Government on a 999-year lease because if a 999-year lease is given you ensure that the ownership of the land by the Government would make the occupier behave himself. I make that statement as a general policy. As regards this particular Resolution, all the playing fields will be owned by the Government; the Vestries will manage them by leasing them from the Government. The point has been drawn to my attention as to whether it is not necessary to amend the Vestries Act. The answer is that there is already an amendment to the Vestries Act which provides that the Vestries shall have power to exercise such other powers and undertake such other duties and functions as the Legislature may from time to time approve by special Resolution. This is a special Resolution to approve of a Vestry having power to

enter into a long term lease for land and that is why a Bill to amend the Act has not been brought. I repeat that as soon as an Act implementing the recommendations of Sir John Maude is passed, the Councils which are going to be the successors to the Vestries will have the power to lease land. This Resolution is primarily for playing fields and, of course, it will enable the Vestries to lease land for any purpose.

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

RESOLUTION TO SANCTION AND CONFIRM THE MERCHANDISE MARKS RULES.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph.— To move the passing of a Resolution to sanction and confirm the Rules entitled "The Merchandise Marks Rules, 1950," made by the Registrar on the 1st April, 1950, under the provisions of the Merchandise Marks Act, 1949.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,— Honourable members will remember the Merchandise Marks Act which we passed a few months ago. If honourable members have not read these Rules I do not blame them because even lawyers do not read them unless they are briefed in cases to which the Rules relate. As far as I am aware, the Act was passed on the 30th August, 1949; these Rules were made under that Act in 1949 but the Registrar signed them on the 1st April, 1950. After the Rules were made they were referred to the Acting King's Solicitor and it may be that that is the reason why they were not signed earlier. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

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

APPOINTMENT OF A SELECT COMMITTEE.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,— Before we proceed to Private Members' Business I ask leave to move the appointment of a Select Committee to draft a Reply to His Excellency's Message No. 16 of 1950 relating to the Reports of the British Caribbean Standing Closer Association Committee and of the Commission on the Unification of the Public Services in the British Caribbean Area.

There being no objection, the honourable member is granted leave to proceed.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that a Select Committee be appointed to draft a Reply to His Excellency's Message No. 16 of 1950.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The question that a Select Committee be appointed to draft a Reply to the Governor's Message No. 16 of 1950 is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER: Subject to the approval of the House I appoint the following members a Select Committee for the purpose above mentioned:—

The honourable senior member for St. Joseph (Mr. Adams), the honourable senior member for St. Peter (Mr. F. L. Walcott), the honourable junior member for the City (Mr. Lewis), the honourable junior member for St. Thomas (Mr. Mapp), the honourable junior member for St. Philip (Mr. Crawford), the honourable junior member for St. Lucy (Mr. Brancker), the honourable senior member for St. James (Mr. E. K. Walcott), the honourable junior member for Christ Church (Mr. Reece), and

the honourable junior member for St. James (Mr. Wilkinson).

TERMINATION OF DR. ASHBY'S APPOINTMENT AT THE GENERAL HOSPITAL.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker,— I beg to move the adjournment of the House for five minutes to discuss a matter of paramount importance; it is with respect to the dismissal of Dr. Ashby from his post as an Assistant Visiting Surgeon at the General Hospital. About two years ago I stood on the floor of this House and spoke in defence of the rights of a West Indian Civil Servant in the person of Col. Duke and criticised the manner in which the then Governor dismissed him—they use the phrase "called upon him to resign" in official circles but the Barbados public call it "dismissal"—and little did I think that the occasion would arise so soon after for me to stand on the floor of this House again to draw to the attention of honourable members and the general public that the method of dealing with West Indians, particularly in the service of this colony, is far from satisfactory. An honourable member has remarked that it calls for ministerial status. Well, if ministerial status must come, when it does come I hope the treatment to Civil Servants will be much better. I sat on Tuesday last and heard His Excellency the Governor say, in the course of his speech, "Soon after my appointment to this high office, I listened with deep interest to a radio broadcast by my distinguished predecessor in which he said 'such positive powers as the Governor has in Barbados are based on the Royal prerogative and on Colonial Regulations and cover only prerogative matters and appointments and discipline. Woe betide a pro Consul who, accustomed to Crown Colony methods elsewhere, attempts to practise the direct way of other Colonial Governments. . .'" The present Government,—I should say—at least I am hoping it is not—is not responsible for this matter. The Hospital, at present, is a Government Department. As is well known its administration has been taken out of the hands of a Board and the institution is now a Government Department. Dr. Ashby was appointed an Assistant Visiting Surgeon of the Hospital and I shall with Your Honour's permission, read certain correspondence relating to this matter. If honourable members so desire, these letters can become documents of the House. As a matter of fact I want the affair to be known and publicized. Dr. Ashby, I repeat, was appointed an Assistant Visiting Surgeon at the Hospital in 1948. I would like this House to understand that I would be the last person to find fault with the dismissal of a doctor or anybody else if he had been given an opportunity to defend himself. In this Country we are still considered to be British subjects and we all claim the right to be given a fair and honest trial. It is true that we have been complaining for several months about the treatment to patients at the Hospital and I suppose one would be tempted to ask off-hand "How can you in one breath complain about the treatment to patients at the Hospital and then in the same breath question, on the floor of the House, the dismissal of one of the doctors at the Hospital?" I am not questioning the dismissal of Dr. Ashby. I am questioning the manner in which he has been dismissed. Any man in the Public Service of this Country would certainly claim the right at least to be given the opportunity to defend himself and that is what the Governor cannot claim has been given to Dr. Ashby in his capacity as an Assistant Visiting Surgeon at the Hos-

pital. I hold here a copy of the communication to Dr. Ashby, dated 16th January, 1950, and I shall read it for the benefit of honourable members. It reads as follows:—

“Colonial Secretary’s Office,
“Barbados,
“16.1.50.

“Sir,

“I am directed by the Governor to give you notice that your services as an Assistant Visiting Surgeon at the General Hospital will not be required after the 31st of March, 1950, and your appointment is, therefore, terminated with effect from the 1st of April, 1950.

“I am,

“Sir,

“Your obedient servant

“(Signed) P. F. CAMPBELL,
“Acting Colonial Secretary”

“DR. A. S. ASHBY.”

It would appear to some honourable members of this House that no attempt should be made to cause an exposure of injustices of this sort but I can only say that as far as I am concerned I did not happen to secure my seat in this House through the instrumentality of any of the honourable members who seem to dislike having matters of this sort raised in the House. If it falls to my lot to raise matters of this sort I am going to do it and I shall do so with pride. From the letter which I have just read, honourable members will see that in January this year this doctor who had been working at the Hospital in the service of the Government was given three months’ notice to quit and as I proceed you will find that he has been given no explanation at all. Let me say here and now that if any doctor is unkind, if he is not carrying out his duties in a capable manner, if it is found that he is negligent or any thing of the sort, hold an investigation and “fire” him as you would “fire” anybody else; but be he doctor or be he porter he should be given a chance to put his side of the case. Unless we in Barbados let it be known that we will not tolerate treatment of this sort to government employees it will continue. It is true that the Governor need not take any advice from members of the Executive Committee in matters of this sort. I shall continue to read the correspondence to show honourable members that this dismissal is done in a manner in which we feel that the Head of the Administration should not deal with a government employee. Dr. Ashby’s reply to the letter he received is dated 20th January, 1950, and reads as follows:—

“Passage Road,
“St. Michael.
“20.1.50

“Sir,

“I am in receipt of your communication of the 16th inst. giving me notice that my services as an Assistant Visiting Surgeon of the General Hospital will not be required after the 31st March, 1950.

“I note that I have been offered no explanation for my somewhat peremptory dismissal.

“I served the Hospital as a House Surgeon from 1938 to 1940 and again from 1943 to 1946 at some sacrifice to my private practice during the war years, when Doctors were not easily available.

“As far as I am aware, the only cause for dissatisfaction arose out of a recent incident involving one of my private patients at the Tercentenary Ward of the General Hospital, who

“was delivered of a baby without medical supervision. The child died some few hours after its birth.

“In an interview on 20.12.49 with the Chief Medical Officer I explained fully to him that

“(a) I had not been informed that the patient was in labour;

“(b) I only omitted to see the patient on the assurance of the Night Superintendent, who is also a midwife, that both mother and child were in good condition.

“Whilst I cannot believe that a single incident can nullify years of faithful service, I am quite unaware of anything else that can have been held against me.

“I have worked as a House Surgeon under Dr. A. G. Bancroft in his capacity as Visiting Surgeon, and as Assistant Visiting Surgeon to Dr. H. E. Skeete. Visiting Surgeon. In addition, the majority of my service as a House Surgeon was during the tenure of office of Dr. J. A. Kernahan, Medical Superintendent. These gentlemen are in the colony and have no adverse criticisms to offer, either as regard my conscientiousness or my efficiency.

“A dismissal of this nature is not merely removal from post; it carries with it the severest implications involving professional conduct and integrity.

“I respectfully ask that this matter be referred back to His Excellency the Governor for his kind consideration.

“I have the honour to be,

“Sir,

“Your obedient servant,

“(Signed) A. S. ASHBY,

“Assistant Visiting Surgeon.”

“HON. P. F. CAMPBELL, O.B.E.”

Now, Sir, from that letter which I have just read, honourable members, I am sure, would think that the next step would be to re-open the matter and give the doctor an opportunity to put his side of the case, if there is a case, and I repeat, Sir, that if the doctor has been negligent, if the doctor has done something which is not in the interest of the running of the Hospital, then kick him out—I make no apology for that statement—but do not merely tell him that you do not want his services after the 31st of March, 1950. You have not given him an opportunity to put his side on the case. Dr. Ashby should have been in a position to hear the charges that were made against him. It is true that it will be argued that the Governor has not got to do that. We cannot make him do that but if such treatment is meted to Dr. Ashby it may be done to anybody else whether he be an employee of the Government or of a private employer. Dr. Ashby put his cards on the table. He stated that he acted at the Hospital, much to the detriment of his private practice and that he has given service to the Government. He says “what is wrong I do not know,” and he asks most respectfully to give him the opportunity of saying something. Here is a Barbadian who has studied his profession in the United Kingdom, who is as qualified as any other doctor; he comes back to his home, practises his profession and puts his knowledge at the disposal of his fellow countrymen. He is appointed on the medical staff of the Hospital and if he has done something wrong, terminate his services. I repeat I am not complaining about the dismissal of Dr. Ashby. I am complaining about the manner

in which he has been dismissed. Run all about this Country if you like and say that I do not like Englishmen, but I say that no Englishman would have been treated in this manner. He would have been given an opportunity to put his side of the case and would have been heard. I am nothing to do with what Walcott did to the Irishman. I heard someone say *sotto voce*, Mr. Speaker, "Ask Walcott (meaning the senior member for St. James) what he did to the Irishman." I say that Dr. Ashby should be given the same chance to put his side of the case as has been given to anybody else. One would expect that every opportunity would have been given to the doctor to make his position clear but listen to the reply to Dr. Ashby's letter:—

"Colonial Secretary's Office,"

"Barbados,

"1. 2. 50.

"Sir,

"I am directed to inform you that your letter of the 20th of January, 1950, has been placed before the Governor, and that the question of the termination of your appointment as Assistant Visiting Surgeon at the General Hospital has been given further and most anxious consideration.

"His Excellency has reviewed carefully and in detail all the relevant circumstances affecting this matter and has given special weight and emphasis to the facts and arguments, set forth in your letter of the 20th of January, 1950. Nevertheless, His Excellency is of the opinion that there are not sufficient grounds for withdrawing the notice communicated to you in my letter of the 16th of January, and accordingly your appointment will terminate on the 1st of April, 1950, in accordance with the terms of that notice.

"I am,

"Sir,

"Your obedient servant

"(Signed) P. F. CAMPBELL,

"Acting Colonial Secretary."

"DR. A. S. ASHBY."

The doctor has said "you have terminated my services. I do not know what for—give me an opportunity to say something. Re-open the matter and tell me what I have done." Can any honourable member of this House say that that is a fair reply? I challenge any honourable member to say that he would like treatment of that sort to be meted to anybody connected to him or to himself. The majority of us are in the position of not having to work for the Government but if any of us were working for the Government we would not like to receive treatment of that sort. I repeat that if a doctor at the Hospital, be he Englishman, Irishman or Canadian, is negligent in the performances of his duties, get rid of him because it is the people that must matter. Do not forget this: Such treatment to a Visiting Surgeon must in truth and in fact have its reaction on the other Visiting Surgeons as far as giving their best to the people of this Country is concerned. How do you think any other doctor at the Hospital will feel after this treatment to Dr. Ashby? Is it unreasonable to expect that he will say "I have given of my best but I know that to-morrow if a report is made against me I am not going to be given an opportunity to say whether it is right or wrong and I am going to be told that I will have to leave." Sir, you are bound to agree with me that in these circumstances

there must be uneasiness on the part of the other Visiting Surgeons at the Hospital. They must feel that the treatment which has been meted to Dr. Ashby may be meted to them to-morrow morning; therefore, Sir, there are many reasons why this matter should be aired on the floor of this House. I cannot say too often that it is the people that must come first; the patient must matter first but give every man an opportunity to say whether he is guilty of a charge or not. Give every man an opportunity to put his side of a case. Give every man an opportunity to hear the evidence against him and give him an opportunity to defend himself. You cannot say that Dr. Ashby has been given an opportunity to defend himself. I do not question whether Dr. Ashby is guilty or whether he is not guilty but what I do say is that he should be given an opportunity to show whether he is guilty or not guilty; he has not been given that opportunity. Now, this is the letter which the doctor sent in reply:—

"Passage Road,

"St. Michael,

9. 2. 50.

"Sir,

"I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 1st February, 1950.

"I am certain that His Excellency is not in possession of all the facts of the case, and as my professional reputation may be involved I have to ask that he order an enquiry to be instituted in the matter of a case connected with a Mrs. Pilgrim, a patient in Hospital, whose infant, born there, died in September last, so that the matter may be gone into in full and so that I may have the opportunity of showing that no blame can be attached to me.

"I have reason to believe that the Chief Medical Officer has been misinformed and I have had no opportunity of confronting the person who has given this wrong information.

"I should be glad of an early reply.

"I am,

"Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

(Signed) A. S. ASHBY,

"Assistant Visiting Surgeon."

"Hon. P. F. CAMPBELL."

It is obvious that the Head of this Department is the Chief Medical Officer and Dr. Ashby who works directly under that official stated that he has had no opportunity of confronting the person who has given him wrong information. Dr. Ashby does not accuse any particular person; all he is saying is "Give me an opportunity, if you have certain information, to prove that I am innocent, inasmuch as my professional reputation may be involved." He is not asking to be given back his post at the Hospital but inasmuch as his professional status may be at stake, he is asking that an enquiry be instituted. (A Voice: I am going to brief you on behalf of Sanitary Inspector Worrell), Mr. Speaker, whenever you get any member of this House with the courage to raise a matter of this sort which some member of the Executive Committee tries to close down, you will always get that rowdiness, that sort of gutter behaviour down there (meaning the other side of the House); and you get it led by the honourable senior member for St. Joseph, the Leader of this House, who ought to know better. But nothing will ever daunt me and he knows that too. I take everything in good faith. I take my licks and I give licks when I have to give them.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,—I have just been informed that the honourable member made some reference to me and connected me with gutter behaviour. I have done nothing that any member of a Legislature does not do from time to time as long as he is not held up by the Speaker. I object most strenuously to that remark of the honourable member. If I have said anything that reflects on him, that is a different matter but I object to his referring to my remarks as gutter behaviour and I ask the honourable member to withdraw that remark. The Prime Minister of England makes remarks in the House of Commons while a member is speaking but that member does not indulge in unparliamentary expressions because he does not like the remarks of the Prime Minister.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I have not done anything more than the honourable member has done and is accustomed to doing. I referred to his type of behaviour which would appear to me to be gutter behaviour. It depends on how he interprets the expression "gutter behaviour." I do not know what he intends "gutter behaviour" to mean.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the honourable senior member for the City was referring to the remarks of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph when he used the expression "gutter behaviour." The senior member for St. Joseph has said that he has done nothing that any other parliamentarian would not do or any other parliamentarian ordinarily does, that is, making asides while another honourable member is speaking, and I take it that that is the sort of behaviour which the honourable member referred to as gutter behaviour.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I heard a lot of remarks on the other side of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: And you referred to those remarks as gutter behaviour?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I referred to such behaviour as gutter behaviour but what he interprets "gutter behaviour" to mean I do not know.

Mr. SPEAKER: The expression "gutter behaviour" is too strong and is, in my opinion, an unparliamentary expression.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not propose to argue with Your Honour, though I do not consider it to be an unparliamentary expression. Gutters run high as well as they run low and if I wanted to use an unparliamentary expression I would have used a stronger term than "gutter behaviour." I cannot conceive, quite honestly, anybody taking exception to the use of the expression "gutter behaviour" as meaning going down anywhere.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable senior member for St. Joseph objects to such words being used about him.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If you refer to asides as gutter behaviour you do not necessarily refer to any particular individual.

Mr. SPEAKER: I appeal to the honourable member to withdraw the words "gutter behaviour," despite what he may think of the behaviour of some honourable members on my left. The senior member for St. Joseph was at pains to say that the behaviour that was being exhibited is the type of behaviour that goes on in any parliamentary Chamber and that, in my opinion, is true. But I do appeal to the honourable member to withdraw the words "gutter behaviour." I know that the honourable member has suffered some interruption but I appeal to him to withdraw the words which he chose to use.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If it appears to you, Sir, that it would be in keeping with the dignity of the House that I should withdraw those words I shall do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member may proceed.

Mr. REECE enters the House during Mr. Mottley's speech and takes his seat.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, — Dr. Ashby, in the last letter I read, made it quite clear that his professional reputation may be involved. "Do not give me back my job", he says, "do not put me back on the Medical Staff of the Hospital, but cause an enquiry to be held into the matter." There are a lot of people to whom it might appear that an enquiry into this matter is not necessary but to me it appears to be necessary to have an enquiry if the doctor's professional reputation may be involved. Any honourable member of this House whose mind is not prejudiced would agree that there is bound to be dissatisfaction on the part of the medical fraternity as the result of this treatment to Dr. Ashby and the persons who are going to suffer most are the patients. I do not contend for a minute that Dr. Ashby is right. I do not contend for a minute that Dr. Ashby is wrong. I would be stupid to take upon myself to contend that the doctor is wrong. Equally the Governor is wrong or the Chief Medical Officer is wrong to come to the conclusion that Dr. Ashby is wrong without hearing the doctor's side of the case. Who in this island could say different from that? Say what you like; it will be felt that Dr. Ashby has been dismissed and inasmuch as his professional reputation may be involved he has asked that an enquiry be held into the allegations on which the dismissal was based. This, Sir, is the reply which Dr. Ashby received:—

"Colonial Secretary's Office,
"Barbados.
"13.2.50.

"Sir,

"With reference to your letter of the 9th of February, 1950, it would appear that you are "under the impression that you have been dismissed "from the service of the Hospital; if this were, in "fact, the case, it would no doubt be reasonable for "you to request that an enquiry be held into the "allegations on which the dismissal was based. You "will, however, observe that my letter of the 16th of "January was a notice terminating your services at "the expiration of a reasonable period, namely, on "the 1st of April, and was not, nor could not be reas- "ably construed as being, a notice of dismissal. In "the circumstances, therefore, it would be neither "appropriate nor relevant to hold an enquiry and, "accordingly, His Excellency is unable to accede to "your request that he should adopt that course.

"I am,

"Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"(Signed) P. F. CAMPBELL,

"Acting Colonial Secretary."

"Dr. A. S. ASHBY."

Later in the course of this debate I suppose you will hear that it is the Governor's right, that he need not cause an enquiry to be held. All that is true; all that I agree with; there is absolutely nothing at all wrong about that. But when you read that last letter to any Barbadian what other conclusion could he come to than that it is telling Dr. Ashby that he is under the wrong impression and that he has not been

dismissed? If they say that he has not been dismissed, then let them give him some reason for terminating his services. As a result of this action of the Governor there is dissatisfaction on the part of the medical staff and when you get a dissatisfied medical staff the patients must suffer. There are no two ways about that because doctors are human beings. Now, Sir, let us say that Dr. Ashby is not dismissed. It will be readily accepted and agreed that there is a shortage of doctors at the Hospital. Is that a fact or not? Is the Governor aware of that? Dr. Ashby has not been dismissed; you give him a reasonable time for the termination of his services. But you have a shortage of doctors. People are knocking everyday to get into the hospital wards for medical and surgical treatment; they are even falling off cots as someone has remarked. There is a shortage of doctors, you do not want to dismiss this gentleman but you terminate his services within a reasonable period. Let me repeat what I have said because I know that my remarks can be twisted to give people the impression that I have complained about patients being badly treated but a doctor has been dismissed and I get on the floor of the House and complain about his dismissal. I repeat that you can dismiss anybody provided that you have given the person a fair trial. Somebody may say that this affair is nothing to do with the House. Everything in this Country is something to do with this House. This is the only place where you can air any grievance that a public servant may have. I contend that no member of this House would like to have similar treatment meted to him or anybody connected to him. The reason for airing this matter on the floor of the House is not to ask that Dr. Ashby be re-instated but to point out that treatment of this sort is not the treatment which should be meted to employees.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to show that the doctor really and truly wanted to have his case investigated I shall read some further correspondence in connection with this matter. Honourable members will remember that in his first letter to the Acting Colonial Secretary Dr. Ashby stated that as far as he was aware, the only cause for dissatisfaction arose out of a recent incident involving one of his private patients at the Tercentenary Ward of the Hospital, who was delivered of a baby without medical supervision and that the child died some few hours after its birth. When Dr. Hallinan, the Commissioner who was appointed to investigate the working of the Hospital and the complaints which were being made against the institution, was carrying out his investigation Dr. Ashby asked that this matter be also investigated and it would be surprising to know that Dr. Hallinan actually refused not only to hear Dr. Ashby but also to hear the parties who were involved, so to speak, in the baby incident at the Hospital. Now, Sir, a Commissioner is investigating happenings at the Hospital; a woman gives birth to child at the Hospital; it dies; there is a row about it; the husband of the woman complains and a doctor is dismissed. But the Commissioner refuses to allow any evidence to be given before him in respect of that incident. Dr. Ashby has stated that he has not been given an opportunity to say anything in the matter. He fails with the Chief Medical Officer; he fails with the Colonial Secretary, and he fails with Dr. Hallinan. Dr. Hallinan would not hear him and incidentally, he would not hear the grievance of the porters of the Hospital. Well, the doctor comes to the conclusion that the only thing to do is to let the people who were involved in the baby incident make the request for an investigation of the matter and Mrs. Pilgrim wrote

a letter to Dr. Hallinan asking that the matter be investigated. What do we find, Sir? Mrs. Pilgrim receives the following letter in reply:—

“Office of Hospital Board of Enquiry,
“Jemmott's Lane,
“St. Michael.
“8th February, 1950.

“Mrs. Lucille M. Pilgrim,
“Rilbrook,
“Top Rock,
“Christ Church.

“Madam,
“I am directed by Major Hallinan to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 7th February, 1950, and to say to you that after perusing it carefully he has come to the conclusion that the matter to which you refer is not one with which he is authorized to deal. He has therefore taken note of it and has passed it on to the Chief Medical Officer who is the Government Officer responsible in the first instance to investigate matters of this nature and deal with them.

“Madam,
“I have the honour to be,
“Your obedient servant,
“(Sgd.) D. CHASE.”

On receipt of that letter by his wife, Mr. Pilgrim wrote the Acting Colonial Secretary as follows:—

“Rilbrook,
“Top Rock,
“Christ Church,
“11th February, 1950.

“Sir,
“I have the honour to draw to your attention that Dr. Hallinan has refused to hold an enquiry or to investigate a grievance which I have in connection with my wife's treatment while she was in Hospital, and, in particular, with regard to the performance of her duties by the Nurse in attendance on her.
“I had reason to believe that Dr. Hallinan's duties were particularly directed to investigating such grievances and I am at a loss to understand his refusal to investigate.
“I have to ask that the matter be treated as urgent.

“I am,
“Yours faithfully,
“(Sgd.) GEORGE C. PILGRIM.”

“The Hon. the Colonial Secretary.”

Mr. Speaker,—what did we pay Dr. Hallinan for but to investigate grievances of patients among other things at the Hospital? Had he investigated this matter, Dr. Ashby would have been afforded the opportunity to put his side of the case. It is a most unkind act on the part of Dr. Hallinan; it is wicked. They are telling Dr. Ashby “We are not giving you any chance to call any witnesses.” And the Acting Colonial Secretary backs up Dr. Hallinan's letter by informing Mr. Pilgrim that Dr. Hallinan was appointed by the Governor to enquire into the administration and organization of the General Hospital and that he was not appointed to enquire into individual grievances and complaints. Mr. Speaker, it is because of the number of grievances and complaints that Dr. Hallinan was appointed to make his enquiry; there can be no doubt about

that; they cannot deny that. Whether we get ministerial status or not, we want it to be understood that there are still some of us in this island with the courage to raise matters of this sort. I am satisfied that an opportunity was not given to Dr. Ashby to defend himself and that is the only reason why I have brought this matter on the floor of the House to-day. Nurses have been to me asking me to raise questions for them—there are other honourable members of this House who can say the same thing—but if after investigation I come to the conclusion that their complaints are groundless I let the particular matter drop there. Mr. Speaker, it may be asked "what good can be done by coming on the floor of this House and bringing to the public's notice a matter of this sort?" Well, Sir, many people have been to me in respect of the absence of Dr. Ashby's services at the Hospital. Many people would like to know for what reason his services at the Hospital have been terminated. There is a shortage of doctors at the Hospital. There are many persons on the waiting list to be admitted to the Hospital wards for surgical treatment—if I am wrong the senior member for St. Thomas will correct me—and yet the Governor of this Country could dispense with the services of a well qualified medical practitioner—qualified at the most ancient university in the British Empire (Aberdeen University)—at the Hospital. I repeat that there are dozens of persons some of whom have been waiting two months, three months, four months to get admittance into the Hospital for surgical treatment and yet the Governor could terminate the services of an experienced medical practitioner, a practitioner with 15 years' experience, the type of practitioner whom you cannot easily get to-day, at the Hospital. They say that they have not "fired" him. Let them tell the public why they have not "fired" him but have terminated his services. I do not think it is fair for the Governor, whatever powers he may have, to hear one side of a case against a doctor or anybody else and then say to him "you are dismissed; we do not want your services any longer." God help this Country if that sort of treatment to its people goes on! Mr. Speaker, I have handed to the Clerk of the House the letters which I have read. I hope that honourable members will be able to get copies of those letters, digest their contents for themselves and see whether this is fair treatment. Dr. Ashby has never attempted to conceal anything. He states "This is the only thing I know that has happened." He asks for a chance to explain but they clamp him down. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help feeling that Dr. Ashby has been treated in this manner because he is a Colonial and they do not want Colonials to become too upstart. As a matter of fact, when it is stated that Dr. Hallinan was not appointed to investigate individual grievances, it should be borne in mind that Mrs. Pilgrim's case is the one that blew off the lid at the Hospital and brought matters to a head and when the aggrieved party asked that an investigation into the matter be held, they said "No." I am sorry for the Governor from this point of view: He has been badly advised; he was not in the island two months when he allowed himself—

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable member must be very careful in his references to the Head of the Administration.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am talking about the people who advised the Governor in this matter. I am saying that the Governor was not in the island two months when he was ill advised. I would be

the last person to actually hold him up to ridicule but this being his first opportunity to administer a Government you can realize the great difficulty. I must say this: All along I have been referring to the Governor. Surely this matter has been drawn to the attention of the Executive Committee. There is no ministerial status and they have no power to dismiss persons but if a matter of this sort is drawn to their attention they should, out of sheer decency, have it investigated. How could I be a member of the Government and know that a government employee has been dismissed without his having been given an opportunity to defend himself? I would tell His Excellency that he is wrong and that he has to give the man an opportunity to state his side of the case. That is all I expect the members of the Government to do; they can do no more. There are members of the Executive Committee who have some experience of this Country.

If the advice which has been given is wrong and it is brought home to you that an injustice has been done, what man would not respect the view of a medical man who has practised in this colony for so long? This medical man says: "I ask you to re-open this case and give me a chance to put my case before you," and the answer is "No." He says: "I ask you to give me a chance to put the case before some Commissioner" and you say "No." He says that people are involved and asks you to put his own case before a Commissioner, and the answer is "No." Honourable members must realise that something must be wrong: if a man says: "Give me a chance to put my case before the Governor or a Commission of Enquiry" do you say "No"? Does that not seem unfair? I am fully conscious of the fact that this matter is nothing to do with the Government; it is purely the prerogative of the Governor. I am voicing these sentiments having taken some time to study the facts myself, because I do not like to think that I would raise in this House a question as grave as this one is without having the facts. When the matter was brought to my notice I wanted to know all the facts and I sit down now by asking this House to consider the matter seriously. I personally feel that this treatment has been meted out to this man because he is a colonial; but on the other hand, be he colonial or no colonial, treatment of this kind would be an injustice. I ask this House to realise that this is the only place where grievances of this sort can be aired. In this matter honourable members must not think that this is merely a question of this sort of treatment being meted out to Dr. Ashby; you have a shortage of doctors in Barbados; you have dismissed one and there are dozens of people at the Hospital awaiting operations. You have dismissed a man who has given satisfaction and as a result you have caused a great amount of discontent among people. I would like this to be known; I have spoken with several medical men at the Hospital and there is a great amount of discontent at the Hospital because it is felt that even if Dr. Ashby is wrong he should be given an opportunity to explain his position. You cannot come to the conclusion that Dr. Ashby is wrong without hearing his side of the case. Let Dr. Ashby know the evidence which is against him. I feel that we should take a serious view of this matter; it is not Dr. Ashby who will suffer as a result of what has taken place; it is the patients who will suffer as a result. As a result of a discontented staff of Surgeons people will suffer, and what man would carry on at the Hospital knowing that at any minute his reputation might be tarnished by his being told: "You are dismissed?" That is very hard. Mr. Speaker, I have

moved the adjournment of the House in order to deal with this matter because I feel it is a matter of paramount importance not only in respect of Dr. Ashby but to the members of the Civil Service, the people who want to go into the Hospital and indeed to all the inhabitants of this colony. I contend that this matter is a very serious one.

Mr. MILLER: This case relative to the dismissal of Dr. Ashby must be regarded as a very sad one. However, I am going to move the adjournment of this debate until next Tuesday. I beg to move that this debate be now adjourned.

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to second that.

The question that this debate be now adjourned was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ADDRESS RE BARBADOS GOVERNMENT REMAINING A PARTY TO ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AGREEMENT.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,— I am asking leave to deal with a very urgent matter. The House will remember that we replied to a Message from the former Governor asking whether the Legislature would agree to our coming under the Marshal Aid Plan. Both Houses of the Legislature agreed to the proposal and since then the United States Congress made an amendment to the Plan, the declaration of policy section of the Economic Co-operation Act having been altered to include the words: "It is the policy of the United States to encourage the unification of Europe." It has become necessary for the United Kingdom Government to agree to the amendment of the wording of the Marshal Aid Plan—an amendment which is an extension of the original words. Owing to the prorogation of the Legislature we seem to be the only colony which has not yet replied with regard to this extension, and the Secretary of State for the Colonies has been asking us to do so urgently. That is my reason for asking for leave to deal with this matter now. If leave is granted I will just formally move that we agree to this extension as set out in His Excellency's Message No. 10/1950.

There being no objection, leave was granted the honourable member.

Mr. ADAMS: If honourable members will pardon me, I will read part of Message No. 31/1948. It is as follows:—

His Excellency the Governor

To

The Honourable The House of Assembly.

His Excellency the Governor has the honour to transmit for the information of the Honourable the House of Assembly copies of an Agreement called the Economic Co-operation Agreement between the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

2. The Honourable House is invited to consider whether the Agreement should be applied to Barbados. This can be effected by His Majesty's Government of the United Kingdom applying for the extension of the Agreement to Barbados.

3. It is the understanding of the Government of the United Kingdom and the United States of America that most British Colonial Governments will participate in the Agreement within a short time, and that the failure of any of the Colonies to come within the scope of the Agreement may be regarded by the United States Government as a change in the relationship of the parties under Agreement, which may affect the form of the Agreement and the continuance of assistance to the United Kingdom.

4. Accordingly it is in the interest of His Majesty's Government that every Colonial Government should be covered by the Agreement. It is considered therefore that the Government of Barbados should accede to the Agreement unless positive disadvantage would arise from accession...."

I propose to use the same wording as has been used by the Other Place, and I beg to move that the following Address be passed in reply to His Excellency's Message No. 10/1950:—

The House of Assembly

To

His Excellency the Governor.

The House of Assembly have the honour to refer to Your Excellency's Message No. 10 of 1950 of the 7th of February 1950 and to inform Your Excellency in reply that the extension to the Economic Co-operation Agreement between the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States of America should apply to Barbados and that this Government should remain a party to the Agreement.

Whatever we may think of the benefits or lack of benefits of the Marshal Aid Plan to us, we cannot very well help ourselves and it seems to me that it is almost a formality that we should signify our approval of the extension inasmuch as we have already signified our agreement to the original Act.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Address do now pass. Honourable Members in favour of that will please say "Aye," those against will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it. I will ask the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to present this Address.

Mr. ADAMS: As Your Honour pleases.

APPOINTMENTS TO SELECT COMMITTEE.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask that there be appointed to the Select Committee which was appointed to consider and prepare a Draft Reply to His Excellency's Message No. 16/1950 inviting the views of the Honourable House on the recommendations contained in the Reports of the British Caribbean Standing Closer Association Committee and of the Commission on the Unification of the Public Services in the British Caribbean Area, the honourable senior member for St. Philip, and I feel sure that the House would also wish Your Honour to be associated with this Committee because of the importance of the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Subject to the approval of the House I nominate the honourable senior member for St. Philip as a member of this Select Committee and I associate myself with the Committee.

THE ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ADAMS: Before moving the adjournment of the House I should like to mention that the consideration of the Report of the Select Committee appointed to prepare a draft Reply to His Excellency's Speech delivered at the re-opening of the Legislature should be an item on the Order Paper; according to the Rule it should have been on the Order Paper today even although the Committee has not yet reported. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 9th May, 1950, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn to this day week, the 9th May, 1950, at 3 o'clock p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.