

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SESSION 1950—51

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 17th October, 1950.

Pursuant to adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 3 o'clock p.m. on the abovementioned date.

Present.

His Honour Mr. A. E. S. LEWIS (*Deputy Speaker*), Mr. L. E. SMITH (*Chairman of Committees*), Dr. H. G. CUMMINS, Messrs. F. E. MILLER, M. E. COX, G. H. ADAMS, B.A., F. L. WALCOTT, J. H. WILKINSON, O.B.E., E. L. WARD, D. A. FOSTER, T. O. BRYAN, and F. C. GODDARD.

Prayers are read.

Messrs. CRAWFORD and MOTTLEY enter the House and take their seats.

MINUTES.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER informs the House that the Minutes of the last meeting are not yet ready for confirmation.

PAPER LAID.

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

Annual Report of the Superintendent of the Market for the year: 1948—49.

NOTICES.

Government Notices are given as follows:—

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$281 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1950—51, Part I, Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1950—51, No. 25, which form the schedule to this Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: Of my intention to move later in the day the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 in order to deal with the abovementioned Resolution in all its stages to-day. It is to cover the expenses of the two Representatives of the Legislature and their wives attending the opening ceremony of the Legislative Council of Trinidad.

Mr. ADAMS: Resolution to place the sum of \$377 at the disposal of the Governor-in-Executive Committee to supplement the Estimates 1950—51, Part II, Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1950—51, No. 26, which form the schedule to this Resolution.

Mr. COX: Resolution to approve the following Regulations made by the Governor-in-Executive Committee under section 6 of the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act, 1937 (1937—14).

Mr. COX: Bill to amend the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act, 1937.

Mr. COX: Bill to amend the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act, 1937.—No. 2.

Mr. ADAMS: Of my intention to move the House into Committee of Supply at the next meeting to consider the other money Resolution of which I have given notice to-day.

Mr. COX: Of my intention to move, later in the day, the suspension of Rules 88 and 89 in order to deal, in all its stages to-day, with the Bill to amend the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act, of which I gave notice earlier.

Mr. CRAWFORD gives notice of the following Address:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House of Assembly are of the opinion that the educational needs of the parish of St. Philip require the establishment in that parish of a Second Grade School. Under the will of Mr. E. J. Hutchinson a Trust Fund was established on the 6th August, 1857, whereby a number of children of the parish were to receive free education.

The House are of the opinion that with the growing needs and demands for education of a secondary grade and by reasons of the expense and other difficulties attendant on travelling to Bridgetown from St. Philip, a great boon could be conferred on the parish, and perhaps on the neighbouring parishes as well, by utilising the Hutchinson Trust as a nucleus for the establishment of a second grade school in the said parish, such a school to be provided with a grant from public funds and be open to children awarded exhibitions by the Parochial Vestries of St. Philip and neighbouring parishes.

The House would remind Your Excellency that the Education Act of 1890 contemplates the establishment of Second Grade Schools in every parish.

The House would also remind Your Excellency that there is precedent for the request of this Resolution. The Christ Church Foundation School, established as a result of Williams Trust Fund, has been converted into a Government Second Grade School.

The House respectfully ask that Your Excellency would take the necessary steps to give effect to the request made by this Resolution.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. CRAWFORD: To enquire of the senior member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House of Assembly:—

1. Is Government unaware of the fact that considerable dissatisfaction exists on the part of peasant proprietors and small cultivators generally with regard to the prices paid for the 1948, 1949, and 1950 cane crops?

2. Is Government unaware that estimated from available figures as to the total value of a ton of sugar, the average costs of manufacturing raw, muscovado sugar and fancy molasses, other production costs and the average recovery of sugar factories, the prices paid for canes during these three (3) years are less than what the value of sugar would have afforded?

3. Does Government propose to take any steps to guarantee that an equitable price be paid for canes reaped during the coming crop?

4. If the answer to Question No. 3, be in the negative, will the Government state the reasons why?

5. In consequence of the circumstances that

(a) Dr. C. Y. Shephard in his Report on the sugar industry of Barbados has recommended since 1947 that the standard cost of manufacturing sugar should be revised annually;

(b) a Committee of both Houses of the Legislature which was appointed to consider his Report has recommended "that the Government should itself collect and analyse the data from which the economic condition of the largest if not the only industry in the colony can be continuously exhibited,"

(c) the Government's allegation that there is at present no suitable officer available to undertake the detailed statistical work which would be necessary in order to calculate standard costs on the lines proposed by Dr. Shephard;

Will the Government take steps immediately to implement the recommendation of the Committee of the Legislature under reference with regard to the appointment of an Agricultural Economist on the staff of the Department of Agriculture?

6. If the answer to Question 5 be in the negative, will the Government please state the reasons why?

Mr. CRAWFORD: To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House of Assembly:—

(1) In view of the general advantages to be gained by reclamation of a valuable land area;

(2) The fact that the mechanical equipment for the purpose—including the light railway and tipping waggons—has been acquired and has been idle and rusting for over two (2) years;

(3) The opportunity which the project provides for finding reproductive employment for a considerable number of the unemployed;

(4) The improvement which will result in the health conditions of the locality, and

(5) The positive danger which the area represents in case of serious weather disturbances;

Will the Government immediately commence work on the canalization of the Constitution Swamp?

Mr. CRAWFORD: To enquire of the Senior Member of the Executive Committee present at the next meeting of the House of Assembly:

In view of the special circumstances of the case, will the Government grant full leave with pay for the period of her illness and convalescence to the nurse who has contracted a serious disease in the execution of her duties at the Barbados General Hospital for which it is proposed to send her to a Trinidad Sanatorium for treatment?

Mr. GILL enters the House and takes his seat.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Mr. Cox, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, a Bill to amend the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act, 1937, is read a first time.

On the motion of Mr. Cox, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, a Bill to amend the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act, 1937,—No. 2—is read a first time.

Mr. ALLDER enters the House and takes his seat.

SUSPENSION OF RULES 88 and 89

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Rules 88 and 89 are suspended.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 60

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Rule 60 is suspended.

SELECTION OF DELEGATES TO THE WEST INDIAN CONFERENCE TO BE HELD IN CURACAO

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received information from the Presiding Member of the Other Place to the effect that they are willing to meet this House as soon after half past three o'clock as it is convenient for a joint session to select the two delegates to the Fourth Session of the West Indian Conference to be held in Curacao from the 27th November to the 8th December, 1950.

Mr. MAPP enters the House and takes his seat.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. WILKINSON, the House is adjourned for a quarter of an hour.

On re-assembling:—

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, — I ask leave to move an Address which arises out of the joint session of the Legislature held a few moments ago.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, — As the result of the joint session of the Legislature which was held a few moments ago, two honourable members of this House were selected as delegates to the Fourth Session of the West Indian Conference to be held in Curacao and there should be a reply to Message No. 26/1950 of His Excellency the Governor notifying him of this fact. I, therefore, beg to move that the following Address in reply to His Excellency's Message do now pass:—

*The House of Assembly
To
His Excellency the Governor*

The House of Assembly beg to acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's Message No. 26/1950 relating to the appointment of two delegates from the Legislature to represent Barbados at the Fourth Session of the West Indian Conference to be held in Cur-

acao from the 27th November to the 8th December 1950.

The House have the honour to inform Your Excellency that at a joint meeting of the two Houses of the Legislature to which Your Excellency sent the Message abovementioned the following were selected as delegates:—Mr. F. L. Walcott, Senior Member for St. Peter, and Mr. E. L. Ward, Senior Member for St. Lucy.

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to second the motion for the passing of this Address.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will ask the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to be good enough to present the Address to His Excellency the Governor.

Mr. ADAMS: As Your Honour pleases.

THE BARBADOS FANCY MOLASSES PRODUCTION AND EXPORT (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. COX: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act, 1937, be taken as the first Order of the Day.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

The question that a Bill to amend the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act be taken as the first Order is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The first Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Michael,—Second reading of a Bill to amend the Barbados Fancy Molasses Production and Export Act, 1937.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker,—Certain exporters of fancy molasses now have in their possession 159,241 wine gallons of molasses which under the existing legislation cannot be legally exported after the 31st May, 1950, and they have requested the Fancy Molasses Control and Marketing Board to recommend to the Government that they be permitted to export this quantity of molasses. The Board has agreed and the Executive Committee has approved and this Bill seeks to sanction the approval of the Executive Committee. This amount of molasses was manufactured during the crop year 1948-49 before the 31st August, 1949, and had not been exported on the 31st May, 1950. The failure to export this molasses was due to (a) re-conditioning of 1949 molasses due to high moisture content, (b) the Canadian Government's refusal to allow such molasses to enter Canada after the 31st December, 1949, and (c) the fact that re-conditioning took a longer time than was expected.

I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Mr. Cox, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 inclusive are read and are agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. Cox, seconded by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of the Bill in Committee.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. Cox, seconded in each case by Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, the Bill is read a third time and is passed.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I ask leave to take Committee of Supply as the next Order.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph,—To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of sums of money for the service of the Government.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. Cox, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER leaves the Chair and the House goes into Committee of Supply, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

RESOLUTION TO MEET EXPENSES OF DELEGATES TO THE OPENING OF THE TRINIDAD LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—This Resolution for \$281 is to pay the expenses of two legislators and their wives who are invited by the Governor of Trinidad to be present at the opening ceremony of the Legislature of Trinidad and Tobago appointed under their new Constitution. Honourable members will see from the addendum that this Resolution is to provide the travelling and out-of-pocket expenses of the invitees. The hotel expenses will be paid by the Government of Trinidad. It is unparliamentary to comment upon the acts of other Governments and I shall do no more than say that if Trinidad feels that this occasion is so unique as to be deserving of the attendance of Members of other Legislatures we should not be discourteous by not going. I hope the new Constitution of Trinidad will work well. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman,—This is a very small amount, it is true, but there is a principle involved. I should like the senior member for St. Joseph to tell me how the out-of-pocket expenses have been arrived at. It is customary to tell this Chamber how out-of-pocket expenses of delegates from this island are made up and I would like the honourable member to tell us in this case. I am beginning, Mr. Chairman, to feel that we shall have, sooner or later, to refuse some of these invitations. I make that statement if I stand alone in so doing. I am not criticizing this amount because it is small but I think that as a result of these invitations we should be able to gain something educational, cultural or otherwise. Like the honourable member I shall say no more: Paragraph 2 of the addendum to the Resolution says:—"This Resolution is to provide for the cost of travelling and out-of-pocket expenses of the invitees." Will the honourable member tell me whether they are calculated on the basis of \$5, or £2, or \$22.50 a day?

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member needs an answer; he has given it although he added an alternative. The cost of the passages is \$52 and the out-of-pocket expenses are computed at the rate of \$5 per day. I did not suspect that even the senior member for the City would ask the question, but when I enquired yesterday I was told that the computation is made on that basis.

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

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of this Resolution in Committee of Supply.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Dr. CUMMINS in each case, the Resolution is read a first and a second time and is agreed to.

NATURAL GAS CORPORATION BILL

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I am asking leave to take Order No. 5 as the next Order.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order stands in the name of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph,—Second reading of a Bill to provide for the establishment of a Corporation to be known as the Natural Gas Corporation, for the functions and duties of the Corporation, for the acquisition by or transfer to it of undertakings, rights and property and to make compensation therefor and for purposes connected with the matters aforesaid.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—This Bill, depending on the way in which you look at it, is either a simple and obviously necessary Bill which seeks merely to carry out the policy adopted by the Government and approved of by the Legislature of this colony or else it is a serious matter of principle. I say that, because one cannot help noticing in whatever community one lives what some sections of the Press may say from time to time on proposed legislation. It would be a regrettable state of affairs if that were not so. It would be regrettable if we attempted to work a Democracy without the Government making as public as possible its proposals for legislation, the policy it intends to pursue and the actual legislation that it has drafted to carry out that policy. It is much too late in the day, even if it were permissible by the Rules of the House, to debate the principle of Nationalization or public ownership of minerals in the soil. The Legislature has approved of the principle of Nationalization. (Voices: No, no)—I believe there are some mind readers or people who say they are mind readers but I have never heard that any of the honourable members on my left were among that number. I am speaking of the principle of Nationalization of minerals, in the sense of ownership of those minerals. The Government has not attempted, nor would it in normal circumstances attempt, to run any publicly owned mineral that may be discovered or has been discovered because, normally speaking, experience has shown in other parts of the world that it is enough for a Government to own and not, except under proper control, to exploit minerals. It may be a selfish reason because millions may be sunk without any remuneration and it is better for a private undertaking to sink millions than for a Government to do so. If anything is got after those millions have been sunk, it is but right that the community should obtain the benefit of what has been got. I think that my friends on my left may well console themselves with the reflection that the blow has been softer than they expected. I would just remind honourable members that one of the provisions of the Petroleum Act—to put it in layman's language—is that any one who at the passing of the Act was in receipt of income from Natural Gas or any other mineral covered by the Act, would be compensated by the Government either by way of a money compensation or by being granted a licence which would put him in the same position in which he would have been if the Act had not been passed. I do not think that even the enemies of this Government would suggest that that is anything but absolutely equitable and it is unfortunate that since the passing of the Petroleum Act it has not been possible for the Government of this Country and the British Union Oil Company who alone possess gas wells of a commercial value—they possess actually two

wells designated Nos. 19 and 20 which they owned at the passing of the Act—have not been able to come to an agreement. I do not propose, unless honourable members choose to make it a subject for debate and a subject for complete exposure, to go into all the details of the negotiations between the British Union Oil Company and the Government. It is sufficient to say this (Laughter):—some members rise easily to a bait—it is sufficient for me to say this: The British Union Oil Company have always been told in emphatic terms that the Government was anxious that their position as regards these two wells should be the same as if the Petroleum Act had not been conceived, let alone passed and on that basis the Government was prepared to negotiate with them. We were prepared to put them in exactly the same position in which they were in 1946, subject, of course, to the Petroleum Act, that is to say, they would run these wells subject to such royalties as they may have to pay under the Petroleum Act. Up to the present moment, the only Agreement arrived at between the Government and the British Union Oil Co., was that they should continue, temporarily, to get gas from these wells and continue their operations in the same way on a 50-50 basis. I am just giving a sketch. I know that there are some honourable members—you have only to look in their direction without even considering what they will say—who have hundreds of questions to ask and I am anxious to answer them. There is nothing that can be thrown at the Government that the Government would not invite. Now, Sir, it appeared in the course of the negotiations that possibly the British Union Oil Co., when it suited them, would say “We have no desire to continue for any length of time.” I do not mean to use the expression “when it suited them” offensively; they are a commercial undertaking and commercial undertakings never do anything when it does not suit them, especially when it comes to making money. The question, therefore, would arise, as it did arise on the part of the British Union Oil Co. rather than on the part of the Government when matters came to a head and when it was obvious that they were not going to continue, that these wells would have to be taken over by the Government. The question did arise and the British Union Oil Co., were definitely unreasonable, from the Government's point of view, in the negotiations affecting the purchase of such of their equipment as was necessary, if the Government were to take over these wells, that is to say, the pipe lines to Lancaster Processing Factory, the Belle Pumping Station, and so on. It has, therefore, become necessary for the Government to provide for the running of these wells. The House will, I hope, pardon me if I read the Objects and Reasons of the Bill but it is worth while reading them. The Government's position is set out in the Objects and Reasons as follows:—

“The Petroleum Act, 1950, vested the property of natural gas in the Governor-in-Executive Committee and provided for the granting of licences and leases to search for, win and dispose of natural gas. Prior to this, natural gas was vested in the landowner. The British Union Oil Company Limited held leases from the landowner in respect of mineral rights at Turner's Hall Plantation in St. Andrew from which a supply of natural gas was obtained. The Company has distributed natural gas so recovered to certain public institutions and to the Barbados Gas Company for supplying private consumers. The Government and the Company negotiated for the issue of a long term licence or lease to the Company

for the purpose of winning and distributing the gas from the wells 19 and 20 situated at Turner's Hall, in lieu of cash compensation in respect of the property in natural gas having been vested in the Governor-in-Executive Committee. These negotiations having proved unsuccessful it was considered that the Government should proceed to undertake the supply of natural gas under public ownership.

"Accordingly this Bill seeks to establish a Corporation for the purpose of recovering and distributing natural gas in order to secure the supply of such gas as heretofore.

"The Government have also been conducting negotiations with the Company with a view to acquiring the pipeline and other necessary equipment to enable the recovery, distribution and supply of natural gas to be continued without interruption. The Company however is not willing to sell immediately such pipeline and equipment. As it is intended that this commodity should be carried on as a nationalized industry, it is considered essential that such pipeline and equipment should belong to the Corporation, and should be transferred to and vested in the Corporation at the earliest opportunity.

"Provision is therefore made for the transfer to the Corporation of the pipeline and equipment of the British Union Oil Company Limited and the vesting of such pipeline and equipment in the Corporation and the payment of compensation therefor. The amount of such compensation may be agreed upon between the Corporation and the Company, but failing agreement, shall be determined by arbitration."

Well, that is the position, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Perhaps I may have given a wrong impression when I spoke about the terms that the British Union Oil Co. laid down, as regards the purchase of their equipment. They do not wish to sell at the present moment. I believe that it will be stated on their behalf that it was not always known how far the Government was prepared to go but I can give this House the solemn assurance that as far as negotiations with the British Union Oil Co. are concerned, the question of Nationalization, in the sense in which honourable members have used this term, although it is the policy of this Government, never arose until the British Union Oil Co. made it arise. In short, as far as this Government was concerned, the British Union Oil Co., were perfectly at liberty, as far as we could see, to run for a number of years these two wells under a licence from the Government. We were not insisting on "Nationalization" that is, on operating them ourselves. Not that we were departing from the principle of Nationalization; not that we regard it, as it has turned out to be, the first industry to be really nationalized but nationalization was not used as an attempt to force the hands of the British Union Oil Co. They could have continued to supply gas under a licence from the Government; their prices could be controlled by us or by a Public Utility Board. This Government was prepared to let them go on on that basis. They have made it impossible for that state of things to continue and there is no alternative but this for the Government, inasmuch as it owns the property in the gas. As regards the Government running the industry by a Department instead of by a Corporation I do not think it needs much to convince honourable members that this is the better way of dealing with it instead of setting up another Department attached to the Public Works. Whatever honourable members may feel about the fact that the British Union Oil Co. had no licence to explore for oil, that is an entirely different matter.

If Your Honour does not stop any honourable member who may make any accusation in that respect, the Government is not too timid to reply. I repeat that there is nothing in the conduct of the Government to make it feel ashamed. This has been forced on us. I am not going to pretend that we are not aware of the result but it was not sought. It falls in with our policy of Nationalization but it was never sought. I am, therefore, asking honourable members — by all means criticize this Bill, criticize the Government, criticize the principle—not to make criticisms on the floor of the House which they are not prepared to back up. If any honourable member knows of any aspect of the negotiations it is his duty to give the facts on the floor of the House. Barbadians are the most critical people on earth. It is easy for rumours to be spread abroad about any of us in our private or professional life and it is not right that any member of this House should make any suggestion that he is not prepared to follow up to the full. If an honourable member knows of anything that has been wrongly done by another honourable member of the House, let him say it on the floor of this House. There is nothing I am not prepared to say on the floor of this House in answer to any question that may arise. It is time that the public of Barbados realize that in every letter to the newspapers there is not always an element of commonsense or the outpouring of an unprejudiced mind. Because there happens to be in Bridgetown a chronic writer of letters—he is a professional man but not a barrister—who is forever making accusations against the Government without any shadow of fact to support them, that is a reason, to my mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker, why, now the opportunity has been granted to members of the House, any suspicious circumstances should be aired, so that anything may come to light which in the minds of honourable members may be considered to be keeping them in the dark. I must qualify that statement to this extent: I have a discretion to say what I myself may have done in Executive Committee or during these negotiations. Obviously, honourable members would not expect me to say what some other member of the Executive Committee might have said or done in the course of these negotiations because to that extent, at any rate, matters are secret. But speaking on behalf of the Government, if honourable members think that there is any ulterior motive, anything hidden in any clause of this Bill or anything of that sort I beg and implore them to say so, in order that it will not be possible for any accusation to remain when there is no ground whatever for the accusation. I do not propose to say much more. I have given an outline of the circumstances that led to the introduction of this Bill. It is a matter of great urgency. The last Agreement with the British Union Oil Co. will come to an end to-day, as regards their distributing gas from these wells. We have had to push this Bill as quickly as we could get it through and I hope that honourable members will deal with it in all its stages to-day, no matter how long it takes. I am making that request in the interest of the community and in the interest of what, we hope, will be useful to the people. I beg to move formally, Sir, that this Bill be now read a second time.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: My first objection to the second reading of this Bill to-day is that the importance of this Bill merits more time for honourable members, especially those of us who form the Opposition, to go into the matter. I say that for this reason: As Your Honour is well aware notice of this Bill was given on Tuesday last and I do

not know if any honourable member received his copy of the Bill before last Saturday. In order that one may become really acquainted with all the facts and circumstances surrounding this Bill, one would have to go through quite a number of reports dating back from the Lepper Report, to be able to do justice not only to oneself and to this Country but also to the Bill. I am sure, Sir, that the Government should not like to see a Bill of this magnitude railroad through the House without constructive opposition. No Bill of this importance should be just put in the hands of honourable members and then they be asked to go through it by just making slight objections to sections here and sections there. There is a principle involved in this Bill. (A voice: What is the principle?) I hear a voice ask "what is the principle?" Every member should take this Bill seriously because, I repeat, there is a great principle involved in it. (Mr. ADAMS: What is the principle?). In this Bill, you propose to set up a Corporation for the purpose of looking after natural gas. There are some of us in this island—fortunately in this House too—who, though we would like to see the inhabitants of this country get the best out of its natural resources, are not wedded to Naturalization. There is, on the other hand, quite a number of persons—unfortunately the majority of the House is included in that number—who are wedded to Naturalization, some blindly so. What I say now might offend some members of my Party or it might offend some members of the Government but as in all my political activities I have gone very carefully into this matter and I make no apology for what I am saying. I have been turning over very carefully in my mind the question of the Government directly controlling this Natural Gas and nothing has brought me nearer accepting a compromise for Naturalization than what I have been hearing transpired between persons responsible for negotiating this business. I cannot find anyone yet who can convince me that Naturalization is the right thing—

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. Nationalization of Natural Gas has been passed by the Legislature of this Colony. Is the honourable member attacking that vote? I ask Your Honour to rule whether the honourable member is in order to criticize a vote that has already been decided upon by the Assembly.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I am surprised that the honourable member is trying to stop me. In paragraph 3 of the Objects and Reasons this is what is stated: "As it is intended that this commodity should be carried on as a nationalized industry, it is considered essential that such pipeline and equipment should belong to the Corporation, and should be transferred to and vested in the Corporation at the earliest opportunity." I do not know why the honourable member should interrupt me because when I am through, he may be surprised to know that I am not levelling accusations against the Government in this respect. I submit most respectfully to Your Honour that on the face of this statement in the Objects and Reasons, if an honourable member cannot refer to the Nationalization of Natural Gas in the course of this debate, then we may as well walk out and let the Government put this matter through. I intend to ask certain questions and to get some facts about things which I have heard. Surely the honourable member for St. Joseph does not expect that as long as I am feeling well I would come in here and approve of this Bill simply because the principle of Nationalization has already been approved by this

House. I may be flogging a dead horse but I am entitled to express the views of the people who sent me here. Mr. Deputy Speaker, it seems to me that honourable members want to go out for tea and I, therefore, beg to move that this House do now adjourn until 5.45 p.m.

The question that this House do now adjourn until 5.45 p.m. is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The House is accordingly adjourned to 5.45 p.m.

NATURAL GAS CORPORATION BILL, 1950

On re-assembling,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On the adjournment the honourable senior member for the City was speaking on the motion for the second reading of a Bill to provide for the establishment of a Corporation to be known as the Natural Gas Corporation, for the functions and duties of the Corporation, for the acquisition by or transfer to it of undertakings, rights and property and to make compensation therefor and for purposes connected with the matters aforesaid. The honourable member may proceed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: When the House was adjourned I was making the point that this Bill is of such importance that in order to be able to offer any appreciable criticism of it we should be given more time to consider it. As I said, honourable members only came in possession of this Bill last Saturday and all the ramifications would have to be considered from the Lepper Report down to the Prospecting License which has been granted. It is true that when the Petroleum Act was passed the State had, so to speak, nationalised all minerals or the minerals were vested in the Crown; to my mind there is a big difference between vesting gas, oils and so on in the Crown and nationalisation. This Bill which is before the House seeks to set up a Corporation, and as the honourable Leader of the House said, the advent of the Bill was purely because negotiations which have been going on between the Government and the owners or lessors of the Turner's Hall wells which actually produce natural gas have broken down. That in itself is a reason why we should be given more time to go carefully into this Bill; all we know about this Bill is what we have been hearing. In introducing this Bill the honourable senior member for St. Joseph made it quite clear that he was prepared to answer any questions which might be asked, but there are certain things which were dealt with in Executive Committee and which he cannot possibly tell us about today. Honourable members are aware that there have been such wild rumours going around, there has been so much talk about the big sum which has been asked for and there has been put in the Press some correspondence with which many of us do not agree that we of the Opposition would like to know more about this matter. I said at the outset that I would be opposed to giving the second reading to this Bill this afternoon for the reason that we did not have sufficient time to consider the Bill; and in a matter of this sort the honourable senior member for St. Joseph ought to agree that if the Opposition and back benchers had to get certain facts that could well be done in Select Committee. I will deal with all these things at a later stage in my speech; but what I am saying right now is that we have been told that the negotiations have broken down and we have been hearing about sums ranging from two to three and one half million dollars having to

be spent when we shall have passed this Bill. It must follow as night follows day, and as all thinking people will appreciate, that every possible thing should be done to prevent the closing down of these two wells. Any self-respecting Barbadian with any sense of responsibility whether he is in the Government or in the Opposition must appreciate that. Natural gas is, to my mind, the only natural gift which we can really see. We have heard and read from the Lepper Report about this bath of oil, but we have not seen that yet; that is something which might not be there. But we know that we have natural gas and whether we are in the Opposition or in the Government we are bound to say: "Let us satisfy ourselves that these wells must not be closed down." The Government is apparently satisfied that it has taken every possible step, that it has done everything humanly possible in the matter and that the only step to be taken after all the negotiations have broken down is to come down with this Bill. If you agree that the success of any democracy is by compromise, is it not right that persons who are not in the know should satisfy themselves that all the negotiations have broken down and that there is the necessity for this Bill? I am not accusing the Government of putting anything on anybody; I am so pro-American that I rejoiced when an American Company got a licence to prospect for oil here. It is not the custom of the American people to dilly dally with anything; they usually get down to business. We on this side of the House plead for time in which to satisfy ourselves as to the necessity for this Bill. A few weeks ago the Government said that they could not nationalise at the moment and they brought down a Bill to provide for the setting up of a Public Utilities Board; that I consider to be the spirit of compromise. Nobody would say that he would like to see these wells closed down, but you must satisfy yourself before you even accept the second reading of this Bill that everything has been done in the matter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this industry in respect of natural gas is something upon which we want to know if we can really rely; it might mean millions to the Treasury or it might mean bankruptcy to the Island. We do know that natural gas is being obtained at the moment; the Petroleum Bill has been passed, a Bill which has been fought up and down the eleven parishes of this island, but I will not dwell upon that. We had the Petroleum Drilling and Production Regulations, 1950, before us, we saw something in the Press and as a result of questions which I asked in this House we had the Prospecting Licence issued which Licence is a Deed of the 17th May, 1950. I crave your indulgence, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to deal with the matter in this way because this is really what leads up to the Government having to bring down this Bill today. You have this Prospecting Licence issued on the 17th May, 1950, to the Gulf Oil Corporation, and we know that this matter has been dealt with quite ably by persons who were brought here and who knew all about it. If you know that the British Union Oil Company was operating here and then you heard nothing about its operation you would feel glad to know that somebody had been offered an agreement to drill for oil. Nobody criticizes any action of the Government in this matter; it is obvious that there must have been some negotiation between them and the British Union Oil Company because somebody had to call in the Gulf Oil Corporation and the British Union Oil Company would have been interested in the matter. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph said

at the outset that he is willing to answer any reasonable question; it must have been known at the time of the issue of the Licence that these wells No. 19 and No. 20 which are in dispute, were producing natural gas. In that Licence these wells situated at Turner's Hall Plantation and the horizon from which such wells are produced to the extent of 100 acres were excluded from the Gulf Oil Corporation. I would have liked to have been able to say that the Gulf Oil Corporation had started operations already because I have been making it my proud boast that an American Company will do something, unlike an English Company which will do nothing. I am now expressing my own feeling. As I have said, this Prospecting Licence excludes these natural gas wells No. 19 and No. 20 and the 100 acres which I have mentioned. I am not a geologist and I do not claim to know if that exclusion is fair or unfair. That is a matter for the geologists and I take it that the Government would have to be guided by the advice of geologists; lawyers and politicians are children in the hands of geologists. I understand that after the Licence was issued, negotiations began and the British Union Oil Company was told that under the law as it stands, the property belongs to the Crown and you have to work for the Crown. I understand that these wells were carried on at a 10% basis, and apparently those negotiations went well. Then further negotiations were begun with the Company for carrying on these wells. At this stage members of the Government thought that the attitude of the persons responsible for the British Union Oil Company was unreasonable. It might be unpopular to say this, but it is true. I do feel that if there had been more sweet reasonableness shown, this Bill would not have been before us. There is a section of this community which does not like nationalisation but you must give in when the time comes for giving in. In this matter I think we should consider the colony first; I feel that the Leader of the House must be in a position to tell us something more than what he has told us; he told us that the negotiations broke down but at what stage did they break down? (Mr. ADAMS: At the end). Some negotiations break down in the middle. We want to know the reason why the negotiations broke down; I think that if the spirit of compromise had been shown in these negotiations the position would have been much better. The conditions are that there should either be a long-term lease to the British Union Oil Company or cash compensation; if apparently the negotiations for a long-term lease broke down, are you telling us that we should pass this Bill because you are in a position to handle the cash? We have been hearing about the sum of two and a half million dollars or three and a half million dollars B.W.I. currency for the wells. I would like some more time so that I could deal with this matter; because if you really think seriously of all the negotiations having broken down—negotiations in respect of a 10% basis, a 50% basis and a long-term lease—you would want to know the reason why they broke down. Even if I were the strongest supporter of the Government I would have to be radical in this matter; if you say that in some instances the Company was unreasonable, where is the spirit of compromise? But we are asked to pass this Bill just so and the principle is far-reaching. In these negotiations a long-term lease could have been obtained but why was that not taken? I am becoming suspicious. No member of the Government is a geologist; you have

to bring in a geologist. If we pass this Bill what will be the next step to be taken? If all these negotiations have broken down and you take over the gas wells and the equipment, the next step will be to come for the money to pay the Company. If you know that your wells have all this natural gas, why are you afraid of a long-term lease? It is true that the British Union Oil Company may have a grudge against the Government; the Company may say; "You have given Gulf Oil Corporation more consideration than you have given us." But even as far as that goes I was glad that an American Company had been given the Prospecting Licence. I ask honourable members to be very careful and to think seriously about this matter. It is not merely because you have a majority in the House to agree to the passing of a Bill that you should pass it; you owe a duty to the country and when you pass this Bill you are coming back to the House for money to pay this Company. These wells must be kept open because natural gas is being obtained and it is a means of fuel with which we are provided in this colony. Therefore I consider that everything possible should be done to keep these wells open. When the honourable senior member for St. Joseph replies I hope he will tell us the reason why the negotiations have broken down. Honourable members should agree to postpone the consideration of this Bill and let us get very much more information. If this long-term lease has been offered and all is well, why would this Company say that it does not want the lease but it wants the cash?

In respect of this Licence which has been issued—I want to be mild upon this matter—honourable members will recall that I asked some questions about it. Luckily for me I went to my files and started to read the terms of the Licence and I snatched a little time to make comparisons. In Part I of the First Schedule I discovered that the exemptions in respect of 100 acres of the gas wells were dealt with; I am wondering if the honourable senior member for St. Joseph can tell us if it is true that the argument used for the breaking down of the negotiations was to the effect that the Company could not take the long-term lease and improve the productivity of these wells because it was felt that this 100-acre radius was too limited and that if the Gulf Oil Corporation came within two acres of this radius and started operations they would be able to draw gas from the reservoir. If that is the reason then the Government should be rather cautious. From what I see, the Gulf Oil Corporation will not be drilling for oil until 1951—52. I repeat, I am no geologist, I know nothing about oil and I cannot argue with the Government who knows something about it; but it seems to me that in this Licence for some reason or other a regulation has been left out. I do not suggest that there is any improper reason for leaving it out; Mr. Tanner was brought down to protect Barbados and he knows about oil, you have the Attorney General who is a draughtsman and it does seem strange that an important regulation should have been left out. If you read the Lepper Report you can see the possibility of something like what I have just mentioned taking place, and if the Government found that anything like that was happening they should be in a position to call upon the Gulf Oil Corporation to cease operations. Which honourable member can say that the omission of such a regulation is not possibly the real cause of this Bill being before us today? It is left for the honourable senior mem-

ber for St. Joseph to tell us if the negotiations broke down through this omission.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the honourable member mean that protection for these wells has been omitted from the regulations?

Mr. MOTTLEY: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker; it would be a question of protection for whoever is controlling the wells. Having Mr. Tanner and all the legal luminaries I say it is questionable to the mind of any honourable member as to why this regulation has been left out. Let us hope that this omission is by accident and not by design. To come a little nearer to the point, I wonder if the insertion of such a regulation would not prevent this colony from having in the not distant future to look for a lot of money to be paid out, which will have to be done if and when this Bill is passed. If that regulation were to be inserted now one wonders if the Gulf Oil Corporation would not fly off. Honourable members are entitled to hear all these things; if you put in that regulation—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think that that point concerns this Bill.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Only in the sense that I am trying to reason out whether the regulation should be put in or not. I must concede to the Government what I see might be its difficulty; I say that if you put in that regulation the Gulf Oil Corporation might fly off and I use that as an argument in favour of the Government. The British Union Oil Company says: "I do not want any long-term lease; I want my money." We did not know anything about these wells; a Bill of this sort—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member saying that this Bill deals with compensation for the wells being there?

Mr. MOTTLEY: This Bill deals with compensation for the pipes; the compensation for the wells is dealt with under the Petroleum Act. However, if the Company carries on we will not have to look for the money; and if you have to give compensation, you will not give compensation for the pipes unless you own the wells. We have not reached the stage when confiscation of the wells will take place; if you are paying for the wells and the Company is saying that it wants its money, it might be that the Company knows that these wells are no good, that they will go dry and therefore the Company will get its money and leave. We have read that gas wells have gone dry in Mexico and therefore the Company may be asking for its money because it wants to get the money quickly; the Company may say that it is spending its money and the Gulf Oil Corporation can still drain the reservoir of gas. This is not just a Bill to be passed so that it can be said that another feather has been put in the cap of the Labour Government; when this Bill goes through you will have a Corporation to take over the pipes and you will not take over the pipes unless you are also taking over the wells. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph should really tell us something more about this matter; I feel that we should be given more time to consider this Bill. I know that the honourable member is anxious to get this Bill through in the interest of the colony, but I want to assure the honourable member that it is not because we of the Opposition happen to be of a conservative view that we will at any time associate ourselves with any unreasonable attitude; that is not so. I say that Barbadians who are responsible for these negotiations must learn to be reasonable; these wells have been dug here and they have produced something

which we did not know we had, and any attempt which is made to put obstacles in the way of the supply of this gas will not meet with the support of the Opposition. This Opposition is diametrically opposed to nationalisation, but let it be known that in these negotiations no unreasonable people will have our support. We want to let the British Union Oil Company know that they have no sponsors in this House for any fictitious or fabulous sum to be paid to them; our first duty is to Barbados and its inhabitants. We want to let them know that only reasonable negotiations will be tolerated by this side of the Table. I plead with the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to see wisdom in this matter; whenever you pass this Bill you will have to come back here for some two million dollars. I hear this talk about big finance and people think that I do not understand it. However, I am asking whether it would not be wiser to re-open these negotiations with the British Union Oil Company or negotiate with the Gulf Oil Corporation than to go in for the expenditure of two million dollars. (A MEMBER: The Gulf Oil Corporation would not be interested). With all the social services which are needed as you look around and see, would it not be reasonable to re-open these negotiations and do every possible thing and try not to go in for the expenditure of this money? It is all well and good to sit here and pass this Bill, but whenever you are finished you will have to bring arbitrators from England and you will have to spend this two million or two and one half million dollars. I say that with pressing problems confronting us in this colony, with the need for a Deep Water Harbour to say nothing about the construction of the East Coast Road of which the hon. junior member for St. Joseph will remind us, and a scheme for compulsory education, the Government should see if these negotiations cannot be re-opened. The hon. senior member for St. Joseph should appeal to the Government to re-open these negotiations and they will have the Opposition behind them. I say that neither the British Union Oil Company nor anybody else can have any fabulous sum out of this colony in a matter of this sort; I am opposed to nationalization, but if it is brought home forcibly to me that nothing can be done and that these people are unreasonable you can count on my vote for taking over the business. I do not understand people being unreasonable in respect of something which has been God-given. The passing of this Bill might appear to be a simple matter to some hon. members; however I am moving that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed. I am not saying that the consideration of this Bill should be postponed for any six months or anything like that. It may be that when I have finished speaking I have just let off hot air; loyalty to their Party will prevent hon. members from seeing the ramifications of this Bill. The Petroleum Drilling and Production Regulations can be amended so that the Gulf Oil Corporation will have to understand that if drilling has been started within a certain area whether it is 100 acres or 200 acres of the reservoir of the natural gas and this reservoir is being depleted, they can be called upon to stop operations. Some hon. members will ask: who in the Gulf Oil Corporation would sign an agreement like that? I think I know businessmen well enough

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. Is the honourable member making the point that the attitude of the British Union Oil Company is that they

should be given a guarantee that nobody could sink a well within this radius of 100 acres?

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not say that at all. I am asking the honourable member to tell us why the negotiations have broken down. The British Union Oil Company might say that they are instructed by their geologist that their gas is being depleted by the operations of the Gulf Oil Corporation and the Government should call upon the Corporation to cease operations. In fairness to the Government I say it may be that the British Union Oil Company know that they are only there for two or three years and they say: "We had better get out." We have got to consider this matter seriously; this Company might be saying: "Let us get our money and get out" and the Government has to be cautious in this matter. My reason for asking for the postponement of the further consideration of this Bill is that we on this side might have an opportunity to study the Bill. When the Government take over this property they might find some time after that the gas has gone, the pipeline is still there and the only thing they can do is to sell it to Mr. A. E. Taylor. Up to now I have not thrown any unjust criticism on the Government; I am merely suggesting that they postpone the further consideration of this Bill because there is a lot more information for us to get. (Mr. ADAMS: Whatever you ask I can answer). I cannot imagine any reasonable man after hearing the arguments which have been put forward, not seeing the necessity for postponing the further consideration of this Bill. We are not asking for a postponement for any six months; it must be obvious to honourable members that the Government has a majority in this House and that eventually they are bound to get this Bill passed, but to attempt to railroad legislation through the House is not the right thing to do in a democracy. We are making the law, and do not let the British Union Oil Company fool you that because the Agreement between them and the Government expires to-night they can put cement down these gas wells; you can call us up at midnight and we will pass a law to lock up anybody. Do not mind that this Agreement expires to-night; if we pass this Bill tonight there is no guarantee that the Other Place will pass it next week. The Other Place must be given the opportunity to go through the Bill, and where you have opposition to a Measure you must give people an opportunity for going through it. I appeal to the honourable senior member for St. Joseph who knows well enough that I take time to deal with these things; I have not got any further than Clause 10 of this Bill. I am sure that the honourable member appreciates criticism of any Measure which is brought forward; he would be the last person to bring forward this Bill and see everybody voting "Aye." I beg to move that the further consideration of this Bill be postponed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I should like to point out to the honourable member that he is at liberty to move that this Bill be read a second time this day week or that the further debate on the Bill be postponed.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Acting on your advice, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am going to move that this Bill be read a second time this day week. The honourable senior member for St. Joseph said that he would be starting with this Bill today and that was when he gave notice of it. We never saw the Bill and today the honourable member said that he is going to finish it. We want to be *au fait* with this Bill and I hope that members of the Government are well acquainted

with it. For the reasons which I have given, I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time this day week and that will give the honourable senior member for St. Joseph time to answer some of the points which have been made.

Mr. REECE entered the House and took his seat whilst Mr. MOTTLEY was speaking.

Mr. WARD: I beg to second the motion for the second reading of this Bill this day week. After hearing the remarks of the honourable senior member for the City, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph should know that the members on this side of the Table want to have the information which led to this Bill having been brought down. It must be borne in mind that the members of the Government can always get information a long time before the ordinary members of the House can get it and that is why in respect of a Bill of this importance which we received only last Monday we should be given more time to consider its implications. I feel that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph in his wisdom and reason will realise that he should not stifle the Opposition; if he has a sound case there will not be any scare in postponing the further consideration of this Bill for a week. I feel that that would be doing justice to the community and to the members of this House. I feel that not even the people who form the British Union Oil Company know about this Bill and some compromise to the satisfaction of the Government might be arrived at. In introducing this Bill, the honourable senior member for St. Joseph said that there was no principle involved, but I feel that there is definitely a principle involved. Previously the Government took over the oil and the minerals in this island, but this Bill seeks to take over the pipeline and the equipment of this Company which, in my opinion, is something different from vesting the oil and minerals in the Crown. This is a sort of acquisition Bill; it is the equivalent of saying "You must let me have your pipeline at any cost." I know very well that these gas wells are of no use to the Government unless they have the pipeline as well. I feel that we should have more time to go into the implications of this particular Bill; I feel that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph should give every opportunity for the people of this community to discuss this Bill and consider what can be done before he comes to any definite decision in the matter, because the people of this colony are the people who have to foot the bill. We were told that the Government had certain negotiations with the British Union Oil Company over wells No. 19 and No. 20 which are producing natural gas at the moment, and we are now asking the honourable senior member for St. Joseph if he can give us the reason why these negotiations have broken down. We have heard that many rumours are going around and as long as the honourable Leader of the House feels that there is nothing of which he should be ashamed, in my opinion, he should allow the people of this colony to consider this Bill and make recommendations before this Bill is passed. We have heard that a proposal put up by the Government to the British Union Oil Company was that they should lease the wells at Turner's Hall for a period of three months at a 10% royalty and at the expiration of that period they would work on a 50% basis. I feel that we should consider the natural resources of this island and I am not one who will agree that we should take the taxpayers' money and fritter it away with the British Union Oil Company if they should ask an exorbitant price as compensation for these wells. You will find that the British Union Oil Company is a

business Company, one which is out to make as much money as it can. In the negotiations between the Government and the British Union Oil Company the Company was offered a long-term lease for running these wells in lieu of cash compensation, but it considered that the lease was not worth while, and that the compensation was more than the lease. The Government is willing to pay the compensation; if this community is called upon to pay for these wells and for the pipeline and the equipment of this Company it must be borne in mind that that will be a big drain on the resources of the island. I feel that the Government should see the wisdom of re-opening negotiations with this Company or of negotiating with some other Company for running these gas wells, and if money is being made out of this business it would be strange if nobody would be willing to negotiate with the Government in this matter. The Government must be very cautious as to how they are moving to acquire this equipment; because the British Union Oil Company are out to make money. I feel that the Government is a little too anxious in this matter; I feel that it would be very hard on this island if we have to commit ourselves to pay for this equipment when we do not know what is operating at the back of these people's minds—these people who were quite willing to carry on the wells which they have dug. I was pleased when the Gulf Oil Corporation came in because I feel that the British Union Oil Company did not act correctly in walking out when negotiations were going on. I blame them for that. If you read the terms of the Licence which has been granted to the Gulf Oil Corporation you will find in Part I of the First Schedule the lands which they may select for leases. These lands are in the parishes of St. Lucy, St. Peter, St. Andrew, St. Joseph, St. Thomas and Christ Church, excluding these gas wells No. 19 and No. 20 and the horizon to the extent of 100 acres surrounding these wells. That is where the danger lies and if this Government is not careful it may be holding empty wells and the money will be going somewhere else. We must realise that it is the money which will be going out of the island which counts; we will suffer if our Treasury is depleted and certain social reforms will not be carried out. We must think of the future.

I am of the opinion that in the Agreement which has been entered into with the Gulf Oil Corporation you cannot have a regulation that they must drill two or three miles outside the particular area, because that would be making the Agreement null and void. And imagine a person drilling a well and the Government saying that he cannot drill further than 8,000 feet! All these things should be gone into before we rush headlong into a Bill of this sort. I repeat that if the honourable senior member for St. Joseph realises that he has a sound case, there is no harm in postponing the further consideration of this Bill for a week, and the British Union Oil Company could carry on these wells for another few months. I would like the honourable member to feel that I am not definitely against this Bill provided that he can show me the reason why we cannot get out of this affair. The people must come first when it comes to this gas question: I will not agree to any closing down of these wells. I feel that these wells must continue to be run while negotiations are being carried on and negotiations could be carried on until we come to some decision. I feel that the British Union Oil Company will carry on these wells because business people do not really go out of business unless they see that the bottom will drop out of it; they will not want to break negotiations unless they feel that something is wrong;

and this Company must have seen a weak spot which we have not seen. I feel that the Government should be very cautious in rushing headlong and acquiring all the equipment of the British Union Oil Company because we have got to pay for it. We are not controlled by any dictatorship; we are still in a democratic country and we should do all in our power to avoid stepping into anything for which we will be eventually sorry. If the British Union Oil Company has refused to carry on these wells, has the Government approached the Gulf Oil Corporation in the matter? All these things must be considered. I am sceptical about pressing this Bill too hard; business people do not give up incomes unless they see that things are getting weak, and if things are getting weak for the British Union Oil Company they will be getting weak for the Government. The Government can undertake things, it is true, but the people will pay for them and so the Government must be very cautious. I repeat that the honourable senior member for St. Joseph should **not be scared** about postponing the further consideration of this Bill; we might be able to give him some information which he has not got, and we may be able to prevent the Government from doing something which may be detrimental to the colony. If the honourable member does not intend to postpone the further consideration of this Bill for a week, we can talk until this day week and that will not matter; but I would like him to realise that I cannot vote for this Bill until I see that it must be brought down. If the honourable member cannot give any good reasons for having brought down this Bill I am bound to vote against it. I think we should **work for the benefit of the community**; this is not a question of Party politics, this is something by which the community will benefit or suffer. I am a member of the community and therefore I may have to pay for something which might have been avoided if we had postponed the further consideration of this Bill. There is no rush to get this Bill through; I am sure that the British Union Oil Company will carry on for a few more days, and before we come to the stage where we have to leave the House without having had any sound argument for passing this Bill, I think it is better for the honourable senior member for St. Joseph to see our point of view. The honourable member has the facts and he knows quite well that if this Bill is something which is for the good of the community, he as a man should be willing to give the Opposition and the public the opportunity to learn something about the Bill. This Bill has cropped up suddenly; it is nothing about which one knew three or four weeks ago and I do not think that the honourable member should rush it through tonight. We have to hear the views of both sides in this matter and in my opinion the postponement of the further consideration of this Bill for a week will not make much difference. I hope that the honourable member will use his wisdom: I know that he is humane and sometimes he will get a little upset, but this is an important issue and the honourable member should consider the community more so than rushing through this Bill.

Mr. ADAMS: I am speaking now purely on the motion for postponement: I do not propose to reply generally. I feel sure that at the end of my second sentence honourable members will not want the consideration of this Bill to be postponed. The honourable senior member for the City has suggested that I should answer certain questions and apparently his further suggestion is that if satisfactory answers cannot be given we

should postpone further debate on this Bill; in fact he has moved that the second reading of the Bill be postponed for a week. I suspect many reasons for moving for that postponement. I am perfectly sure that if hon. members were to see what necessarily follows from the position reached between the British Union Oil Company and the Government they would hasten to get this Bill through. The stage was reached that close on the proclamation of the coming into force of the Petroleum Act on the 26th April, the Attorney for Turner's Hall gave notice on the advice of his lawyers—I suppose to his regret—to the British Union Oil Company to pack up their trunks and get off his land. When we remember that institutions and other places are dependent upon the supply of natural gas we had to consider the inconvenience to which these places would be put if the supply of this gas were cut off. Negotiations were begun between the Government and the British Union Oil Company for the Company to continue to operate, and throughout the negotiations, as the hon. senior member for the City has said, the British Union Oil Company were pointing out that the radius of 100 acres surrounding the gas wells was too small and they wanted protection. Then the 26th August became a very material date—I mention these dates in order to show that negotiations were constantly going on. Short-term arrangements were made and the time approached for these negotiations to be completed. When the terms were finalised we reached a position where I am sure that every hon. member sitting around this Table will agree with the Government. The Government said: "We are willing to put you in the position in which you were before the Petroleum Act was passed, lease or anything you like." The Company said that the 100-acre radius of these wells is not sufficient and they wanted protection from the Gulf Oil Corporation outside the 100-acre limit minimising their wells.

In the negotiations it was established and admitted that nobody knows, humanly speaking, whether if you sink a well at the top of St. George, it will drain a reservoir in St. Andrew. The Government said that as far as practicable they would do anything to ensure that the gas is not diminished by a lease given to anybody else. That was not all; from time to time the Company would say that their principals in London would have to give assent to proposals put up at this end, and, finally, the Government got a letter from the Company's Solicitors enclosing a letter from that chronic letter writer, Mr. Herbert Sealy. The Company's last proposal was that they should be given the sole right to sell gas in this island; in fact it was put in writing that within a radius of $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles from Turner's Hall to the Belle they must have the sole right to sell gas for as long as the licence lasted. The last straw was this monopoly, that within that radius nobody should have the right to sell gas but this Company. (Mr. MOTTLEY: Nobody could agree with that). That is why the negotiations broke down; what is the good of continuing with a Company like that? You give an inch and they ask an ell. On the 30th September Mr. Herbert Sealy wrote a letter pointing out that the Government was acting illegally, that the Government had no right to operate anything and all it could do was to grant a licence to operate, and that if within seven days they did not get a lease from the Government they would have to get off the land. The position now is that it is necessary for the Government, not having a Department which can take over and operate this business, to set up a Corporation to deal with it. I must thank hon. members who have spoken; nobody could be so unmindful of his duty to the community as to allow anything to happen to cause these wells to be shut down. In the light of what I have said we have to move speedily; we

have to try and jump ahead of the seven days' notice which has been given, and I hope that this motion for postponing the further consideration of this Bill will not go to the vote.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A motion has been made that this Bill be now read a second time. An amendment has been moved that this Bill be read a second time this day week. I shall put the amendment first. The question is that this Bill be read a second time this day week. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye," those against will please say "No." I think the "Noes" have it.

The following division was taken:—

Ayes: MESSRS. MOTTLEY, GILL, GODDARD, REECE, WILKINSON and WARD—6.

Noes: MESSRS. SMITH, ALLDER, MILLER, MAPP, BRYAN, COX, F. L. WALCOTT, ADAMS, BRANCKER and DR. CUMMINS—10.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the negative, six hon. members voting "Aye," and ten hon. members voting "No." The question now is that this Bill be now read a second time. Hon. members in favour of that will please say "Aye," those against will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: MESSRS. SMITH, ALLDER, MILLER, MAPP, BRYAN, COX, F. L. WALCOTT, ADAMS, BRANCKER and DR. CUMMINS—10.

Noes: MESSRS. MOTTLEY, GILL, GODDARD, REECE, WILKINSON and WARD—6.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the affirmative, ten hon. members voting "Aye," and six hon. members voting "No." I declare that the "Ayes" have it.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to move that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee. This is a very important Bill, and as the hon. senior member for the City has said, we have not had time to really digest it. I think it is reasonable to ask that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee; there are many points in this Bill and I do not think it would be out of order to appoint a Select Committee to consider this very important matter.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that. Now that the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has made certain explanations which have been rather illuminating, he has brought out something which has caused me more or less to agree that this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee so that we can get to the bottom of it. All along I have been saying that the representatives of the British Union Oil Company have been unreasonable but now.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member must be careful to use a parliamentary word.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will use the word "dishonest." The hon. member has given the strongest reason why this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee; he has read out something which will cause us to make certain amendments if we have the opportunity to do so. The letter which the hon. member has read has shown that the British Union Oil Company was unreasonable, and that this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee because there are other matters which should be clarified and we will be able to deal with them in Select Committee. If what the hon. member has read out is correct, then this is an outrageous Company.

Mr. WARD: I see a reason why this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee. If this Company move out it will mean that we will not get any more of this fuel. The Government is using this fuel and that is something which should be taken into consid-

eration; but I feel that from what the hon. senior member for St. Joseph has said, there is a strong reason why we should know all the implications in this matter and a Select Committee will be able to ask questions in dealing with the matter.

Mr. MILLER: I should like to make a few remarks on this Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The principle of this Bill has already been approved and the hon. member will only be able to speak on the motion for going into Committee on the Bill or on the motion for the Bill being referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. REECE: It has been said that the best way of killing a Bill is to refer it to a Select Committee. That was in the old days when the members of the House were not alive to their responsibility (Cheers) and failed to attend meetings of Select Committees. After hearing the speech of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph and that of the honourable senior member for the City, one could not think that honourable members are not conscious of their duty and that they would not be ready to attend a meeting of the Select Committee when there is a matter of such importance to be considered. I do not propose to make a long speech on the merits of this Bill; the House has agreed to the motion for the second reading of the Bill, but I do not think it would be amiss if I point out that this Bill does more than acquire the pipeline and the equipment of this Company. This Bill seeks to create a Corporation to perform certain things; in Clause 9 it will be seen that it is the duty of this Corporation (a) to manage and work any natural gas undertaking acquired by the Corporation under this Act; (b) to establish, manage and work such natural gas undertakings as may be required in the public interest; and (c) to advise the Governor-in-Executive Committee, if so required, on all matters relating to the searching for, winning, getting, storing, treating, use and distribution of natural gas. And in Clause 10, it is set out that in addition to the powers conferred by Sub-clause (2) of Clause 9, the Corporation may carry on all or any of the following particular functions:— (a) the manufacture, provision, sale, letting on hire, connection, maintenance, repair, removal of any natural gas fittings; (b) the maintenance of shops and show-rooms for the display, sale, and hire of natural gas equipment of all kinds; and (c) the advertisement of such natural gas equipment whether by way of demonstration, exhibition or otherwise.

The question to be borne in mind is whether or not this Corporation should be given these wide powers. Unfortunately I was unable to be here earlier as I was attending the Court; but I was fortunate to hear the reply of the honourable senior member for St. Joseph. I was at a disadvantage in not being here earlier; the real question now is not whether the Corporation should come into existence because we have approved the second reading of the Bill, but whether the Corporation should have these additional powers.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House has approved the second reading of the Bill and if the honourable member is going to show that referring the Bill to a Select Committee might be of assistance, I will hear him on that point.

Mr. REECE: That is exactly my point. I do not think that we should grant the Corporation such wide powers as are mentioned in this Bill without giving the matter further consideration. The question as to whether the Corporation should have such wide powers or not has been discussed and determined by the Executive Committee; they must dis-

discuss the Bill before it comes before the House. I am suggesting that a Select Committee of the House is the proper body to determine how wide the powers and functions of the Corporation should be, and it would be more convenient to determine that question in Select Committee than in a Committee of the whole House. I know what the honourable senior member for St. Joseph is thinking; I know that he is anxious to get this Bill through. I do not think that the honourable member has any fear as regards his ability to have this Bill put on the Statute Book whenever he thinks fit that that should be done; but I know the honourable member well and I know that he does not like to exercise his authority arbitrarily. The honourable member has given an example of that this very afternoon; he has paid attention to the arguments advanced by the honourable senior member for the City and he has replied to them. In this matter I am asking him to see that it would be as well if a Select Committee went into the matter and determined whether from the point of view of the House as distinct from the point of view of the Executive Committee, the powers to be given to the Corporation should be as wide as has been suggested in this Bill. For those reasons, I beg to support the motion for referring this Bill to a Select Committee.

Mr. ADAMS: It is a bit surprising that the honourable member who has just sat down and the honourable senior member for the City have asked that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee, which is, in effect, seeking to get a postponement of the Bill in another way. The honourable junior member for Christ Church is a lawyer who is accustomed to dealing with company legislation, and he only has to glance at this Bill to see that it is an absolutely simple Bill for the establishment of a Corporation and giving it certain powers. The honourable senior member for the City has almost unique knowledge of finance, high and otherwise; he has commercial ability and with his power of grasping things quickly he could not possibly want this Bill to be referred to a Select Committee. One might have argued that there were certain alternatives before us, and with your permission, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would say this: the Gulf Oil Corporation would say that they have no interest in making money out of gas, and as far as we can see, there is nobody else on the horizon who would have an interest in selling gas. Our prognostications for the future can only be based on the experience of the past; and, when as recently as the 26th September, we had one firm of Solicitors sending to another firm of Solicitors and saying that the Government is acting illegally, we have to come down with this legislation. These are the actual words: "On behalf of the owners of Turner's Hall plantation we are now instructed to require you to obtain a lease of the reservoir attached to Well No. 19 permitting you to operate the same within seven days, or, in the alternative to close the well. This notice is final." If tomorrow the Government woke up to find that the supply of natural gas to the Government institutions were cut off, the Government should resign because it would have failed, in the face of a clear statement like this, to take action in the matter. I will prophesy now that if we pass this Bill tonight, the wells will be in operation tomorrow and nobody will throw cement or anything in them. The passing of this Bill tonight will prevent any accident from taking place: there are present with us three or rather two lawyers in the Opposition—I am told that the honourable junior member for St. Lucy is not in the Opposition—and this is a simple Bill before us. As far as the Government is con-

cerned, we are prepared for every line of this Bill to be explained in its legal aspect.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A motion has been made that I do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill. An amendment has been moved that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee. I shall put the amendment first; the question is that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye," those against will please say "No." I think the "Noes" have it.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs MOTTLEY, GODDARD, REECE, WILKINSON, GILL, and WARD—6.

Noes: Messrs ALLDER, MILLER, SMITH, BRYAN, COX, F. L. WALCOTT, ADAMS, BRANCKER, MAPP and Dr. CUMMINS—10.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question has been decided in the negative, six honourable members voting "Aye" and ten honourable members voting "No." The question now is that I do now leave the Chair, and the House go into Committee on this Bill. Honourable members in favour of that will please say "Aye," those against will please say "No." I think the "Ayes" have it. Before I leave the Chair I should like to point out that in Clauses 16 and 22 it is proposed to lay certain documents on the Tables of both Houses of the Legislature. I think the question of a time-limit should be considered and I draw that point to the attention of honourable members, particularly the honourable senior member for St. Joseph.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. SMITH being in the Chair.

Clause 1, the title Clause, and Clause 2 were read and passed.

Mr. COX: I beg to move that the further Clauses of the Bill be taken as read on the numbers being called.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 5 were called and passed.

Clause 6 was called as follows:—

6. (1) The Corporation shall consist of a Chairman and not more than four members all of whom shall be appointed by the Governor.

(2) Every member of the Corporation shall hold and vacate his office in accordance with the terms of his appointment and shall, on ceasing to be a member, be eligible for re-appointment.

Provided that any member may at any time by notice in writing to the Governor resign his office.

(3) A person shall be disqualified from being appointed or being a member of the Corporation so long as he is a member of either House of the Legislature.

Provided that the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to a public officer who is a member of the Legislative Council.

(4) The Governor may appoint any person to be a temporary member of the Corporation during the temporary incapacity from illness or during the temporary absence from the Island of any member.

(5) The Governor may appoint any member of the Corporation to be temporary Chairman during the temporary incapacity from illness or during the temporary absence from the Island of the Chairman.

(6) The quorum at all meetings shall be three members, of whom one shall be the Chairman or the temporary Chairman.

(7) There shall be paid to the members of the Corporation or to any of them, such remuneration, fees and allowances for expenses as the Governor-in-Executive Committee may determine.

Provided that no such remuneration or fee shall be paid under the provisions of this section to any person who is in receipt of emoluments from the Government, except such allowance as may be expressly authorized by the Governor.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 6 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I do not follow the terms of appointment of members of the Corporation. Do honourable members not think that the number of years during which a member of the Corporation shall hold office should be stated? I suggest that the number of years be five, but if the honourable member in charge of the Bill think that the period should be three years, I would not object to that. However I beg to move that the words "For a term not exceeding five years" be added at the end of Sub-Clause (1).

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: Exactly what has happened to the honourable member while he was on his feet has happened to the Government. We said that we should put in a period of five years or three years and the result was that we did not make up our minds as to whether the period should be three or five years. It is better to leave the Sub-clause as it is, but I suggest that the shorter term is better because the members are eligible for re-appointment. A man might be there and you would be unable to get rid of him unless he resigns; all of that occurred to us in Executive Committee and it was decided to leave the matter as it is. This Bill was drafted similar to legislation which exists in other parts of the British Empire: whatever argument is used to justify the period of three years I could use to justify the period of five years, and similarly whatever argument is used against the period of three years I could use against the period of five years. This matter will be reported to the Governor and he will take action in connection with it, but I have no instructions for putting in an amendment for a fixed period.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The honourable member's argument cannot hold water because I have suggested that the period should be one not exceeding three or five years. The Governor therefore has a discretion to make the period one not exceeding three or five years; surely he could appoint members of the Corporation for one, two, three or five years. We want to ensure that the Governor cannot appoint a member for ten or fifteen years; if we put in the words "For a period not exceeding five years" that does not mean that a member must be appointed for five years. We should have a limited period during which members of the Corporation shall hold office; you may have a Governor appointing members of the Corporation for a very long period.

Mr. MAPP: I was inclined to agree with the honourable member, but I notice that Clause 7 says: (1) The Governor may at any time remove from office all or so many of the members of the Corporation as he may consider necessary in the interests of the effective and economical performance of the functions of the Corporation.

I know that there will be the old prejudice against putting these matters in the hands of Governors; but even if you have a limited period and the responsibility is in the hands of the Governor, a member of the Corporation can be re-appointed unless the Governor takes action under Clause 7 of the Bill. The strength of this Clause eliminates the honourable member's objection.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I ask leave to withdraw my motion.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: As regards Sub-clause (7) if you have an amount of \$10,000 or \$20,000 in the annual Estimates for the purpose of running this Corporation and the warrant of the Governor goes to the Colonial Treasurer, he will pay the money. That is not subject to any legislation. I think that the words "Subject to the approval of the Legislature" should be added at the end of this Sub-clause. I see great wisdom in an amendment allowing the Legislature to approve of the payment of the members of this Corporation. When you come down with the Estimates and there is a Head in respect of payment of the members of this Corporation nobody can prevent them from being paid; but if we add to this Sub-clause the words "Subject to the approval of the Legislature" that will mean that we will know how the members are being paid.

Mr. ADAMS: It is only at the beginning if there are no funds with which to start, that you would have to come to the Legislature. This Bill provides that the members of the Corporation will be paid out of the funds of the Corporation; the Corporation will be paying its officers and servants. We are not in the year 1945; we talk about self-government and let us keep apart the duties of the Legislature and those of the Administration. It is the duty of the members of the Executive Committee to show responsibility in this matter, and if a vote of censure goes against them they will have to resign. The Governor would be failing in his duty if he did not prorogue the Legislature and get rid of the Executive against which a vote of censure has gone. The duty of the Legislature is to pass laws and the duty of the Administration is to administer them; do not let us say anything about the approval of the Legislature in this Clause. As I have said, a money Resolution would only apply immediately at the beginning and it is not a question of coming back to the Legislature for money in every case because the Corporation pays its expenses. I ask honourable members to see that this is a matter which should be left to the Executive Committee and not to be debated in the House except in case of censure of the Government if you do not agree with it.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move that the words "With the approval of the Legislature" be added at the end of line 4 of this Sub-clause.

Mr. GODDARD: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: We are giving the Corporation power to borrow money with the approval of the Legislature. Let us stick to administrative principles and let us stick to legislative principles.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If the Corporation in Trinidad want to borrow money they will have to go to the Legislature. Is it the idea that because you set up this Corporation you give it powers plenary? I do not agree with that at all. When honourable members reflect on this matter they are bound to see that that is not correct. And because you are going to have ministerial status are you saying that these payments should be made without the approval of the Legislature? I suggest that this amendment should be made.

Mr. ADAMS: The honourable member is confusing two entirely different things. If they are allowed to borrow a million dollars in Trinidad the ratepayers will have to pay for it; if the Vestries of Christ Church and St. Michael decide to buy anything, the ratepayers are going to pay for it. Where you appoint a Corporation with limited power

ers which might affect the pockets of the people of a whole district, obviously you limit it by saying that before you raise this loan we have to see this, that and the other. In this case, there is a statutory division of the Government. If we had a Petroleum Department the sale of natural gas would be run in the same way as the Waterworks Department is being run to-day. This Corporation will be a Statutory Sub-Committee of the Executive Committee; the Executive Committee will deal with this matter through the Corporation. We cannot ask the Corporation to come to the Legislature every time they want money; they have to keep proper audited accounts and copies of statements and reports must be laid on the Tables of both Houses of the Legislature. In our desire to be democratic, let us keep a check on things; but do not let us keep a check in the wrong place. To say that the Corporation must come to the Legislature for money is nothing as compared with the powers which are given to the Corporation. Let us speak with the same voice all the time; let us clamour for ministerial responsibility but do not let us go back to the old days.

Mr. MOTTLEY: The honourable member has said that I am confusing two different issues. You are going to carry on this commodity as a nationalised industry and a Corporation is going to run it. If you have a Corporation they should come to the Legislature for money, otherwise it does not seem right to me. This is not a question of bringing administrative details here; if these payments should not be made with the approval of the Legislature with whose approval should they be made? I do not think that we should wait until something has happened and then talk about passing a vote of censure against the Executive Committee.

Mr. ADAMS: What is the difference between the Chairman of the Corporation and the man who sweeps the yard at Turner's Hall except a difference in salary? Does everybody want the Legislature to approve of the wages paid to every turncock for instance? The principle is the same here; you must give some credit to the Corporation which, I repeat, is a Statutory Sub-committee of the Executive Committee and which will have instructions from the Executive Committee, you must give the Executive Committee credit for seeing that salaries remain as they are. Unless the honourable member is prepared to say that every single act of the Corporation must come up for legislative approval he must see that he cannot maintain his present position.

Mr. MOTTLEY: In connection with the Waterworks Department we know that the Manager is paid so much money and that is fixed by law; but in this case before us payments are going to be made with the approval of the Governor-in-Executive Committee. I say that the Legislature should approve of these payments. What the honourable member said about the turncocks is a question of administrative detail, but should you have a Board set up with somebody drawing £2,000 a year without the approval of the Legislature?

The question that the words proposed to be added at the end of Sub-clause (7) stand part of the Clause was put and resolved in the negative.

A division was taken as follows:—

Ayes: Messrs. ALLDER, MOTTLEY, GODDARD and WILKINSON—4.

Noes: Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Messrs. MILLER, MAPP, BRYAN, F. L. WALCOTT, ADAMS, and Dr. CUMMINS—7.

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

Clause 7 was called and passed.

Clause 8 was called as follows:—

8. A member of the Corporation who has any interests in any company or concern with which the Corporation proposes to make any contract or any interests in such contract shall disclose to the Corporation the fact of such interests and the nature thereof, and such disclosure shall be recorded in the minutes of the Corporation and such member shall take no part in any deliberation or discussion of the Corporation relating to such contract.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 8 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: If you read this Bill you will see that three out of five members which comprise the Corporation will form a quorum.

Mr. ADAMS: If I may interrupt the honourable member, I see the point he is making. I think we can pass this Clause, re-commit Clause 6 and insert the words "any other cause" after the word "illness" occurring in line 3 of Sub-clause (4).

The question that Clause 8 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 6 be re-committed.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the words "or any other cause" be inserted after the word "illness" occurring in line 3 of Sub-clause (4) of this Clause. That amendment would make a member of the Corporation who has any interests in any concern with which the Corporation proposes to make any contract, unable to take part in any deliberation or discussion of the Corporation relating to such contract.

Dr. CUMMINS seconded the motion which was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 6 as amended stand part of the Bill.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 9 to 15 inclusive are called and are agreed to.

Clause 16 is called.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to amend this clause by inserting the words "as soon as possible thereafter" after the word "shall" in line 1 of sub-paragraph b of sub-clause 2.

There being no objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 16, as amended, stand part of the Bill.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The question that Clause 16, as amended, stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 17 is called and is agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—Clause 18 is one of the most important clauses of the Bill and I suggest that it be read.

18. (1) Subject to the provisions of this Act, the privately owned natural gas plant, specified in the Schedule to this Act, owned and operated by the person specified therein prior to the commencement of this Act, shall on a day to be appointed by the

Governor-in-Executive Committee by notice in the *Official Gazette* (hereinafter referred to as the appointed day) be transferred to the Corporation.

(2) Upon the appointed day, the natural gas plant specified in the Schedule to this Act, shall by virtue of this Act, be transferred to and vest in the Corporation without further assurance.

(3) Until the appointed day such person shall keep and maintain such natural gas plant in as an efficient condition as theretofore.

(4) When the property in any natural gas plant is vested in the Corporation in accordance with the provisions of this section, the corporation shall pay therefor compensation as hereinafter provided.

(5) Compensation payable under this section shall, in default of determination by agreement, be determined by arbitration.

(6) The provisions of sections fifteen to twenty, both inclusive, of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949, with the necessary modifications and adaptations, shall have effect in respect of such arbitration.

(7) The amount of compensation determined by agreement or arbitration and any expenses incurred by the Corporation in the acquisition of any natural gas plant under the provisions of this section shall in the first place be paid for out of the Public Treasury on the warrant of the Governor-in-Executive Committee, but the Corporation shall repay to the Government such compensation and expenses.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that clause 18 stand part of the Bill.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The question that clause 18 stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 19 to 25 inclusive are read and are agreed to.

Clause 26 is called.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that clause 26 stand part of the Bill.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Chairman,—Sub-clause 4 of clause 26 states:—"The Corporation shall not construct, place, maintain, examine, repair, allow or remove any pipe line under, in, upon, over, along, or across any land, road, building, embankment, dock, harbour, or pier under the control of a Department of the Government or other public or parochial authority without the prior approval of the head of the Department concerned or of such public or parochial authority." I notice that this subclause provides that the Corporation shall not do certain things in respect of property under the control of a Department of the Government or other public or parochial authority without the prior approval of the head of the Department concerned or of such public or parochial authority but that nothing is said about the head of the Department or public or parochial authority refusing to give such approval. A case may arise in which it would be in the public's interest for the Corporation to do any or some of these things but may be prevented from so doing because of the refusal of the Department or public or parochial authority concerned.

Mr. ADAMS: It is easy to see the Colonial Secretary and the Head of the particular Department putting their heads together and effecting a settlement of an issue of that sort but the greater difficulty would be with a parochial authority. I shall bear in mind the point raised by the honourable member and draw it to the attention of the Attorney General. If

it is necessary to make any amendment along that line it may be done in the Other Place.

The question that clause 26 stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 27 to 31 inclusive are called and are agreed to.

The Schedule is called and is agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that clause 28 be re-committed.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

Mr. BRYAN: Mr. Chairman,—Subclause 2 of clause 28 states:—"In the case of a dispute as to the amount of compensation payable under the provisions of this section, the same shall be determined by a Police Magistrate exercising jurisdiction in the place where the land is situated." The point which I want to make is this: Suppose the amount of compensation is greater than that for which the Police Magistrate's Court has jurisdiction.

Mr. ADAMS: I see the honourable member's point, but the real reason for putting in a Police Magistrate's Court instead of a higher Court is to get things done as speedily as possible. You must give a Police Magistrate credit for showing as much intelligence as a Judge of the Court of Appeal. I beg to move that clause 28 stand part of the Bill.

Dr. CUMMINS: I beg to second that.

The question that clause 28 stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,—I beg to move that clause 22 be re-committed.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

The question that clause 22 be re-committed is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. ADAMS: I ask leave to insert the words "as soon as possible thereafter" after the word "shall" in line 2 of subclause 5 of clause 22. I beg to move that clause 22, as amended, stand part of the Bill.

Mr. COX: I beg to second that.

The question that clause 22, as amended, stand part of the Bill is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Mr. ADAMS, seconded by Mr. COX, the CHAIRMAN reports the passing of the Bill in Committee.

The House resumes and on the motions of Mr. ADAMS, seconded in each case by Mr. COX, the Bill is read a third time and is passed.

THE ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that this House do now adjourn to this day week, Tuesday, 24th October, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. F. L. WALCOTT: I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to move, as an amendment, that the words and figures "this day week, Tuesday, 24th" be deleted and the words "this day fortnight, Tuesday, 31st," be substituted therefor.

Mr. WILKINSON: I beg to second that.

The question that this House do now adjourn to this day fortnight, Tuesday, 31st October, at 3 o'clock p.m. is put and resolved in the negative, the division being as follows:—

Ayes: Mr. WILKINSON and Mr. REECE—2.

Noes: Messrs. SMITH, BRANCKER, ALLDER, MILLER, COX, ADAMS, F. L. WALCOTT, BRYAN, and MOTTLEY—9.

The question that the House do now adjourn to this day week, Tuesday, 24th October, 1950, at 3 o'clock p.m. is put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The House is accordingly adjourned.