

SECOND LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

(Constituted under the British Guiana (Constitution) (Temporary Provisions) Orders in Council, 1953 and 1956).

Wednesday, 6th January, 1960

The Council met at 2 p.m.

PRESENT :

Speaker, His Honour Sir Donald Jackson

Chief Secretary, Hon. D. M. Hedges

Attorney-General, Hon. A. M. I. Austin, Q.C.

Financial Secretary, Hon. F. W. Essex, C.M.G.

} *ex officio*

The Honourable **Dr. C. B. Jagan**

— *Member for Eastern Berbice*
(Minister of Trade and Industry)

„ „ **B. H. Benn**

— *Member for Essequibo River*
(Minister of Natural Resources)

„ „ **Janet Jagan**

— *Member for Western Essequibo*
(Minister of Labour, Health and Housing)

„ „ **Ram Karran**

— *Member for Demerara-Essequibo*
(Minister of Communications and Works)

„ „ **B. S. Rai**

— *Member for Central Demerara*
(Minister of Community Development and Education).

Mr. R. B. Gajraj

— *Nominated Member*

„ **W. O. R. Kendall**

— *Member for New Amsterdam*

„ **R. C. Tello**

— *Nominated Member*

„ **F. Bowman**

— *Member for Demerara River*

„ **S. Campbell**

— *Member for North Western District*

„ **A. L. Jackson**

— *Member for Georgetown North*

„ **E. B. Beharry**

— *Member for Eastern Demerara*

„ **S. M. Saffee**

— *Member for Western Berbice*

„ **Jai Narine Singh**

— *Member for Georgetown South*

„ **R. E. Davis**

— *Nominated Member*

„ **A. M. Fredericks**

— *Nominated Member*

„ **A. G. Tasker, O.B.E.**

— *Nominated Member.*

Mr. I. Crum Ewing — Clerk of the Legislature

Mr. E. V. Viapree — Assistant Clerk of the Legislature.

ABSENT

Mr. Ajodha Singh—Member for Berbice River

Mr. L. F. S. Burnham—Member for Georgetown Central

Mr. H. J. M. Hubbard—Nominated Member.

Handwritten signature

MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Tuesday, 29th December, 1959, as printed and circulated, were taken as read and confirmed.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

The Minister of Community Development and Education (Mr. Rai) : I beg to give notice of the introduction and First Reading of a Bill intituled

“An Ordinance to amend the Georgetown Town Council Ordinance.”

ORDER OF THE DAY

BILL—FIRST READING

The Georgetown Town Council (Amendment) Bill was read the First time.

TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Financial Secretary (Mr. Essex): I beg to move that the Bill intituled

“An Ordinance to Amend the Tax Ordinance”

be read a Second time.

The Attorney-General (Mr. Austin): I beg to second the Motion.

The Financial Secretary: The simple object of this Bill is to place a tax of 10% on the gross stake money received by people in the course of their running pool-betting businesses. The Bill appears, at first sight, to be more complicated than it really is, and I would like to explain some of the secondary provisions and objects. It is complicated in its form because of the inherent difficulty in trying to cover potential loopholes when dealing with a thing like betting. But before dealing in detail with the Bill, I would like, quite briefly, to give some background to its origin.

It has been apparent for a long time that betting of all kinds has been doing considerable harm both to the people of British Guiana and to its economy. Pool betting, in particular, has assumed what appears to be, and I say ‘appears’

advisedly, alarming proportions. The social evil of this large amount of betting has been stressed by religious leaders, social workers and Members of this Council from time to time, and people who should know have said that, in their opinion, it is becoming as much a social evil as excessive drinking. People are spending more than they can afford. They are spending more money on betting, particularly the glamorous kind like pool betting, than they can afford—money which they should have been spending on more essential things. The economic effect, if the problem is as large as one is led to believe from circumstantial evidence, is equally great.

A good deal of the pool money, in particular, goes overseas. It is a serious capital outgo and, unfortunately, this bread which is cast upon the waters does not come back very many fold. There may be the case of the lucky chap, but it is quite obvious, according to the law of averages, that money sent out to the United Kingdom cannot possibly give a fair return to British Guiana as a whole. First of all, the United Kingdom Government takes 30% of that money in the form of tax, that is 30% of the potential divisible. Then, of course, the promoters themselves have to make profits. Then they give something like £300,000 a year to the British Football Association, which is very laudable, but that does not help British Guiana very much. When all these deductions are taken from the stake money, it is quite obvious that British Guiana cannot be getting a large return on the money which goes abroad.

The Chamber of Commerce suggested last year that a tax should be put on all forms of gambling except those for charity. What the Chamber obviously realized was that betting on a large scale was interfering with trade. Here we are in a position where, obviously, the heaviest or the most attractive part of betting here should be controlled in some way. One might consider trying to stop it, as some people advocated. I do not think it is practicable to do this even if it were

desirable. So as I started off by saying, the obvious object of the Bill is to put a 10% tax on the gross stakes.

I would like to say that the secondary object of the Bill is to find out what the magnitude of the problem is. We have no firm statistics of the money which is spent on pool betting. Various people who are in a position to know something about it have given estimates which range from \$2 million to \$5 million a year. I, personally, think that \$5 million a year is an incredible estimate. But I would have thought that something between \$1½ million and \$2 million would not be beyond the bounds of possibility, that is for overseas pools and local pools. So what the Bill is trying to do is to quantify the various opinions there are about the size of the problem. To do this it is necessary first of all to have licensed operators of these pools who will, as it were, provide the statistics. Next it is necessary to provide in the Bill that any money which is sent out of the Colony for the purpose of pool betting should be sent out through a licensed operator. In this way we should be able to find out exactly how much money is involved. It will be obvious that with the local pools we do not need to do anything about individual postings, because the money would be paid locally to the pools themselves.

When we have seen what the problem is, of course we may have to take different measures. We may have to alter the percentage of the tax, or we may have to try and stop it. What I am stressing is that this Bill is in some sense experimental, but while this process is going on — this process of finding out the magnitude of the problem — we should be, of course, collecting revenue which will be very welcome. A tax of this sort on betting is perfectly legitimate and perfectly normal. It operates in the United Kingdom and it is just as logical as the tax which is put on a man who drinks or goes to the cinema. Some people have said that it may kill the goose that lays the golden egg. I fail to

see what sort of golden eggs pool betting has laid for British Guiana. It may have laid an egg here and there for the individual, but for the country as a whole I cannot see any golden eggs. Indeed, if the goose is killed there might be definite social and economic advantages.

This tax of 10 per cent. seems to me to be a classic one in that it has social effect as well as a revenue-raising one. On the social side it should, or it might, tend to curb a man betting who cannot afford to do so, while at the same time it makes a contribution to the revenue from the man who can afford to bet.

I do not propose to say any more in explanation of the general objects and reasons of the Bill. There are one or two complicated provisions with which I will deal in the Committee stage, or in reply to any observations which Members may make on the Second Reading. I do not think that any Member has any doubts about the justice and desirability of this Tax Bill. I formally move that it be read a Second time.

The Attorney-General: I beg to second the Motion.

Mr. Campbell: I am supporting the Bill without any qualms, for it is the fashion nowadays to tax things, and I think gambling is one of the things that should be taxed. If there is quite a lot of money going out of the country and something can be done to check the flow; if this Bill can help to do that and enable that money to circulate in the country, then I am for it. It do not think a tax on pool betting can hurt the country at large. It might hurt some individuals, perhaps, but I am always for the greater good for the greater number of persons.

Mr. Fredericks: I would like to voice my support of this Bill. Some of us here have viewed with alarm the vast amount of money which has been exported overseas, and have felt that this legislation would have been introduced early in 1959. I myself had promised to support the hon. Nominated Member,

[MR. FREDERICKS]

Mr. Hubbard, who had signified to me his intention to move a Motion in this Council to give effect to what this Bill proposes to do. It is indeed difficult to assess the effect of the implementation of this proposed legislation at this stage, and I agree with the hon. the Financial Secretary that the necessary amendments can be made at a later stage when we have more facts on the subject. There is no doubt that a very large number of people are playing the pools who cannot afford to do so, and money which should be more beneficially utilized is being sent overseas. This country of ours is small and has many problems and very little money. I commend Government for bringing forward this measure.

Mr. Gajraj: I also wish to offer my congratulations to Government for having the courage and the wisdom to propose this legislation. I think it should be recalled that several Members on this side of the Table urged about a year ago that betting of this nature should be taxed, and taxed heavily. The suggestion was made when we were discussing the tax proposals in the last Budget, and I am very pleased indeed to find that Government has brought this measure forward, even though a little late. Nevertheless I think it is in time for the new fiscal year.

I think the hon. the Financial Secretary dealt with the subject very thoroughly when he analysed the evils which gambling can inflict upon the community. There is no doubt whatever that this gambling fever has caught on with all classes in British Guiana to such an extent that the working man can almost claim now that the amount he puts on his pool betting is part and parcel of his cost of living, for one has only to pass around the places where this evil of betting is indulged in to see the large numbers of working people intermingling with others placing their bets and looking forward to some large return. For myself I am completely against gambling in any form, and in supporting this measure I do not do so with the hope

that the coffers of the Colony will be enriched by any large amount, but in the hope that in the course of time we will be able to stamp out this evil from the life of British Guiana. If it can be done it would be much better for us, particularly as we move on into the future with very great hopes of taking care of our problems, and if we sink so much money in gambling we will be the poorer for it.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: This is an age in which the accent is on gambling, not only in British Guiana but all over the world. Like the "Teddy Boys" in England, it is a fact which we have to face in the new way of thinking in the world. This is desirable legislation but I cannot agree that both justice and desirability go with this Bill. It is over a year since I tabled a Motion recommending a State lottery, and I do not know whether the Minister concerned has delayed the debate on my Motion, or whether the hon. the Attorney-General is responsible for the delay. I discussed the matter with the Minister who asked me to withdraw my Motion, and I am very glad that I did not, because it is now on record that over a year has elapsed since the Minister told me that the Attorney-General was expediting the matter. I now have to look in another direction.

I feel that we must face the facts. If we do not want our community to indulge in betting abroad we must provide an alternative at home. I believe that the people of a community have the right to bet and to do the things they love to do, and if they wish to live by betting and speculation we should provide facilities so as to let our money remain at home. I think that is one of the things we should aim at. I support the Bill although I do not accept the word "justice" which was used by the hon. the Financial Secretary.

Mr. Tello: I would like to add my support of this Bill. At the same time I would like to add that the working-class people invest their money in the pools because they are seeking to find a better standard of living in an all but jobless country. They want to live, rather

than to merely exist. That is why I mentioned in the Budget debate last year that some taxes should be earmarked for social welfare services. While I am happy to support the Motion, I would have been happier if the revenue from this taxation was reserved for specific services to help the working-class. Perhaps the Financial Secretary can give me the assurance that this can be done.

Mr. Bowman: The Mover of the Motion said that the Motion had two objects, one revenue-raising and the other to raise the moral standards in this country. Our moral standards are patterned after the British, and if the object is to stop people in British Guiana from gambling—

The Financial Secretary: Excuse me, Sir; I did not say “moral” but “social”.

Mr. Bowman: The two cannot be divorced. If the object was to stop the people here from gambling, then he should have directed his attention to England and see what goes on there.

It is estimated that \$3 million can be raised to be contributed to the Development Programme, and in that case I heartily support the Bill. However, I have some reservations about the way the tax will fall. It is the agents who will be taxed, and they are already paying what is virtually a tax. This will be an additional burden, when they have to pay \$250 for a licence. I do not think some of them make as much as \$250 from the coupons they sell. When the Bill is in Committee stage I will move that the licence be reduced.

The Member for Georgetown South said he tabled a Motion in this respect almost a year ago, and I know the Minister of Community Development and Education had something similar in mind when we were colleagues — he wanted to see the establishment of Government lotteries.

Lastly, I support the view that a man who spends two or three shillings

on the pools is seeking to better his standard of living and is very often investing his money in that way because he cannot find work.

Mr. Jackson: If the primary intention of this Bill is to raise money for meeting the expenses of Government, I would have been happier than I now am if the Mover had presented the case merely on that basis without touching on the social evils now existing in our midst, because if the intention is also to remove these it is going to be a failure. It will fail because it is a negative approach and because it has not taken into account the psychological nature of the problem. Has the local tax on rum stopped people from drinking rum, or does the penalty of hanging prevent people committing murder? People go on doing those things month after month, year after year.

I have heard it said that this measure will stop the outflow of money through pools-betting, but I think the only time people will cease to spend money on the pools is when the pools cease to pay out money which people feel they ought to get from accurate betting. What has been responsible for the decline in sales of Demerara Turf Club sweepstake tickets? Bigger prize moneys are obtainable elsewhere. Barbados Turf Club, for example, offers more money on sweepstakes than the D.T.C., and in spite of legal restrictions, the tickets from Barbados have been selling plentifully over here.

Government's attitude to gambling should not be to tax with a view to discouraging it; Government should seek to find out why people do these things which are wrong in our assumption. I believe that as long as people are willing to spend 10 cents in the hope that such an investment would bring them as much as \$10,000, they will continue to spend money on the pools. In England they go in for dog racing and betting on dogs in a big way. A bet is a business transaction. It is an investment just as an in-

[MR. JACKSON]

vestment in a grocery or a dry goods store. It is the poor man's way of investing his money, and like another investor, he hopes to get returns on his investment. The profit motive is there in both cases. I suppose some will deny that to go into business is also a gamble.

In spite of the fact that this legislation is only now before this Council, some of the persons responsible for selling coupons have already put on a 10% tax, that is, if my information is correct.

I feel, Sir, there are bigger problems other than gambling. For example, we have in this country murders and suicides being committed frequently. What is the policy of Government with respect to dealing with these very dangerous aspects of our community life? We have heard no one say that we should investigate or try to put an end to these problems. Now, the incidence of these social evils is on the increase. It is my hope that somebody will say what should be done to remove the evils other than gambling.

Mr. Beharry: Mr. Speaker, what I do not understand about this Bill, and I hope the hon. the Financial Secretary would be good enough to explain, is the fact that the running of pools or betting, taken in its modern context, is a commercial transaction or is carried on as a commercial business. The individual carrying on a pool makes sure at all times, that he makes money out of this venture. I do not see, in this Bill, any provision whereby individuals carrying on this type of business would be liable to pay income tax on their capital gains or earnings.

I shall be grateful if the hon. the Financial Secretary will explain whether income tax is payable by these individuals. These concerns do make profits. I do not think only the premises should be taxed in the form of licences. If these individuals do not pay income tax, I would like to know

why provision has not been made in this Bill for that purpose.

The Financial Secretary: It is a little difficult to say from where I should begin. To take what I might call the substantial points, I think they are, in the main, two. One was from the hon. Nominated Member, Mr. Tello, who suggested that the money derived from this tax should be applied to charitable purposes. I know that the tax on the Demerara Turf Club Sweepstake is applied to charitable purposes. I am, however, very much opposed to earmarking any revenue. It serves no useful purpose whatever. There is no inherent connection between charity and betting.

One hears that the money received from road licences should be applied to the maintenance of roads; the money received from house rentals should be used for the building of houses; and the money received from the railways be put back into the railways. There is nothing to be gained by this at all. Government is spending a considerable amount of money on social services. The fact that "X" dollars is received as a betting tax does not give charity any larger share of the Government's revenue, or claim to a larger share, than it can afford from revenue as a whole. As I said, it is not logical and it serves no useful purpose.

The other point is the one raised by the hon. Member for Eastern Demerara about income tax on the profits or capital gains made by the promoters of pools. I cannot speak with authority on this point, because it has never occurred to me that the promoter of this particular sort of pool should not pay income tax. It may possibly be that the bookmaker, who offers fixed odds, does not pay income tax on his capital gains, and you may take the view that he is in the same position as the man betting against him. If bookmaking is his business, he no doubt pays income tax, but there should be no doubt about the man who runs a football pool or acts as agent for one. He is not gambling and cannot lose.

However, as I said, I cannot speak with authority, but as the point was raised by the hon. Member, I shall make it my duty to find out.

We are very grateful to the hon. Members who have lent their support to this Bill. To those who criticized it, I repeat that it is in some sense a tentative bit of legislation which is going to find out what the figures are. Some Members went on to say that it would not stop gambling. I never said it would. If we find that gambling is excessive, there may be a case for doing something to stop it or to curtail it further.

There was an attempt to impute—I do not know quite why it was made—that I was attempting some discrimination against gambling in British Guiana as against gambling in the United Kingdom, and that I said it was a question of morals. I never said any such thing. Gambling is not immoral and I never said it was. What I did say was that in a country like this where there is a lot of poverty and low wages, it is essential that those wages should be applied to the best social uses, of which gambling is not one. What is immoral is to spend money on gambling which ought to go on food for the family.

One hon. Member attempted to import something which I can only describe as politics, because he tried to blame the Government for murders and suicides. He said ‘why don’t the Government do something about it?’ Whether he meant we should make murder illegal or that we should tax it, I do not know. From the same Member we hear that putting a tax on drink does not reduce the consumption—not very consistent of him after last year. It seems to me, from information gleaned from our newspapers, that all the suicides are caused either by drink or love. But it is obviously not true to say that by putting a sufficiently high tax on something which is consumed you do not reduce the consumption. If I wished to be controversial, I would refer to the

same hon. Member’s arguments last year with respect to a certain tax which was imposed, when we heard that it was going to do all sorts of things to the business.

I think, on the whole, this Bill has received a favourable reception, as indeed it should. There are one or two minor points, one is about the amount for the licence, which the Member for Demerara River promised to raise in Committee stage; but I am sure from what Members have said, that this Bill will, at least, receive the Second Reading which I now move.

The Attorney-General: I beg to second the Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

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

COUNCIL IN COMMITTEE

Clause 1.—*Short Title.*

The Financial Secretary: It will be necessary to amend “1959” to “1960” in the second line of Clause 1, subsection (1). It should then read:

“This Ordinance may be cited as the Tax (Amendment) Ordinance, 1960, and shall be construed and read with the Tax Ordinance, hereinafter referred to as the Principal Ordinance, and any Ordinance amending the same.

Question put, and agreed to.

Subsection (2):

The Financial Secretary: Subsection (2) should then read:

“This Ordinance shall be deemed to have come into operation on the 1st January, 1960.”

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 2.—*Insertion of new section 8A in Chapter 298.*

The Financial Secretary: There is an Amendment which we would have

[THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY]

liked to insert after subsection (4)—the Amendment which has been circulated which states:

“Provided that where any Thursday is a public holiday, the proprietor shall make such payment to the district commissioner on the next following day not being itself a public holiday.”

I think the reason for this Amendment is obvious.

Agreed to.

The Chairman: What about the substitution of a colon for the full stop?

The Financial Secretary: The full stop after the word “Saturday” should be changed into a colon.

Agreed to.

Mr. Bowman: I would like to ask for an Amendment to paragraph (3) of Section 2 of this Bill. I would like to substitute the words “one hundred and fifty dollars” for the words “two hundred and fifty dollars”. I feel that the amount of \$250 is too high and that it would stamp out pool betting, and the Bill would not achieve its purpose. Therefore, I am asking that the amount be reduced from \$250 to \$150.

The Financial Secretary: The hon. Member said the Bill would not achieve its purpose. I do not know which purpose he meant. Two hundred and fifty dollars is a small licence having regard to the magnitude of the pool business which is being carried on. I think it compares favourably with the licence of other businesses like moneylending, etc. In the absence of any evidence of hardship or injustice I see no reason for accepting the hon. Member’s Amendment.

Mr. Bowman’s Amendment was then put and negatived.

Mr. Jai Narine Singh: There are main offices in Georgetown for these pools and branch offices in the country. Can the Financial Secretary tell us

whether the sub-agents in the country will have to pay a licence?

The Financial Secretary: The intention is that if an agent or a sub-agent has a set of premises for the purpose of carrying on pool betting business he has to take out a licence for \$250.

The Financial Secretary’s Amendment was then put, and agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3 passed as printed.

Council resumed.

The Financial Secretary: I beg to report that the Tax (Amendment) Bill has passed the Committee stage with amendments. I now beg to move that the Bill be read the Third time.

The Minister of Trade and Industry (Dr. Jagan): I beg to second the Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the Third time and passed.

SUPPLEMENTARY APPRO- PRIATION (1958) BILL

The Financial Secretary: I beg to move the Second Reading of the Bill intituled:

“An Ordinance to allow and confirm certain additional expenditure incurred in the year ended on the thirty-first day of December, 1958.”

This is a very formal act which we do every year. The intention is to appropriate the money which has been granted in the form of Supplementary Estimates by Finance Committee and accepted by this Council by Resolution during the year. Although the Supplementary Estimates have been accepted by the full Council it is still necessary to have a formal act of appropriation. That is what this Bill seeks to do. I therefore move that the Bill be read a Second time.

The Attorney-General: I beg to second the Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a Second time.

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

COUNCIL IN COMMITTEE

Clause 1.—*Short Title.*

The Financial Secretary: I move that the figures "1960" be substituted for the figures "1959".

Agreed to.

Clause 2, and the Schedule passed as printed.

Council resumed.

The Financial Secretary: I beg to report that the Bill has passed the Committee stage with one amendment. I now move that it be read the Third time.

Dr. Jagan: I beg to second the Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the Third time and passed.

NONPAREIL PARK (LEASE TO THE INDIAN EDUCATION TRUST OF BRITISH GUIANA) BILL

The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Benn): I beg to move the Second Reading of the Bill intituled :

"An Ordinance to authorise the leasing to the Indian Education Trust of British Guiana for educational purposes of a parcel of land at Nonpareil Park".

This Bill seeks to validate the action taken by the Georgetown Municipality some years ago in leasing a piece of land at Nonpareil Park to the Indian Education Trust of British Guiana for the purpose of running a secondary school. Nonpareil Park was ceded to the George-

town Municipality by the late Mr. Quintin Hogg in 1887, on the condition that it should be used as a park or for any building connected with a park. The Indian Education Trust made application to the Municipality for the use of a portion of the land for the building of a school, and were given the piece of land.

When a formal lease was asked for in 1956 a mistake was discovered, and it was suggested that the heirs of the late Mr. Quintin Hogg should be consulted. It took a long time before that was done, and it was finally found necessary to bring forward a Bill to validate the action of the Georgetown Municipality in giving the piece of land in the park to be used for the purpose of the Indian Education Trust College. The use of the park by the College, whilst not in keeping with the will of the late Mr. Quintin Hogg, is certainly a very desirable object, and the Minister of Education will say that the Indian Education Trust College, which is now a Government-aided secondary school, is serving a very useful purpose in our community. I formally move that the Bill be read a Second time.

The Minister of Community Development and Education (Mr. Rai): I beg to second the Motion.

Mr. Gajraj: I should like to congratulate Government on the introduction of this measure, and to take the opportunity to fill in one or two gaps which have been left open by the Minister in tracing the history of the granting of this lease. It is quite true that a fair-sized parcel of land situated in the Thomas area was willed by the late Mr. Quintin Hogg to the Municipality of Georgetown for the purpose of recreation activities by citizens. When the application was made by the Indian Education Trust for a portion of that land it was shortly after the Government of the day itself committed a breach of the terms of the bequest, in that a portion of that land so designated was ceded by the Municipality to the Government for the purpose of building the Technical Institute, another

[MR. GAJRAJ]

worthwhile educational institution which, like the Indian Education Trust College, is serving a very useful purpose.

But the Greater Georgetown Plan had by then been accepted, and the whole of the Thomas area was reserved for institutional and recreational purposes, and one would expect that "institutional" would include educational institutions. So that the Municipality of Georgetown felt that in acting as it did it was within the general ideas of the day, whereby land which was very valuable, and which would be used in some measure for the improvement of the citizens of Georgetown in particular, and the citizens of the Colony in general, should be so delineated.

In the case of the parcel of land used by the Technical Institute a Bill was passed by the Legislature some years ago, making it legal for the land to be so used. So that it is merely following in the footsteps of what Government itself did some years ago that we find this measure being introduced today. I am wholly in favour of it and I wish to congratulate Government once again on its late start but, nevertheless, useful effort.

The Attorney-General: I think I should say, in fairness to the Government, that this Bill has taken a long time to come before the Council because when an approach was first made by the Indian Educational Trust to the Georgetown Town Council who, quite rightly, said it would give sympathetic consideration to the matter, the advice of the Town Council's legal adviser was that the first step would be to get the formal approval of the representatives of the donor. The next step, to get the approval of the Governor in Council, was not taken, and when eventually approval was sought from Viscount Hailsham, who is the surviving representative of the donor, it was

found that many steps had been taken without proper authority. So it is not merely a matter of the Town Council following in the footsteps of a breach by the Government in helping a worthy institution of this kind. While there is no doubt that there was good intention all along the line, unfortunately the proper procedure was not followed, and the result has been a delay of eight to nine years before it could be put right by legislation such as this.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a Second time.

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

COUNCIL IN COMMITTEE

Clause 1.—*Short Title.*

The Attorney-General: I beg to move that the figures "1960" be substituted for the figures "1959" in the last line.

Agreed to.

Clause 1 passed as amended.

Clause 2 passed as printed.

Schedule.

Mr. Fredericks: In the fourth line where Mr. Wong's initials are referred to, the capital letters "RNW" should be "RMW", for R. M. Wong.

Agreed to.

Schedule passed as amended.

The Attorney-General: In the title and enacting Clause I beg to move the deletion of the words "BE IT THEREFORE", and the substitution of an initial capital "E" in the word "enacted."

Agreed to.

Title and enacting Clause passed as amended.

Council resumed.

The Attorney-General: I beg to report that the Nonpareil Park (Lease to the Indian Education Trust of British Guiana) Bill was considered in Committee and passed with Amendments, and I beg to move that the Bill be now read the Third time.

The Financial Secretary: I beg to second the Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the Third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chief Secretary (Mr. Hedges): I beg to move that this Council do now adjourn until tomorrow, the 7th of January, at 2 p.m.

Council adjourned accordingly, at 3.25 p.m.