

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Monday 22nd December, 1947.

The Council met at 2 p.m., His Excellency the Governor, Sir Charles Woolley, K.C.M.G., O.B.E., M.C., President, in the Chair.

PRESENT.

The President, His Excellency the Governor, Sir Charles Campbell Woolley, K.C.M.G., O.B.E., M.C.

The Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Mr. D. J. Parkinson (acting).

The Hon. the Attorney-General, Mr. E. M. Duke (acting).

The Hon. the Colonial Treasurer, Mr. E. F. McDavid, C.B.E.

The Hon. F. J. Seaford, C.B.E., (Nominated).

The Hon. Dr. J. B. Singh, O.B.E., (Demerara-Essequibo).

The Hon. Dr. J. A. Nicholson, (Georgetown North).

The Hon. T. Lee (Essequibo River).

The Hon. V. Roth (Nominated).

The Hon. T. T. Thompson (Nominated).

The Hon. D. P. Debidin (Eastern Demerara).

The Hon. J. Fernandes (Georgetown Central).

The Hon. Dr. G. M. Gonsalves (Eastern Berbice).

The Hon. Dr. C. Jagan (Central Demerara).

The Hon. W. O. R. Kendall (New Amsterdam).

The Hon. C. A. McDoom (Nominated).

The Hon. A. T. Peters (Western Berbice).

The Hon. W. A. Phang (North Western District).

The Hon. G. H. Smellie (Nominated).

The Clerk reads prayers.

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on the 19th of December, as printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

A PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SMELLIE: Sir, before proceeding with the Order of the Day I ask your permission to make a personal explanation. I regret that at the last meeting of the Council I spoke on the Workmen's Compensation (Amendment) Bill before it was introduced by the hon. the Attorney-General for the second reading. I confess that through inexperience I was led astray by the hon. Member who spoke immediately before me, and I should like to thank Your Excellency for the indulgence shown to me on that occasion, and to say that it was not my intention to oppose or obstruct the Bill, the provisions of which I was substantially in agreement with, I merely desired to draw Government's attention to the provisions of a certain clause. I should, of course, have waited until the Bill was in the Committee stage.

ORDER OF THE DAY

SHOPS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1947.

The PRESIDENT: I quite appreciate the point made by the hon. Member. I think when we adjourned on the last occasion we were considering an amendment to a certain clause of the Shops (Amendment) Bill proposed by the hon. Member for Eastern Demerara (Mr.

Debidin), and I think Government undertook to consider that particular point.

The Council resolved itself into Committee to resume consideration of the following Bill:—

A Bill intituled "An Ordinance further to amend the Shops Ordinance, 1944, with respect to the opening and closing hours of shops."

COUNCIL IN COMMITTEE

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Mr. E. M. Duke, acting): Since this Council last met I have given consideration not only to the amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Eastern Demerara (Mr. Debidin) but also to the remarks which were made by the hon. Member for Berbice River (Mr. Ferreira), and I propose to ask that certain amendments be made to clause 2 of the Bill as printed. Copies of the proposed amendments are in the hands of hon. Members. The first amendment is to insert as clause 2 (b) the following:

(b) by the addition of the following at the end of the proviso to subsection (1) —

" , or he may, in the case of a rural area, by Order in Council exempt all shops or any specified shop or class of shops in such area from the operation of this section; and where any such Order of exemption is made no shop assistant shall be employed in any shop to which the Order relates for more than forty-two hours in any one week."

The object of that proposed amendment is to meet the case where it is impracticable to prescribe any hours at all for the opening and closing of shops in particular rural areas. By this amendment the Governor in Council would be empowered to exempt all shops in a rural area or any specific shop, or any specific class of shops from the operation of section 5 of the Shops Ordinance, 1944, which provides specific hours for opening and closing of shops. But where the Governor in Council is pleased to make such an Order that would not mean that the shop assistants can be worked 24 hours a day. Where any such Order is made, no shop assistant shall be employed for more than 42 hours in any one week. The principle of the Shops Ordinance, 1944, is that of a maximum of 42 hours

per week in the case of shop assistants. That principle is maintained to its fullest extent by the amendment which is proposed. Consequential on the insertion of this amendment paragraphs (b) and (c) will be re-lettered (c) and (d) respectively. Then there is a typographical error in par. (c) in which the words "such and Order is made" should read "such an Order is made."

Further I propose to move that there be added as paragraph (e) the following:

"(e) by the addition of the following as subsection (3) —

"(3) It shall be a defence to any proceedings, in relation to a shop in a rural area, for contravention or failure to comply with the provisions of sub-section (1) of this section, to prove that such shop was opened, or kept or permitted to be open, as the case may be, for the purpose only of taking delivery of goods wares and merchandise which have arrived at and for the shop."

That proposed amendment meets to a certain extent the objections which have been raised by the hon. Member for Eastern Demerara (Mr. Debidin). The hon. Member further proposed that there should be no offence constituted where a window of a shop is opened for the purpose of cleaning or airing the shop, but an amendment of that sort might give rise to very great difficulties, and might lead to abuse, whereas the amendment which I am putting before the Council would not, because, if a cart does in fact arrive at a shop with goods the cart would be visible for everybody to see, and the goods would be also visible, but in the case of a window being opened or allowed to be opened for the purpose of cleaning or airing the shop that is a matter which is really only within the knowledge of the shop manager, and other circumstances might arise or might be the case, and the shop manager might very easily be able to say that what was really being done was cleaning and airing the shop, which is done inside. I move that clause 2 be amended in accordance with those amendments which I have read.

Mr. PETERS: May I inquire whether the hon. the Attorney-General had in mind the question of shifts in referring

to the 42-hour period of work per week for shop assistants. The question is whether the 42 hours would be continuous, or whether it might be computed in shifts arranged to suit the convenience of those working in the shop?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The words in the amendment are as follows:

Clause 2 (d): "and where such an order is made, shop assistants may be employed, for the purpose specified in the Order only, in the shop or class of shops specified in the Order at any time such shop or class of shops may be opened."

No hours will be prescribed, but no shop assistant shall be employed during any week for more than 42 hours, which may begin at any time.

Mr. PETERS: Therefore that means that if it becomes necessary or convenient to open a shop for the purpose of receiving goods at any time in the night that would be permissible?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Yes, that is so.

Mr. PETERS: What is the definition of "shop assistants"? Does the term include members of the family of the owner of a shop, or only strangers employed?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The term "shop assistant" is defined in section 2 of the Ordinance of 1944 which says:

"Shop assistant" means any person wholly or mainly employed in or about a shop in connection with the service of customers or the receipt of orders or money or the receipt or despatch of goods."

I cannot improve on that. It is there. (laughter).

Mr. LEE: I think the hon. Member for Western Berbice (Mr. Peters) is trying to point out to Government that there are several instances in which members of a shop owner's family assist in the shop, and that they would not come within the proposed amendment. Some members of a family do not receive salaries; they are voluntary

workers, and cannot be described as shop assistants. For example, a shop owner may come to Georgetown to purchase goods, and may leave his wife or his son in charge of the shop. He may not return in time to receive those goods himself. Could his wife, his son, or even his daughter open the shop to receive the goods in his absence? I think some provision should be made in the definition of "shop assistant" to include members of the family of a shop owner.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The hon. Member has entirely missed the point. The object of the first amendment is to give the Governor in Council power to exempt from the operation of section 5 of the Shops Ordinance, 1944, shops in rural areas where it is impracticable to fix definite hours for opening and closing. That is the object of that amendment, but there must be a proviso, and the proviso is this: that where an Order of exemption is made no shop assistant employed in any of those shops shall be so employed for more than 42 hours in any one week, because that is the principle of the Shops Ordinance, and that principle is being maintained.

Mr. LEE: I am not quite satisfied with the explanation given by the hon. the Attorney-General. Are we going to term a shopkeeper's wife and children "shop assistants?" They are not included in the definition of "shop assistants."

Mr. DEBIDIN: I regret that I had not an opportunity to see the amendments drafted by the hon. the Attorney-General before coming into Council. I had hoped that I would have been served with a copy so as to be able to make a better study of them. However, on perusal I have observed that a very important element in the amendment which I moved on the last occasion has been omitted entirely—the point dealing with the cleaning and airing of shops in the rural areas. I consider that to be even more important than the opening of shops for the purpose of receiving goods. When shops in the rural areas are closed on Saturday nights there is no opportunity for cleaning them until the

following day which is Sunday. It is necessary to open a window in order to admit light and air. It cannot be suggested that lamp light is a good substitute for sunlight, and moreover, after a shop has been scrubbed a certain amount of air is required for the drying of the floor and counters. A certain amount of humidity would result if the shop is kept closed after scrubbing has been done, with probable damage to the goods in it.

With regard to the opening of a window I would not agree with anyone who suggests that it would open the way to illicit trading, because it is common knowledge that anyone who wishes to indulge in illicit Sunday trading would do so secretly. To pass goods through an open window would be courting disaster. I know of the case in which the firm of S. Wreford & Co., New Amsterdam, was prosecuted for keeping a window or a door open after closing time, and found to have violated the law. In that particular instance stock-taking was being done. Where there is opening of a shop for a legitimate purpose I do not see why it should be felt that shop owners would be so perverse as to seek that particular opportunity to carry on illicit trading. There is a small Police Force in the country districts with some rural constables, and it is quite easy for a shop-keeper to trade during closing hours without having a window open. I therefore do not think the hon. the Attorney-General should emphasize that if such a provision were made it would lead to a wide practice of illicit trading.

I strongly urge that that portion of my amendment should be put to the Council. There have been too many prosecutions under that section, and shop-keepers are helpless about it. I commend the hon. the Attorney-General on having made ample provision in his amendment for the receiving of goods, but if it is necessary to do so I would move the second part of my amendment, that provision be made to enable proprietors of shops in rural areas to open a window in order to facilitate cleaning and airing of their shops. I would suggest the addition of the words: "and also for the open-

ing of a window for the purpose of cleaning and/or stock taking." I think if those words were added to the amendment they would meet the case. I move that as an amendment to clause 2 (e).

Mr. ROTH: With reference to the question of the open window, I must confess that the hon. Member who has just taken his seat has convinced me of the righteousness of his argument but I can also follow the reasons which the hon. the Attorney-General has against it. I would suggest that both sides could be met by a compromise and that is that windows be opened at the time and for the reasons stated, provided they are securely covered by wire mesh.

The CHAIRMAN: Can the hon. Member for Eastern Demerara tell me what greater reason there is for such a provision in the country than in the town where it does not exist?

Mr. DEBIDIN: The shops in the country districts are usually very small and built entirely of wood. Then there are usually no glass windows to admit light, with the result that there is hardly ever sufficient ingress for fresh air and light. On the other hand, the majority of the shops in the City are better provided for—as suggested by the hon. Nominated Member who has just taken his seat. They have wire mesh over the windows and some of the doors, and usually have more space for the accommodation of goods and everything else. If the shops in the country districts are closed while they are being cleaned there would be darkness within and much of the goods around the counter would get wet and damaged. I do not think they stand in the same position as the shops in the City.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: These shops in the rural areas are not always very busy. As a matter of fact, we know that in some of these shops draughts, bridge and other games are played during the greater part of the day and I should like to know why the cleaning cannot be done during ordinary hours.

Mr. THOMPSON: I support,

heartily, the amendment as moved by the hon. the Attorney General. I am a resident of the country and I can say that shops in the country districts are built along strictly sanitary lines. No sanitary officer is going to pass a shop building if it is stuffy and so built that people cannot get along safely in it. I know of many shops in which cleaning is done through the back doors without any complaints, so that I cannot see the necessity for providing for the opening of windows which might lead to evasion of the law. I take it that this Bill is intended to continue certain Defence Regulations which will expire on December 31 and if hon. Members are not going to support Government then what is the good of it. I agree that provision should be made for the receiving of goods by shopkeepers in the country districts and the hon. Member for Eastern Demerara has stated that he is satisfied with the amendment moved by the hon. Attorney General in that respect. I do not think we should waste any more time and I support, heartily, the amendment moved by the hon. the Attorney General.

Amendment put and agreed to.

Council resumed.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I beg to move that the Bill be now read third time and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

Motion put and agreed to.

Bill read a third time and passed.

IMMIGRATION BILL, 1947

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I beg to move that the relevant Standing Rules and Orders be suspended in order to permit the following Bill to be read the second time and to be passed through all its remaining stages to-day:—

A Bill intituled "An Ordinance with respect to Immigration and for purposes connected therewith."

The COLONIAL TREASURER seconded.

Question put and agreed to.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: an important Bill as there are certain Defence Regulations which will expire at the end of this year and it is necessary that they should be continued by Ordinance as from January 1, 1948. I move that the Bill be now read the second time.

The COLONIAL TREASURER seconded.

Motion put and agreed to.

Bill read the second time.

COUNCIL IN COMMITTEE.

Council resolved itself into Committee to consider the Bill clause by clause.

Mr. DEBIDIN: I should like to make an observation. On perusal I find that this is far too important a Bill to be rushed through this Council and I respectfully ask that its consideration in Committee be deferred to a subsequent date—before the end of the year if possible. As the Attorney General has stated, there are certain Regulations to be continued and from what I have seen I am satisfied that the Bill is far too important to be rushed through this Council. There are clauses of a far-reaching effect in it, especially at this time when we are thinking of introducing population into the country. Then there is the question of the present immigration laws—those on our statute books—which have to be considered with the passing of this Bill, and I feel that all these are matters which should be carefully tackled by those hon. Members who want to go into this question. Personally, I would like to make a few observations on the Bill but not at this stage.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Member wishes to have the Bill deferred he should give some indication of the points he desires to make. I suggest to the hon. Member to bring up his points as we go through the Bill clause by clause. The Bill should be passed by the end of the year, otherwise we would have no law to govern immigration. As I have already

stated, however, I do not want to rush it through.

Mr. DEBIDIN: It seems to me that most of the clauses of the Bill are interdependent and one might consider a particular clause while another is affected, with the result that the whole thing might not be put together properly. I feel that it is necessary to make a study of the complete Bill and not of any particular clause in order to make useful observations on it.

The CHAIRMAN: Does any other Member wish to speak on the question of deferring the Bill?

Mr. LEE: I would like to support the suggestion that the Bill be deferred and brought up again before the year ends. I also have been considering certain points in it—particularly the one relating to the question of domicile—and I would like to be clear on them before the Bill becomes law. I would like to know what would happen if a man leaves the Colony and loses his domicile, and then returns. How would he be affected, especially as regards the divorce laws? Then there is the question of persons entering the Colony without passports. I think all those points should be considered carefully in detail. I know of three cases where much difficulty and inconvenience arose because persons arrived here without proper passports. In one case two women arrived here from St. Lucia to join their husbands who were employed on a grant in the Demerara River and they were detained for over four days before they got someone—Mr. Archer—to sign a bond for them. It happened that their husbands knew they were coming, but did not know on what date they would arrive. Mr. Archer spoke to the owner of the grant and the matter was mentioned to me over the telephone after which the two women were made to sign a bond. If we are going to encourage workers from the West Indian islands to come here I think we should give them free and easy access to the Colony.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that is covered in the Bill.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Two points have been made by the hon. Member for Essequibo River and if they are the only objections he has against the Bill I am sure that after hearing me he would not urge that its further consideration be postponed.

Mr. DEBIDIN: May I move a motion at this stage that further consideration of the Bill be postponed?

The CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. Member is rather late; the second reading has already been passed.

Mr. DEBIDIN: I beg to move that further consideration of this Bill be deferred until next week.

The CHAIRMAN: I just want to remind the hon. Member that there is only one more meeting possible, and that is on December 30, on which date the Budget Statement will be presented. It must be remembered that the Christmas holidays are coming in.

Mr. LEE: If necessary we can sit during the night.

Question put and not agreed to.

Motion lost.

Clause 5—Person entering the Colony to have a passport.

Mr. LEE: I would like to move an amendment to the effect that the word "shall" after the word "passport" in clause 5 (1) be substituted by the word "may". I also wanted to move an amendment to clause 3 (f) which makes a person a prohibited immigrant if he "is not in possession of sufficient means to support himself and such of his dependents as he shall bring with him to the Colony..." I feel that a definite sum should have been stated there, because a man might arrive in the Colony and show an Immigration Officer \$500 and yet be told that he has not got sufficient money in his possession, whereas an agricultural or other worker might be admitted with \$25. I think, therefore, it would be wise to state what amount would be regarded as "sufficient means".

Dr. SINGH: If the hon. Member would read further he would see that there are exemptions whereby certain persons would not be regarded as prohibited immigrants for the purposes of this Ordinance. Certain persons need not have any passports.

Mr. LEE: That is what I am trying to point out to this Council. If we are going to have an interchange of visits in the British Colonies in these parts, why should there be this provision insisting on passports being produced.

The CHAIRMAN: I think this provision is the same as that in the Trinidad law.

Mr. LEE: But the intention, to my mind, is that there should be free travelling—without passports—for the people in the West Indies when travelling from one part to another.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I should like to mention for the information of the hon. Member that sub-clause 5 (2) defines a passport. As the hon. Member knows, there is what is called a "travel permit". A document known as a travel permit has been agreed upon between the British West Indian colonies for the purpose of inter-communication between the British West Indian Colonies and British Guiana, but apart from that sub-clause 5 (4) empowers the Governor in Council to exempt from the provisions of section 5 "any person or any class of persons entering the Colony, and such exemption may be general or subject to such conditions, restrictions, limitations or exceptions as are specified in the Order." Clause 5, therefore, enables any particular case to be dealt with, and dealt with in a statutory and proper manner.

Mr. SEAFORD: Doesn't clause 5 (3) meet the point when it says :—

"(3) The Governor in Council may, by Order published in the Gazette,—

(a) direct that no passport of a subject or citizen of any foreign country, or of any specified foreign country, shall be accepted as such under this section unless it bears a British consular visa valid for the Colony...."

Mr. LEE: That is my point. If I may

again explain it, one of the ideas of federation is that the people of the British West Indies should have easy intercourse among themselves, without any formality or hindrance. Let us assume for the sake of argument that that has been preached in the idea of federation; are we going to insist here on passports from people of the British West Indies who may wish to come to British Guiana, if they do not have a bad character?

The CHAIRMAN: But there may be the fear of conviction.

Mr. LEE: Under the Immigration Law we have the right to deport any immigrant if he or she is a convict. We are trying to link the West Indies closer with British Guiana and it would be in the interest of all concerned to provide for the easy entrance of immigrants here.

Mr. ROTH: To a point of correction: I think the hon. Member is speaking for himself when he says that, and not for the Council as a whole

Mr. LEE: I am not speaking about people who have not studied the question, but of the points as put forward by the Caribbean Labour Conference. My point is that if good and honest people have not got the show money we should not prevent them from coming into the Colony. I have asked the Police for a permit for a person to go to Trinidad, only to find them asking me questions like "why is he going to Trinidad?" I think this matter should be dealt with from a wide aspect, since the idea is to give the people of the British West Indies easy access to the various Colonies in these parts and to let us know each other better.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The object of this clause is merely to provide that every person who seeks access to this Colony must be able to prove his identity. If he has a document which is a passport, then he would be able to establish by that document where he is from. The document itself will establish whether he has come from one of the West Indian islands, and if he has not got it he would have great difficulty in

proving his identity because it would require a number of people to come and do so. I may also point out that the provisions in this Bill are similar to those which exist in Trinidad and Jamaica.

Mr. FERNANDES: I can safely say that I have had considerable experience with passengers coming in and going out of the Colony and I desire to congratulate the hon. the Attorney-General for the manner in which he has handled the many difficulties which arise. I think clause 5 covers everything relating to the point and I cannot see how it would interfere with the liberty of anyone who wants to come here from the British West Indian Islands. I do not know if the hon. Member for Essequibo River has considered what might happen to us if we make it possible for anybody to walk in here and just say that he belongs to the British West Indies when he might really belong to somewhere else. I think the clause is quite satisfactory when it says:—

“(1) Except as otherwise provided in this section, every person entering the Colony without a passport shall be deemed to be a prohibited immigrant unless he explains why he has no passport and establishes to the satisfaction of the immigration officer his identity and national status.”

I cannot see that any difficulty or hardship whatever would be caused by this provision to any person who wants to come here in the ordinary way. I think the clause as it stands covers all the difficulties that may arise under that head.

Clause 5 put and agreed to.

Clause 15—Permits to prohibited immigrants.

Mr. LEE: I would like to know whether a definite sum could not be put as a bond or security acceptable to the Immigration Officer?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: To save time I would point out to my learned friend that Regulations have to be made and the security would have to be fixed by Regulations. Those Regulations will have to come to the Council and there

will be ample opportunity at some subsequent time for any Member to object to the amount of security to be fixed by the Regulations under the Ordinance.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that meets the hon. Member's point.

Clause 33—Evidence and burden of proof.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: With reference to this clause I move that the words “or given” be added at the end of paragraph (c).

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 40—Commencement of Ordinance.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: With reference to this clause I beg to move that it should read:—

“This Ordinance shall come into operation on the first day of January, 1948”.

The CHAIRMAN: What about the Regulations?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: They have been already drafted. There is sufficient in the Ordinance, however, to make it quite workable even if the Regulations are not printed.

Mr. ROTH: I am rather chary about an Ordinance coming into force before the Regulations in respect of it are made. I draw the parallel case of the Old Age Pensions Ordinance. That Ordinance has been in existence two, if not three, years and the Regulations and things to be done under that Ordinance have not yet been done. I refer to the appointment of the Boards of Appeal. I am rather against any Ordinance coming into force before the Regulations, which are to be made under it for its working, are ready.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The Regulations are ready. I can show them to my hon. friend.

The CHAIRMAN: With that assurance from the hon. the Attorney-General that they are already in draft and will

be published, hon. Members will have no objection to the passing of this Ordinance'

Mr. ROTH: I trust they will come before this Council for approval within a reasonable period of time.

The CHAIRMAN: That has to be done within fourteen days of the enactment. I think you will find that in clause 36.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause as amended passed.

The Council resumed.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I beg to move that the Bill as amended in Committee be read a third time and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time.

NEW BUILDING SOCIETY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1947.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I beg to move the second reading of—

A Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the new Building Society Ordinance, 1940, with respect to the powers and accounts of the Society, the appointment of Auditors, and unclaimed amounts payable on Bond Certificates and Deferred Shares."

The COLONIAL TREASURER: It is not desirable that this Bill should come before the Council this year. The hon. Member on my right (Mr. Seaford), who is Chairman of the Society, is not prepared to go into it at the present time. It can be taken next year.

The PRESIDENT: I think I had mentioned that it would be taken next Feb-

ruary. Then hon. Members agree that consideration of this Bill be deferred. It is not one of the Bills we must have passed before the end of the year.

Mr. SEAFORD: One reason for the delay is that we want to find out what will be done in the way of the Housing Scheme before it is taken by this Council.

The PRESIDENT: We will let the matter stand over to a subsequent meeting of the Council. That concludes the business of the Council for to-day. May I remind hon. Members of the meeting of the Finance Committee to-morrow?

YULETIDE GREETINGS

Dr. SINGH: Before the Council rises I desire on behalf of the hon. Members of this Council to wish you, Sir, and Lady Woolley a happy and merry Christmas. We know, Sir, that this will be your first Christmas in this Colony and we also realize that especially at this particular festive season you would like to be with those who are near and dear to you. In these Christmas days I feel you will have fleeting reminiscences of those Christmases you have spent away, but we are sure, Sir, with Lady Woolley at your side in our salubrious city you are going to have just as much an enjoyable Christmas as you ever had in the past. Once again we tender you the Season's Greetings.

The President: I thank the hon. Member for the kind sentiments he has expressed and say how warmly I wish to reciprocate. I do trust that all hon. Members of Council would indeed have a very happy Christmas, and I hope that 1948 would be a good year for us individually and as a Council. I thank you, gentlemen. The Council is now adjourned to Tuesday, 30th December.