

# LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

*Friday, 23rd May, 1936.*

The Council met, pursuant to adjournment, His Excellency the Governor, SIR GEOFFRY A. S. NORTHCOTE, K.C.M.G., President, in the Chair.

## PRESENT.

The Hon. the Colonial Secretary, (Mr. E. J. Waddington, C.M.G., O.B.E.).

The Hon. the Attorney-General, (Mr. Hector Josephs, K.C.).

The Hon. F. Dias, O.B.E. (Nominated Unofficial Member).

Major the Hon. W. Bain Gray, C.B.E., Director of Education.

The Hon. J. S. Dash, Director of Agriculture.

The Hon. E. G. Woolford, K.C. (New Amsterdam).

The Hon. E. F. McDavid, M.B.E., Colonial Treasurer.

The Hon. M. B. G. Austin (Nominated Unofficial Member).

The Hon. J. Gonsalves (Georgetown South).

The Hon. W. A. D'Andrade, Comptroller of Customs.

Major the Hon. J. C. Craig, D.S.O., Director of Public Works.

The Hon. J. A. Henderson, Surgeon-General.

The Hon. S. E. Gomes, Assistant Attorney-General.

The Hon. A. MacDougall, General Manager, Transport and Harbours Department.

The Hon. Percy C. Wight, O.B.E. (Georgetown Central).

The Hon. J. I. De Aguiar (Central Demerara).

The Hon. Peer Bacchus (Western Berbice).

The Hon. E. M. Walcott (Nominated Unofficial Member).

The Hon. H. C. Humphrys (Eastern Demerara).

The Hon. A. R. Crum Ewing (Essequebo River).

The Hon. C. R. Jacob (North Western District).

The Hon. S. H. Seymour (Western Essequebo).

The Hon. J. W. Jackson (Nominated Unofficial Member).

The Hon. F. A. Mackey (Nominated Unofficial Member).

## MINUTES.

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on the 21st May, as printed and circulated, were confirmed.

## ORDER OF THE DAY.

### LIST OF VOTERS.

Mr. JACOB asked the following questions of which he had given notice:—

1. How many Voters' names were on the 1934 List of Voters for the Demerara River Electoral District No. 10?

2. How many application forms, duly declared, were received by the Registering Officer for District No. 10 during 1934 for registration up to 1st November, 1934, for the 1935 list?

3. How many persons were registered by the Registering Officer for District No. 10 for the year 1935?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied as follows:—

1. 596.
2. 847.
3. 363.

### DRAINAGE AND IRRIGATION (PAYMENT OF ARREARS) BILL.

The Council resumed discussion on the motion for the second reading of "A Bill to make special provision for the payment of arrears prior to nineteen hundred and thirty-six, of annual rates under the Drainage and Irrigation Ordinance, Chapter 165, and of advances of instalments thereof under the Drainage and Irrigation (Advances Repayment) Ordinance, 1932."

Mr. McDAVID (Colonial Treasurer): Sir, the statements which were made in relation to this Bill when it was before the House yesterday have been considered by Government and it is now proposed to make certain amendments. In the Bill as drafted clause 4 empowers the Governor in Council to make funding arrangements in respect of individual proprietors. It is now proposed to make an amendment which will allow the Governor in Council to deal only with units of declared areas, and any arrangements would therefore apply throughout any area to all proprietors in that area in exactly the same way. It is also proposed to amend clause 7, which, as drafted, creates an offence for the removal or attempted removal of any movable property or fixture from an estate in respect of which a funding arrangement has been authorised. It is now proposed that if any person, without the consent of the Director of Public Works first obtained in writing, shall remove or attempt to remove from any estate in respect of which there is a funding arrangement any such property, then the whole of the unpaid arrears due at the time shall become immediately payable. When the Bill is in Committee I shall move the amendments exactly as they are intended to be.

Mr. DE AGUIAR: The Bill, after all, has not turned out to be as simple as we were told yesterday afternoon. In my constituency there is a certain amount of arrears. It was hoped that some funded scheme would have been evolved whereby relief would have been granted by means of payment in annual instalments. There are several reasons for these peoples' default. First of all, the schemes cost two or three times more than was originally estimated. There was then a reallocation of the cost and it was decided that payment should be made on the original estimates. Another important reason is that the benefits intended for the drainage areas were never realised. Whether that was due to defective pumps or too much rainfall I cannot say, but the benefits expected to be derived were never achieved. The people found themselves saddled with very heavy liabilities. The reallocation did give them a certain amount of relief, but there should be some funded scheme, as in the case of the Georgetown Town Council, spread over a number of years and payable in definite annual instalments. I

think people should always be made to respect their obligations and I would be the last person to say they should not be made to pay. I am willing to support Government but I do not think the amendment proposed will meet the objection. With regard to clause 7, I would like to know what would be the position of a proprietor whose tenant removes a building after the determination of his tenancy. It seems to me that before a tenant on an estate can remove a building, which he has erected and after the tenancy has been determined, he would have to obtain the permission of the Director of Public Works. The tenant is under no obligation to Government for the payment of the rates but to the proprietor of the land for the payment of rent.

Mr. JACOB: I understand that before the proprietors agreed to the expenditure on irrigation and drainage works they had made up their minds definitely that the sea defences should be made a Colonial Question; in fact, it had already been made a Colonial Question and the proprietors felt that they would not be asked to pay any further liability. There is a distinct breach of faith on the part of Government as no proprietor expected to pay sea defence assessments up to three years ago. The people, particularly those in Essequibo, find it impossible to pay these assessments in addition to the drainage and irrigation rates. There is always uncertainty as to when one has to pay or what he has to pay. Let the people realise that they have to pay a certain amount and work to that end. The amount outstanding by the villages and proprietors is reflected by the uneconomic position of all agricultural crops except sugar, and Government are reaping some of the benefits for not helping minor industries. Government is advised that the people have the money and can afford to pay but won't pay. I think Government are satisfied that is not the position in the Canals Polder or in Essequibo. One property in Essequibo is going out of cultivation on account of these high charges. But for these charges the position of that property might have been somewhat different. It is the beginning of what we must expect in the not distant future, and something will have to be done to assist the people in these areas to meet their obligations and to make their financial arrangements. I

think some assurance was given yesterday that the question of sea defence will be reconsidered and made a Colonial Question. The sooner that is done the better. If it is not done Government will find themselves with these liabilities outstanding, and the lands will be thrown back on them and there will be less revenue and officers in the districts.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. Member is not speaking to the Bill, which is to give assistance to the proprietors by a funding arrangement. I suggest that he speak to the subject of the Bill.

Mr. JACOB: I am finished.

Mr. WIGHT: Your Excellency's remark hinders me on what I have to say, but I ask you for some indulgence. To be frank, as I always like to be, I describe this Bill as "The Cove and John and the Hampton Court Bill." It affects those two places more than any other. I consider it an iniquitous thing for Government to come to this Council and ask us to pass this Bill in its present form. I will give an illustration of what I have in mind. Pln. Lima in Essequibo is owned by Mr. Rahim Bacchus, who had a contract with Government for the carriage of the mails. Government allowed the rates on that estate to accumulate for eight years. The Hand-in-Hand Insurance Company, which had a first mortgage on the property for \$3,000, caused it to be put up for sale at execution. I, unfortunately, had a second mortgage on the property for \$11,000. I attended the sale and had to pay \$8,000 in addition to my mortgage to acquire the property. The Director of Public Works stepped in and drew \$6,000 of that money for rates, while every other proprietor on the Coast owed money for rates and were allowed to go on owing. If that were done in Water Street it would be termed nothing else but sharp practice. I am not blaming the Director or alluding to him: I am only saying what it would be termed in Water Street. I have paid that money for somebody else. The same thing applies to Pln. Hampton Court. I understand that estate is heavily indebted to Government. Perth, an outstanding village in the Pomeroun, had its sheep levied on and removed to Anna Regina. I as a shareholder paid the amount and then I understood that the proceedings were with-

drawn against everybody else, and up to the present I have not received a refund of my money. I hold that this treatment is not fair. If this Bill is passed it will be class legislation.

I now come to Cove and John. I am stressing the point that this Bill is really to get at Pln. Cove and John. Government are perfectly right in trying to get their money, but the estate cannot stand the expenses of sea defence. Cove and John is penalised on a tremendous acreage which is not occupied, and most of it is Government land held under lease on which is paid this high rate. Cove and John as a sugar estate was sold during the War for £25,000, and the machinery was tied up with strings and cow manure to keep it going. The estate is now under rice cultivation and nothing else. I have appealed to the Commissioners that something should be done by way of a compromise for the estate's indebtedness. There was a first mortgage on the estate while it was under sugar, and I believe that a portion of the mortgage—something in the vicinity of \$11,000—still remains unpaid. This Bill makes Government's claim preferent—it has always been claimed to be preferent although the debt is 10 years old and nothing whatever has been paid. In addition to that the Conservancy's claim has to be paid. They attempted to levy on the estate and found that if they levied and bought it in they would be buying subject to the mortgage which is still in existence, so they withdrew and left the property without any levy. I gather that it is the wish of Government to acquire this property. The Commissioners approached me with the object of taking it over, but they want it for the debt to Government, which I consider is not at all satisfactory. The man who lent his money on it is entitled to get some of his money back. Cove and John has not got one penny's assistance from sea defence expenditure. The drainage is appalling.

THE PRESIDENT: This Bill has no particular relation to Cove and John.

Mr. WIGHT: What made me come to that definite conclusion is the fact that the reference to the removal of buildings in clause 7 relates only to Cove and John. That is the only estate that has removed any building or anything else.

THE PRESIDENT: I must ask the hon. Member to confine himself to the subject of the Bill, which is to enable funding arrangements to be made in a drainage area.

Mr. WIGHT: The amendment will serve some useful purpose with regard to this particular estate. If the funded arrangement is extended over a period of 25 years it would be some relief to proprietors, but interest should not be charged at the rate of 6 per cent. Why penalise proprietors with 6 per cent. when money can be obtained at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.? A loan can be obtained easily at 4 per cent., and extended over a period of 25 years proprietors will get some benefit from it. If it is the intention to assist the proprietors I see no reason why the loan should not be raised at 4 per cent. and 25 years allowed.

Mr. WOOLFORD: The unfortunate position in which some of the proprietors find themselves has been largely the result of their own neglect. I agree that Government in neglecting to collect the rates for drainage and sea defence to a large extent caused a large sum of money to be outstanding, but I appeal to those who are interested in mortgages on these estates to consider how far they have contributed to this result. It was their duty as mortgagees to enquire how far payments of rates were being made during past years, and not having made enquiry they have no cause for complaint. It could have been found out years ago whether Cove and John or any other estate was indebted, and that they did not was due to their own laches. Clause 7 will have a deterrent effect on those who, in anticipation of a mortgage being foreclosed, remove movables in the shape of tanks and other things from the property, thereby imposing on the general community a liability for which they are not primarily liable. After all we are all taxpayers. If statutory bodies fail to collect moneys due them the general inhabitants are going to pay, and I ask hon. Members to assist in the passage of the Bill, which I think will do some good and prevent a recurrence of events to which not only the proprietors have contributed but to some extent the Government. I assure Members from the knowledge I possess of the circumstances of some of these estates that if this Bill had been in operation, or clause 7 had been

given effect to earlier, the unhappy position in which the hon. Member for Georgetown Central found himself in respect of Pln. Lima would never have arisen. I think no proprietor has any right to inveigh against Government for neglect when they have been guilty of neglect themselves.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Mr. Hector Josephs): There is one point on which I might enlighten the House. It was stated here that the Bill would affect the case of a tenant on an estate who removes his house from that estate when his tenancy is determined, and that he would be under the obligation to go to the Director of Public Works to get permission. There is nothing in the Bill which suggests that and I cannot imagine why such a view has been arrived at. Under the Roman Dutch law the erections of a tenant are not fixtures but movables and may be removed by him when his lease is determined. That happens to be the law of the country and it has not yet been changed. Further, clause 7 as it now stands deals with "any building or erection which is a fixture," and the fears of the hon. Member have no foundation in law. The House need not consider any points of that kind as they will not arise in the administration of the Ordinance if it is enacted.

There is another point arising out of some matters referred to by the hon. Member for North Western District. One of his complaints is that people do not know what they have to pay and that under this Bill they would not know what to pay. If the hon. Member looks at the Drainage and Irrigation Ordinance he would find that rates—not assessments as he calls them—are levied every year and in a particular manner, and before the time for payment begins they are published and everybody in the declared area has an opportunity of knowing what his rates are. That is in exactly the same way as the Georgetown ratepayers know what they have to pay. In clause 4 the Governor in Council will by Order direct with regard to any area the conditions of the payment of arrears, the time, the amount of instalments and so forth. All of that is to be stated in the Order in Council, and to be effective the Order in Council must be published in the usual way.

Mr. McDAVID: I thank the hon. Attorney-General for having cleared up the most important points which were made by Members who spoke. One other point was made by the hon. Member for Central Demerara. He referred to the position of the districts on the East Coast, Demerara. I would like to remind him that there is already a funding arrangement in regard to those districts. All the loans and advances which had been previously made to Local Authorities were accumulated in one loan covering the arrears up to the end of 1932. Those districts are Beterverwagting, Victoria, Golden Grove, etc., and that funding arrangement is working extremely satisfactory, all the instalments up to the end of last year having been duly met. It is true that in moving the second reading I said that this Bill originated with Essequibo, and three drainage schemes in Essequibo will be dealt with before any other. The hon. Member for Central Demerara also seems to think that the Bill should describe all the funding arrangements, but it is impossible for the Bill to go into the details and deal with every drainage area. The drainage area in Berbice might require some different treatment, and the terms and conditions of the funding arrangement are left absolutely to the discretion of the Governor in Council. I think the Attorney-General has answered the point made by the hon. Member for North Western District. As regards the remarks of the hon. Member for Georgetown Central, I cannot understand how a Bill which is intended to give relief can be described as an attempt to get at any particular estate or any particular drainage area. The estate to which he refers is in no worse position now than it would be after this Bill becomes law. I am not suggesting that this Bill will apply to that property, but it will at any rate give relief to that estate.

THE PRESIDENT: As the Colonial Treasurer has pointed out, this Bill is intended as a measure of relief and also is a means by which the Colony's interest, sometimes described as Government's interest, can be properly safeguarded. There have been no objections, I think, in principle to the Bill with the possible exception of the hon. Member for Georgetown Central. There have been several objections raised to details, but

those can be more suitably dealt with in Committee. I therefore now put the second reading.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the second time.

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

Clause 3 - Interest payable on arrears.

Mr. WIGHT: What I was trying to impress on the Council is that if we add the funding debt to the present charges the people cannot pay. I think Government might make the interest 4 per cent.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I would like to point out that all statutory interest is 6 per cent in our laws where liability to Government is concerned, and if the suggestion is adopted it would be an innovation.

Mr. McDAVID: I would like to add to that that under the Principal Ordinance there is a provision for interest to be added at the rate of 6 per cent. to current rates one month after they become due.

Mr. JACOB: The hon. Member for Georgetown Central anticipated me in asking for the reduction of the rate of interest. I have heard the reply of the Attorney-General and the Colonial Treasurer, but I think the idea of Government is to give relief to the parties concerned. Government has raised a loan at the rate of 3 per cent. If it would cause some difficulty in reducing the rate to 3 or 4 per cent, Members would give Government an opportunity of a few days to meet that difficulty. These people have to pay the current assessment together with the accumulated debt with interest on it, and if it is difficult for them to pay the current assessment it would be still more difficult to pay the accumulated debt with interest of 6 per cent. The Austin Commission recommended that some relief should be given to the proprietors in Essequibo. These proprietors never approved of the expenditure: what is worse they received no benefit in any way from irrigation and drainage expenditure there. They are under the impression that they will not be called upon to pay interest. I appeal to Government to reduce the interest to 4 per

cent at least, and I hope the Elected Members will press for it to be reduced.

Mr. McDAVID: The arrears of rates will be funded without any addition of interest in respect of the period they have been due, but after they have been funded they will bear interest.

Mr. DIAS: The hon. Member for North Western District has endeavoured to get a reduction of the interest made. He may be right or he may be wrong, but his argument is absolutely bad. The Georgetown Town Council by the authority of this Council directed that all loans should bear interest of 6 per cent. When the Town Council's proposals were before this Council he did not say anything. His consideration seems to me to benefit the people in the country, let alone the people in Georgetown who are carrying a very heavy liability because this Council, according to his argument, did not say that the Town Council should pay interest of less than 6 per cent.

Mr. JACOB: I do not remember being here when the Town Council wanted to borrow money at 6 per cent., but if I were and I did not suggest a reduction then, that is no reason why I should not make the suggestion now. Government told us a few days ago that they borrow money at 3 per cent. What happened before is past. We are looking at the matter from now and I am appealing to Government either to charge no interest or 4 per cent.

Mr. GONSALVES: The Town Council did not ask Government to lend them money at 6 per cent. but at a cheaper rate. We borrowed at 4½ per cent. but had to collect at 6 per cent. One other feature is that the people who are to benefit under this Ordinance seem to be better off than the people in Georgetown because it is not proposed to charge them interest on the funded sum but from the date of the funding.

Mr. SEYMOUR: I quite appreciate Government's intention in this matter. I think it is a very good gesture on the part of Government in not charging interest on the funded arrears. Georgetown has had a very square deal, which we have not had in the country. All the internal drainage has been effected by us; not so in Georgetown. The Canals Polder also

had excellent treatment. They have had a loan which has not been repaid. On top of that Government want to give them a free grant of \$160,000 from general revenue. On the one hand we are liberal; on the other we are not. It does not appeal to me that we are putting matters fairly in the scale, and in this Bill I have a suspicion of one getting a better deal than another.

Mr. DE AGUIAR: All we are pleading for is the funding of this indebtedness. The position that existed with the Town Council is no different to what now exists, and there seems to be no difficulty whatever in doing what is asked. The authority to the Governor in Council to direct the payment of the arrears in instalments is not the funding of the arrears. What I would like to see is the dividing up of the debt into so many years annual instalments.

Mr. McDAVID: The hon. Member is labouring under a misapprehension. The Bill is to give the Governor in Council power to do what he wants. I pointed out that it is impracticable to put everything in the law, and that is why authority is given to the Governor in Council. The conditions of payment of the arrears will be published in any Order and there is no necessity to put them in the Bill.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sorry that Government cannot accept the amendment. The question is that the clause stand as in the original motion.

The Committee divided on the question, and voted:—

*Ayes:* Messrs. Mackey, Jackson, Walcott, MacDougall, Gomes, Dr. Henderson, Major Craig, D'Andrade, Gonsalves, Austin, McDavid, Woolford, Professor Dash, Major Bain Gray, Dias, the Attorney-General and the Colonial Secretary—17.

*Noes:* Messrs. Seymour, Jacob, Crum Ewing, Humphrys, Peer Bacchus, DeAguiar and Wight—7.

Clause 4—Governor in Council may direct that arrears be paid in instalments.

THE CHAIRMAN: I now ask the mover of the Bill to explain the difference in the proposed amendment and the original clause as printed.

Mr. McDAVID: I propose that clause 4 (1) be deleted and the following substituted:—

The Governor in Council may by order direct that the arrears of proprietors and of local authorities in a declared area may be paid in such instalments at such times for such period and subject to such conditions as he may think fit.

If hon. Members would look at the clause as printed they will observe that the proposal was that the Governor in Council may direct that the arrears of a proprietor or of a local authority may be paid in such instalments, at such times for such period and subject to such conditions as he may think fit. What is intended by the amendment is that the relief should apply to declared areas, and every proprietor in a declared area would get the same relief. It follows that if a proprietor has paid off more than another he would be in a better position but the relief would be the same between proprietor and proprietor in a declared area.

Mr. JACOB: I take it that it is within the discretion of the Governor in Council to levy the rates plus interest. If the Governor in Council finds it is advisable not to levy certain rates or to charge interest he will do so.

Mr. McDAVID: In clause 3 it is imperative that interest must be charged. At this stage I move that sub-clause (2) be deleted. The reason for that is that in the new clause 4 there is provision for the publication of the Order, and in that way every proprietor would get to know what he has to pay, therefore there is no necessity to provide for intimation to individual proprietors.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not intended to inflict any hardship under this Bill: it is intended as a relief measure.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 5—Payment of arrears by Local Authority.

Mr. DE AGUIAR: I observe that there is a little difference in the wording of clause 5 (2) and clause 6 (2). If a Local Authority fail to pay an instalment there must be some reason for it. If they fail to pay one annual instalment the whole amount of the unpaid arrears and interest

shall become payable. How would an Authority be able to pay the whole amount if they are unable to pay the annual instalment?

Mr. SEYMOUR: That is the crux of this question. How are you going to get a village like Queenstown to pay? If they don't pay in three months they will never pay.

Mr. McDAVID: There will be a corresponding provision in the case of default of a Local Authority as in the case of default of a proprietor. It is essential that the penal clause of the Bill shall apply in order to enable the Authority itself to use force to recover rates which it has itself levied in order to pay these rates. The Local Authority and the Local Government Board must be placed in a position to enforce payment of the local rates,

Mr. SEYMOUR: I agree that you must have machinery to enforce payment, but what is the good of having machinery when there is nothing to recover.

Mr. McDAVID: A good deal will depend on the date fixed for the collection of the arrears. So far as the collection of village rates are concerned the time is about April or May. If these rates are not paid the Local Authority would not be able to pay the arrears. If the Local Authority fails to pay within three months the amount of the funded debt immediately becomes payable. I am endeavouring to protect the villages to the extent that these villages may not collect the rates from the proprietors within three months; in that way the relief intended to be given them will be lost.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is better to leave the clause as it is.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 7—Penalty for removing fixture from premises in arrears.

Mr. McDAVID: I beg to move that the following be substituted for clause 7 as printed:—

7. If any person, without the consent in writing of the Director, shall remove or attempt to remove from any estate in respect of which the proprietor or local authority is liable for arrears any

building or erection which is a fixture the whole amount of the arrears and interest then outstanding on the estate shall thereupon become payable and the Director may recover the arrears and interest in the manner set out in section twenty-three of the Drainage and Irrigation Ordinance.

It is felt that the criminal feature in this clause should be taken out and that the penalty should be immediate collection of the amount due rather than that there should be a criminal offence.

Mr. HUMPHRYS: I would be very glad if Government, through the Attorney-General, would explain to the Council what really is a fixture in this Colony. We have had considerable argument on the question from time to time. It is really very difficult to say what is a fixture, and so far as we are concerned we have not yet arrived at a decision.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The point has been authoritatively decided in a case in the Supreme Court by Mr. Justice Dalton about 1915. It is in accordance with the principles of law so far as Roman Dutch law is concerned, and in fact, generally speaking, there is no difference between a fixture in the English law of property and a fixture in the Roman Dutch law, except in so far as a house or building being movable according to the person who constructed it. If the owner of property constructs an erection on his estate it becomes a fixture under English law, but if a tenant does the same sort of thing on his landlord's estate it is not a fixture but movable.

Mr. HUMPHRYS: I am glad that the Attorney-General has referred to that decision because I am familiar with it. Most of the houses in the villages and on estates are not fixtures because they are built on posts which are not in the soil. Most of the buildings of the working classes would not come within the definition of "a fixture" at all.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It is not intended to oppress the working-classes at all. It certainly affects the proprietor of an estate who thinks he ought to pull down a chimney or a factory and remove mechanical fixtures in that fashion. Those are the people whom it is intended to reach.

Question put, and agreed to.

The Council resumed.

Mr. McDAVID: I give notice that at a later stage I shall move the suspension of the Standing Rules and Orders to enable the Bill to be read the third time and passed.

#### DEEDS REGISTRY (SALES IN EXECUTION) BILL.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I move that "A Bill to amend the Deeds Registry Ordinance, Chapter 174, by making better provision with regard to the effect of sales of immovables in execution" be read the third time and passed.

Major BAIN GRAY seconded.

Question "That this Bill be now read the third time and passed" put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. McDAVID: I beg to move "A Bill to appropriate the supplies granted in the last session of the Legislative Council" be read the third time and passed.

Major BAIN GRAY seconded.

Question "That this Bill be now read the third time and passed" put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. McDAVID: I beg to move that "A Bill to allow and confirm certain additional expenditure incurred in the year ended thirty-first day of December, 1935" be read the third time and passed.

Major BAIN GRAY seconded.

Question "That this Bill be now read the third time and passed" put and agreed to.

Bill read the third time.

#### SPIRITS (COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS POWERS) BILL.

Mr. D'ANDRÉ (Comptroller of Customs): I beg to move that "A Bill to transfer to the Comptroller of Customs the powers and duties of the Chief



Commissary under the Bitters and Cordials Ordinance, Chapter 109, the Spirits Ordinance, Chapter 110, and the Stills Ordinance, Chapter 111” be read the third time and passed.

Dr. HENDERSON seconded.

Question “That this Bill be now read a third time and passed” put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time.

**DRAINAGE AND IRRIGATION (PAYMENT  
OF ARREARS) BILL.**

Mr. McDAVID: I move the suspension of the Standing Rules and Orders to enable me to move the third reading of A Bill to make special provision for the payment of arrears prior to nineteen hundred and thirty-six, of annual rates for the Drainage and Irrigation Ordinance, Chapter 165, and of advances or instalments thereof under the Drainage

and Irrigation (Advances Repayment) Ordinance, 1932.”

Major BAIN GRAY seconded.

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. McDAVID: I beg to move that “A Bill to make special provision for the payment of arrears prior to nineteen hundred and thirty-six, of annual rates under the Drainage and Irrigation Ordinance, Chapter 165, and of advances or instalments thereof under the Drainage and Irrigation (Advances Repayment) Ordinance, 1932” be read the third time and passed.

Major BAIN GRAY seconded.

Question “That this Bill be now read a third time and passed” put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time.

The Council adjourned *sine die*.

