

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.*Thursday, 14th April, 1932.*

The Council met pursuant to adjournment, His Excellency the Governor, SIR EDWARD DENHAM, K.C.M.G., K.B.E., President, in the Chair.

PRESENT.

The Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Mr. C. Douglas-Jones, C.M.G.

The Hon. the Attorney-General, Mr. Hector Josephs, K.C., B.A., LL.M. (Cantab.), LL.B. (Lond.).

The Hon. T. T. Smellie (Nominated Unofficial Member).

The Hon. P. James Kelly, M.B., Ch. B., Surgeon-General.

The Hon. F. Dias (Nominated Unofficial Member).

The Hon. T. Millard, C.M.G., Colonial Treasurer.

Major the Hon. W. Bain Gray, M.A., Ph.D. (Edin.), B. Litt. (Oxon), Director of Education.

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

The Hon. R. E. Brassington (Western Essequibo).

The Hon. E. A. Luckhoo (Eastern Berbice).

The Hon. B. R. Wood, M.A., Dip. For. (Cantab.), Conservator of Forests.

The Hon. S. H. Bayley, General Manager, Transport and Harbours Department.

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

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

The Hon. N. Cannon (Georgetown North).

The Hon. A. V. Crane, LL.B. (Lond.) (Demerara River).

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

The Hon. J. Eleazar (Berbice River).

The Hon. A. R. F. Webber, F.R.G.S., (Western Berbice).

The Hon. V. A. Pires (North Western District).

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

The Hon. Jung Bahadur Singh (Demerara-Essequibo).

The Hon. G. E. Anderson (Nominated Unofficial Member).

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

The Hon. F. J. Seaford (Nominated Unofficial Member).

MINUTES.

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on the 12th April, as printed and circulated, were confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENT.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Mr. C. Douglas-Jones): I am the bearer of the following Message from the Governor to Members:—

MESSAGE No. 11.

Honourable Members of the Legislative Council,

It will be recollected that when the Secretariat Estimates for the current year were being considered by Council during the Annual Session at the close of last year Unofficial Members recommended that, in view of the need for economy, the salary of the post of Assistant Colonial Secretary should be reduced to the scale £700—£25—£800.

2. The recommendation of Council was duly forwarded to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, who had, however, in the meantime, approved of the appointment of Mr. G. C. Green, M.B.E., to the post with salary at the rate of £800—£25—£850. A reply has now been received to my communication forwarding Council's recommendation to the effect that the Secretary of State regrets that he is unable to approve the recommendation and that the salary to be adopted for the post of Assistant Colonial Secretary should be on the scale £800—£25—£850.

3. Under the circumstances and in view also of the fact at the time of his promotion Mr. Green was drawing £740 per annum, I trust that Honourable Members will not press their

recommendation for a reduction in the salary of the post beyond that now fixed in the Civil List.

EDWARD DENHAM,
Governor.

April 11th, 1932.

GOVERNMENT NOTICE.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY gave notice that at a later stage he would move the suspension of the Standing Rules and Orders to enable "A Bill to impose an increased tax on Bills of Entry on the value of goods imported into the Colony" to be taken through all its stages.

UNOFFICIAL NOTICE.

Mr. CANNON gave notice of the following questions:—

1. During the past 20 years has any portion of the loans made by Government to village and other local authorities not been repaid; if so, how much?
2. Has this indebtedness been cancelled? If only part has been cancelled, state how much.
3. Will the Government specify the total amount of relief for each respective village or other local authority affected?
4. What amount has been voted on the annual estimates for the past 20 years in respect of grants to village authorities towards administration expenses?

ORDER OF THE DAY.

BILLS OF ENTRY BILL.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: With the permission of the Council I ask that the motion of which I have given notice should take precedence of the Order of the Day and that the Bill be taken through all its stages to-day.

Mr. SMELLIE seconded.

Question put, and agreed to.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move that "A Bill to impose an increased tax on Bills of Entry on the value of goods imported into the Colony" be read the first time.

Mr. SMELLIE seconded.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the first time.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: In moving the second reading of the Bill it is perhaps necessary that I should cover some of the grounds which have led up to its introduction. Hon. Members are fully aware of what has taken place recently with regard to the reallocation of the cost of the Sewerage Scheme in Georgetown, and also that some time ago Your Excellency appointed Commissioners to go into the matter with the object of making recommendations with regard to the reallocation. The Commissioners have held four meetings and at the fourth meeting it was recognised, I think, that no further progress of any value could be made until it was definitely decided what that reallocation should be. The Secretary of State was therefore approached and a suggestion was made to him that an equitable reallocation would be on a basis of 50-50. I think we may safely assume that with some hesitation the Secretary of State agreed to that in view of the representations Your Excellency made to him; and, as stated in your speech on Tuesday, that is the reallocation we are now endeavouring to find the means to put through in two directions. First of all, the Colony has to bear an increased portion of the cost from 20 to 50 per cent., and it has been decided and I think should be regarded as an equitable contribution to the cost of the main drainage part of the scheme. What we are dealing with to-day is purely the contribution to the cost of the scheme which is to be made by the Colony as a whole. We know that other methods of meeting the cost have been suggested, but obviously a number of those suggestions are not acceptable either to Government or to the Colony as a whole, and I think we have been very fortunate in arriving at the decision we have. It now remains for the Council to decide how the extra money should be raised to meet the Colony's extra cost. In order to do that Government has considered the matter very carefully and found that the easiest method, and one which has been adopted before and was said to be the easiest collected and has the least detrimental effect on the consumer, is to increase the Bill of Entry Tax. We find that if we increase the tax at present imposed from 1½ to 3 per cent. the sum of money required will be met. I would like to emphasise that what we are doing is to meet that part of the cost which is falling on the Colony. It now

remains for the Municipality, as distinct from the Colony, to devise means to raise their share of the cost of the scheme, the house connections. There is now a clear-cut issue before the Commissioners, who will shortly resume, and we hope suggestions will be forthcoming from those who are able to make them. The Comptroller of Customs has been instructed to collect the tax from to-day, and it is therefore necessary that the Bill should pass through all its stages as if it is not it will be necessary to move an additional clause to make it retrospective.

Mr. SMELLIE seconded.

Mr. CRANE: I did not interpose to urge my objections to the motion for the suspension of the Standing Rules and Orders because I recognised that it was Government's desire to collect what tax it can at the earliest period so as not to lose revenue. What struck me when the notice of motion was given was that it would be rushed through when it involved a piece of Government policy which this House had not accepted and had not had an opportunity of declaring whether it will say "Yea" or "Nay" to these proposals. In other words, the financial aspect of the scheme was being given effect to before the scheme was approved. Your Excellency has given a great deal of time and attention to the matter which the increased levy in intended to cover financially. I desire to say that the exercise of your prerogative has met with the acclamation of the general public. That does not mean, however, that the measure itself should not be fully debated in this House, and I respectfully submit that the time for that discussion is precedent to the time for levying the finances to give effect to the proposal. I recognise, however, that Government wants as early as possible to commence the collection of this revenue while the measure is in course of discussion. I do not think we can fittingly discuss the Sewerage Question at this stage, and my colleagues have not had notice that that discussion would be on to-day. This is an emergency measure and I am going to suggest a course which I think would meet everybody interested in this matter. Appreciating that Government must necessarily collect the revenue at the earliest possible moment, I suggest that we allow the Bill to go through

but that its operation should be limited to such time as is covered by the proposals made in the Governor's speech. The Governor indicated that the Secretary of State approved of a settlement of the matter during the years 1931-33, and the increase ought to be made operative only up to the time the settlement is going to hold good. Government should seek an early opportunity of inviting discussion on its policy. I cannot forget how action was taken on the Financial Commissioners' Report. I ask you to direct the Leader of the House to frame a motion permitting of the just discussion of the Sewerage Question. I submit it is the business of Government to get such a motion on the Order of the Day and so give an opportunity to the non-Officials to discuss matters which Government has decided to bring into effect.

Mr. CANNON: Unlike the last speaker I am opposed to this Bill forming part of our statutes. There is nothing on the Order of the Day which refers to this Bill and I think it is very ill-advised on the part of Government to attempt to rush it through at this sitting. I could not possibly accept this Bill. It is detrimental to the people of the Colony, and more especially the people of Georgetown, and to give my vote in acquiescence of it would be distinctly wrong and improper. Before I give my vote to a Bill such as this I shall have to receive a mandate from the people I represent. My request is that this matter be deferred to give Members of the Council an opportunity to consult the people we represent.

Mr. ELEAZAR: Unlike the last speaker I am in agreement with the views of the previous speaker. I wish to say something about the manner in which the Bill has been brought before the House. Government must have been aware before Tuesday of its intention to bring forward this Bill, which contemplates penalising the whole community.

THE PRESIDENT: I interrupt the hon. Member to say that notice was given the Council that the Bill would be brought. I said "Government is therefore proposing to consider an increase in the Bill of Entry Tax, which at present stands at the low figure of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to 3

per cent. which if introduced this month—and it is proposed to take the earliest steps in the matter—should yield a sum of approximately \$68,000, which together with a consequential reduction in the amount of Municipal rates which will be payable on Government property should provide a sum of \$75,000 which represents the amount of the relief to be given to the Municipality this year.”

Mr. ELEAZAR: I took it that the matter would be considered as early as possible and Government would then bring forward the Bill. Anyhow, I am not prepared to oppose the passing of the Bill because I quite conceive Government's anxiety to get hold of as much revenue as possible. That seems to be the reason for Government bringing forward the Bill in this irregular manner. Although I am going to vote for this measure I protest against matters being brought before the House in this slipshod manner.

Mr. WEBBER: I support the Bill (Laughter).

THE PRESIDENT: I should like to make a remark or two with regard to what has been said by the hon. Member for Demerara River and the hon. Member for Berbice River. I do appreciate their point and assure them that there is no intention of railroading any measure through the Council with regard to the Sewerage Scheme. We have had enough of the Sewerage Scheme for a number of years, and it has been said that Government should give some lead as to what it is prepared to contribute. As I see the Sewerage Scheme it is in two sections. The section we are dealing with to-day is the Colony's responsibility, and nobody can deal with the Colony's responsibility except the Government in Legislative Council. We have to deal with what the Colony has to contribute towards the scheme not merely as residents in Georgetown or anywhere else but as residents of the Colony in general. It is the Colony that is going to pay this money, and all the Council is asked to do is to agree to a certain tax being paid to enable a certain sum being handed over to the Municipality as a contribution towards the cost of the Sewerage Scheme. The hon. Member who spoke last always has quips to give us. I will give him another one: "*Bis dat qui cito dat.*" The point is

that we want to do something definite for Georgetown and the sooner the better as if we do not put the Bill through now we will be losing money every day. That is the only reason why we brought it in this way. I mentioned to the House that it would be brought in as early as possible. I think it is a most objectionable course to rush matters, and I am myself against putting any measure through and saying "Yea" or "Nay." The hon. Member for Demerara River asked that there should be discussion on a motion tabled by Government. We have had many discussions, the last on the report of the Bain Gray Commission. I think the Council is entitled to information on all developments, whether it is by laying on the table some paper or a motion, but we have reached the stage where the Colony has definitely said it will contribute to half the cost of the scheme and the other half the Town Council will have to consider. I recognise the ingenuity and ability displayed both inside and outside the Council in regard to the scheme and I suggest that that ingenuity and ability might be placed at the disposal of the Commissioners now that they have charge of the allocation of the other half. It is now for the Commissioners to deal with that part of the question. All we ask you to do is to provide the money for the Colony's contribution. I will give full consideration to what has been said by the two hon. Members for further discussion, but I feel that the less discussion we have now with regard to this question the better. What we want to-day is to get down to the payment and working of the scheme, which, as a scheme, I believe is an entirely good one in the interest of the Colony.

Mr. CRANE: The point I endeavoured to make was that the Executive Government has decided to pay 50 per cent. of the cost of the scheme, but that the Colony cannot undertake to do that until this House approves of what the Executive Government has done. The Executive Government has done it and then seeks approval of this House.

THE PRESIDENT: I see the point of the hon. Member. What the Council is asked to do is to approve of a sum equivalent to 50 per cent. being raised by taxation. The hon. Member has suggested that the Council might also be asked to approve of that amount being given to the

Municipality. That is a good point. We do not want to prolong the discussion more than we have done and I will give that matter consideration.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Your Excellency has dealt with the point of the hon. Member quite adequately. In that connection I say that as far as Government is concerned the allocation has been arranged. If when the whole matter has been explored that particular allocation is not approved then some other arrangement will have to be made, but that is a matter for consideration in the future. Criticism has been made of the manner the Bill has been brought forward. It is not the desire of Government to railroad matters through the Council, but very often it is desired that matters should be done quickly. This matter is one of considerable urgency. It may be only a temporary measure, and probably will be to a certain extent, as the Ordinance to levy the Bill of Entry Tax is only effective till the end of the year. It will be quite competent for the people of Georgetown, through the medium of a public meeting, to make any suggestion that they consider equitable for the distribution amongst the property owners of their share of the cost of the scheme, and Government would welcome suggestions. That is the part of the scheme the ratepayers are concerned in and as taxpayers they are concerned in the contribution by the Colony. The hon. Member for Berbice River accused Government of not giving some intimation prior to Your Excellency's speech on Tuesday. The telegram was only received on Saturday morning and it was impossible to make a statement before Tuesday. With regard to the question of giving the Council an opportunity for discussion of the allocation of the cost of the Sewerage Scheme, I suggest that the opportunity would best be afforded when we receive the final report of the Commissioners who have been appointed to go into the matter. One of the reasons why it is suggested that the matter should come up for reconsideration in 1933 is that in that year the 1 per cent. sinking fund will have to be paid. It is also not possible to earmark revenue for any particular purpose and this Bill authorises Government to raise revenue and allocate it to specific purposes.

The Council divided on the second reading of the Bill and voted:—

Ayes—Messrs. Seaford, Austin, Anderson, Dr. Singh, De Aguiar, Pires, Webber, Eleazar, Wight, Crane, Major Craig, D'Andrade, Bayley, Wood, Luckhoo, Brassington, Professor Dash, Major Bain Gray, Millard, Dias, Dr. Kelly, Smellie, the Attorney-General and the Colonial Secretary—24.

Noes—Mr. Cannon—1.

Bill read the second time.

The Council resolved itself into Committee and considered the Bill clause by clause.

Clause 2—Bill of Entry Tax.

Mr. CRANE: I suggested that the operation of this Bill ought to be limited to the duration of the settlement which has been suggested in Your Excellency's speech. There you state:

In view of the representations which I have made to him and of the present financial situation, the Secretary of State has now authorised me to announce that Government will agree that the charge for main drainage and house connections for the years 1932 and 1933 should be shared on a basis of equal division between Government and the Municipality, provided that the question of the final allocation of the total cost of the scheme be further considered in the Autumn of 1933.

This Bill, necessary as it is for taking revenue at a very early period, should be limited. It may be necessary to increase or reduce the tax next year. The financial provision should not be of any longer duration than the settlement itself, and if the settlement is for 1932-33 the Bill should be for those two years only. I move that after the word "paid" there be added the words "from the passing of this Ordinance and until the thirty-first day of December, nineteen hundred and thirty-three."

Mr. MILLARD (Colonial Treasurer): May I rise to a point of information. The present Bill is estimated to provide such sum as will be required in 1932. The Secretary of State's decision covers the years 1932 and 1933 and that decision means that the cost will be divided 50-50, including sinking fund. Sinking fund is not payable in 1932 and in 1933 it will be necessary to provide such sum as will implement 50 per cent. of the total loan

charges. I should like to remind the hon. Member that there is a principle that revenue is not to be earmarked. With the assistance of the Imperial Government the Colony has balanced its Budget for 1932 and it cannot give effect to this decision without additional revenue. It is therefore necessary to pass this Bill to give additional revenue in 1932, but it does not follow that it would be earmarked against the obligation for 1933.

Mr. CRANE: The Colonial Treasurer has not touched the point I raised. The Bill, which is to be repealed by clause 4, is to be in force till the end of the year. My point is that the financial provision should be extended to 1933 and no longer. You should not make the financial obligation extend beyond the period of the obligation.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Mr. Hector Josephs): I think the point raised by the hon. Member as to the limitations of the Bill might be met in a little different way. The Colonial Treasurer has pointed out that the contribution for this year will be sufficiently found by the additional revenue under this Bill and that next year further contributions will have to be found. That will be a matter for next year's Estimates. What may be done is to put at the end of the Bill a clause corresponding to section 5 of Ordinance No. 6 of 1932—the Ordinance now in force, viz., "This Ordinance shall continue in force until and including the thirty-first day of December, nineteen hundred and thirty-two." At the end of this year provision will then be made in the Estimates for what will be required for next year.

Mr. CRANE: I withdraw my amendment in favour of that amendment.

Question put, and agreed to.

The Council resumed.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move that the Bill be read the third time.

Mr. SMELLIE seconded.

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

Bill read the third time.

PETROLEUM BILL.

The Council resolved itself into Committee and resumed consideration of "A Bill to amend the Petroleum Ordinance, 1930, as to storage of Petroleum and other matters."

Mr. D'ANDRADE (Comptroller of Customs): I move the insertion of a new clause 2:—

2. Section two of the Principal Ordinance is hereby amended by the deletion of—

- (a.) the definition "Oil Fuel"; and
- (b.) the words "and oil fuel" at the end of the definition "Ordinary Petroleum."

The object of this amendment, and others to be moved later, is to exclude fuel oil from the provisions of the Petroleum Ordinance, 1930. Under the existing Ordinance as well as the Ordinance of 1916 there are several provisions governing the importation, storage and handling of oil fuel. Those provisions have never at any time been carried out, and these amendments are therefore to legalise the existing practice. Storage would necessitate the erection of a new building. That would increase the price of fuel oil from two to three cents, which would be an appreciable increase and would fall heavily on the rice and other agricultural industries, which use this oil largely for driving machinery. It is considered that no great risk is being run in allowing these oils to be stored in places other than a petroleum warehouse, no greater risk, at any rate, than already exists in respect of other goods which are stored in Water Street, and the insurance companies to whom the matter was referred have offered no objections to the amendments being made.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 2 (renumbered 3): Removal of petroleum after landing.

Mr. D'ANDRADE: I move that the words "or oil fuel" in the sixth and eighth lines and the words "or to fuel oil in transference through pipe lines to a licensed building" in the fifteenth and sixteenth lines be deleted. This is complementary to the previous amendment.

Mr. DE AGUIAR: This clause requires that all petroleum shall, on being landed, be removed immediately by the owner

from the wharf and stored in a warehouse or licensed building. I move that for the word "immediately" the words "within seventy-two hours" be substituted. A great deal of discretionary power is given to the Customs and one does not know how far that power will be used. If a steamer arrives on Saturday morning, unless the consignee is prepared to pay overtime charges, it may not be possible to remove the petroleum in time to a warehouse. That is my reason for moving that within seventy-two hours be substituted.

Mr. WEBBER: I do not think that amendment entirely meets the situation. Within seventy-two hours, I am advised, will not always meet the case. That time will be sufficient to meet Sundays, but where Sundays are followed by a holiday seventy-two hours will not cover it. That would therefore mean paying overtime to Customs Officers and double rates of wages to labourers. A very great hardship would be created in the case of oil arriving on Holy Thursday, I think the point can be met by striking out the word "immediately" and inserting the word "working" between the words "next" and "day" in the ninth line. I move that as an amendment.

Mr. D'ANDRADE: This matter has been very carefully considered by Government, and these proposals were put forward by persons interested in the importation of petroleum. It was suggested that I should be given power to allow kerosene oil to remain over Sundays and Public Holidays until the first working day. The Ordinance at present requires it to be removed immediately. In the case of a steamer discharging petroleum in the afternoon it would be necessary to stop working at 3 o'clock to enable all the petroleum discharged to be removed to the warehouse before 6 o'clock. The quantity that would be discharged between 3 and 6 o'clock would be comparatively small, and Government thinks that can be allowed to remain on the wharf until the next day when it can be removed immediately. Undue risk would be taken, which Government does not think is desirable, if it is allowed to remain beyond the time proposed.

Mr. DE AGUIAR: My point is to accommodate steamers which arrive and have to unload and leave the same day.

Mr. SEAFORD: The Comptroller of Customs said the insurance companies were referred to and they have no objection to the amendments. I should like to know whether the companies were consulted as to petroleum being left over and whether they are prepared to take the risk.

Mr. D'ANDRADE: I do not know whether the insurance companies dealt with the matter.

Mr. AUSTIN: The insurance companies are very anxious to get rid of petroleum from the waterside and to have it put in a place of safety. The sooner it gets away from the river frontage the better for all concerned. I very much doubt that steamers would handle petroleum or oil of an inflammable nature if they know that they are going to be kept in port a day after they discharged it or that overtime dues would have to be paid. Personally, I think the sooner we get it from the wharves into the warehouse the better.

The Committee divided on Mr. Webber's amendment and voted:—

Ayes—Messrs. Seaford, Anderson, De Aguiar, Pires, Webber, Wight, Crane, Cannon and Brassington—9.

Noes—Messrs. Austin, Dr. Singh, Eleazar, Major Craig, D'Andrade, Bayley, Wood, Luckhoo, Professor Dash, Major Bain Gray, Millard, Dias, Dr. Kelly, Smellie, the Attorney-General and the Colonial Secretary—16.

The Committee divided and voted on Mr. De Aguiar's amendment also, 9 for and 16 against, Dr. Singh voting with the minority and Mr. Brassington with the majority.

The amendment of the Comptroller of Customs was agreed to without a division.

Clause 3 (renumbered 4)—Conditions of keeping petroleum.

Mr. D'ANDRADE: I move the deletion of the words "or oil fuel" where they appear in this clause and the substitution of "one thousand" for "five hundred" in the seventh line of sub-clause (2). The amendment to sub-clause (2) is to provide for the storage of kero-

sene oil in quantities not exceeding 1,000 gallons in a building other than a petroleum warehouse. Under the existing Ordinance no quantity in excess of 50 gallons is allowed to be kept otherwise than in a warehouse or licensed building. It is considered in the interest of trade that larger quantities should be available for immediate delivery, and that merchants should not have the necessity of sending on every occasion to the petroleum magazine for small quantities for immediate sale. Although the quantity is 50 gallons in the Ordinance that provision has never been enforced because it is unworkable.

Mr. DE AGUIAR: I move that for 500 gallons 1,500 be substituted. When the Ordinance was passed Government thought 50 gallons were adequate for trade. 500 were substituted in the Bill but it has been found that even that is not adequate. There are five brands of petroleum sold in drums of, approximately, 50 gallons each and eight brands sold in cases containing $8\frac{1}{2}$ gallons each. Every trader has to carry in stock every brand in the market, and how they are going to do that with a limit of 1,000 gallons is beyond my conception. The amendment of Government is in the nature of a compromise and I do not know why the suggestion of 1,500 gallons has not been accepted.

Mr. WEBBER: I think Government might well accept this amendment. There is either a danger or the danger can be circumvented. Would 1,000 gallons present no risk while 1,500 gallons would endanger a building? I am advised that 1,000 gallons would not be sufficient to meet the convenience of trade. This is an endeavour to meet the convenience of trade, and if you are going to do that do it in a generous way as long as you are not endangering the city.

Mr. D'ANDRADE: The hon. Member for Central Demerara said Government first considered 50 gallons were sufficient for trade. When 50 gallons were determined on the intention was that merchants who deal in kerosene oil would provide a licensed building for the storage of that petroleum, to which they would be able to have access at any time. The reason why Government is now considering the question of increasing the quantity is that it has been found very difficult for merchants

to obtain suitable sites or buildings that can be converted into licensed buildings, because the regulations require that such buildings should be a considerable distance from other buildings. In the circumstances it is thought that if proper precautions are taken that is all that is necessary. In so far as the quantity is concerned 1,000 is the quantity recommended by the Inspector General of Police and the Superintendent of the Fire Brigade, who together visited premises in Water Street and took stock of the quantities which were then being stored. With the exception of one firm, of which the hon Member is Managing Director, every firm had less than 1,000 gallons. The hon Member's firm had 1,800 gallons. The Inspector-General Police after considering the matter carefully recommended that the quantity should be fixed at 1,000 gallons. My view is that if a building is properly constructed and the necessary precautions required are taken Government might consider the question of increasing the quantity to 1,500 gallons.

The amendment of the Comptroller of Customs was put, and agreed to.

Mr. D'ANDRADE: I move the insertion as clause 5 of the following:—

5. Section six of the Principal Ordinance is hereby amended as follows:—

(a.) by substituting the words "Director of Public Works" for the word "Governor" wherever that word occurs in sub-sections (3), (4) and (5) thereof; and

(b.) by adding the following as sub-section (7) thereof:—

"(7.) For every licence issued and for every renewal of a licence a fee of five dollars shall be paid."

Section 6 provides that the Governor may issue, or revoke or suspend any licence. The intention is to transfer this work to the Director of Public Works. The provision of a fee of \$5 is for the reason that at present, under the Tax Ordinance, for the signature of the Governor a stamp duty of \$5 is payable. If licences are now issued by the Director of Public Works the fee will no longer be payable under the Tax Ordinance, therefore provision is made here for the payment of the fee.

Mr. DE AGUIAR: Is it the intention of Government to charge a man who has a

small gasolene station in the country \$5 as compared with a man operating a station in Georgetown? If that is so it is wrong. I suggest that it be limited to licences within the Municipal limits.

Mr. ELEAZAR: Let stations in the town pay a little more; but those in the country can afford to pay \$5.

Mr. CANNON: People who keep gasolene for personal use have to pay this fee; it is not limited to people who trade in petroleum.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suggest that this clause stand over.

Mr. WEBBER: It might be borne in mind that these licences not only cover gasolene selling stations but every man who has a gasolene engine to grind coconuts or for running a launch.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: This is purely a registration fee and if \$5 is too much that is a question for consideration. It is for registration of places where petrol is stored either for private use or for trade. The storage of petrol is a dangerous thing. The fee has been fixed at \$5 because it is the fee exacted for the signature of the Governor, but if it is considered too high it might be reduced.

Mr. CRANE: This \$5 should never have been exacted. It was never intended for a document of this kind but for the Governor authenticating documents. With these people finding it difficult to meet taxation imposed why should they be charged this sum. And \$5 is absurd in the country. I suggest that Government should give up this tax because the Tax Ordinance never contemplated that it should be charged for this purpose.

THE CHAIRMAN: I consider some licence should be paid, certainly in Georgetown. In cases where it may not be kept for trade purposes there might be some reduction. I will look into the matter further.

Clause deferred accordingly.

Mr. D'ANDRADE: I move the insertion as clauses 6, 7, 8 and 9 of the following:—

6. Section seven of the Principal Ordinance is hereby amended by inserting the word "dangerous" after the word "of," and by substituting the words "or ordinary petroleum" for the words "other than oil fuel in bulk" after the word "petroleum" in the first line thereof.

7. Sub-section (1) of section eight of the Principal Ordinance is hereby amended by deleting the words "to any building licensed solely for the storage of oil fuel, nor" in the first and second lines of the proviso thereto.

8. Sub-section (1) of section nine of the Principal Ordinance is hereby amended by deleting the words "unless licensed or provided solely for the storage of oil fuel" at the end thereof.

9. Section ten of the Principal Ordinance is hereby amended by substituting the words "Director of Public Works" for the word "Governor" wherever that word occurs in the said section.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 5 was renumbered 10.

Mr. D'ANDRADE: I move the insertion of the following additional clauses:—

11. Section fifteen of the Principal Ordinance is hereby amended by inserting the word "or" after the word "petroleum" in the fifth line and by deleting the words "or oil fuel" in the sixth line thereof.

12. Section sixteen of the Principal Ordinance is hereby amended by inserting the word "or" after the word "petroleum" in the fourth line and by deleting the words "or oil fuel" after the word "petroleum" in the fifth line thereof.

13. Sub-section (4) of section seventeen of the Principal Ordinance is hereby amended by inserting the word "or" after the words "dangerous petroleum" in the fourth and ninth lines, and by deleting the words "or oil fuel" after the words "ordinary petroleum" in the fourth, fifth and tenth lines thereof.

14. Section twenty-seven of the Principal Ordinance is hereby amended by substituting the words "one hundred and fifty" for the words "two hundred" in the third line and by adding the words "or a distillery spirit store" after the word "warehouse" at the end of the section.

Question put, and agreed to.

The Committee also approved of a new form of certificate of test of petroleum.

The Council resumed.

POSTAGE RATES.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I beg to move the motion:—

That, with reference to Governor's Message No. 9 of the 25th February, 1932, this Council approves of the postage letter rate from British

Guiana to the United States of America being increased from 4 cents to 6 cents for the first ounce, and of the postage rate of external "Printed Papers," which includes "News-papers," being fixed at 1 cent. for 2 ozs. instead of 2 cents for 2 ozs.

Further, that these rates shall come into force as from 1st May, 1932.

By increasing postage rates to the United States another \$1,000 a year is expected. It also brings the rate of postage to the United States into line with the letter rate of other foreign countries and the West Indian Colonies. It also helps to meet the loss incurred by the fact that the terminal charges on parcels to the United States and its possessions will be increased which will be offset by the increased revenue to be gained by increasing the rate of postage to the United States. It is not thought advisable to increase the rates on parcels postage to the United States. It was brought to our notice in regard to printed papers that in increasing the rate to two cents we were contravening the conditions of the Postal Union. As a matter of fact the increase was never paid and the reversion to the old rate will cause no loss of revenue.

Mr. SMELLIE seconded.

Motion put, and agreed to.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING BILL.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I move the second reading of "A Bill to amend the Electric Lighting Ordinance by extending the New Amsterdam Electric Lighting Order, 1900, for a period of twenty years from the 23rd day of August, 1930." The necessity for this Bill was discovered as the result of a difference of opinion between the Town Council and the Surgeon General with regard to the cost of electric lighting power supplied to Government institutions in New Amsterdam. In the course of the altercation it was discovered that the Order granting power to operate electric lighting had expired.

The Council adjourned for the luncheon interval.

Mr. SEERAM was present when the Council resumed.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: When

the Council adjourned I was explaining that this Bill is necessary to rectify an omission. The Lighting Order should have been renewed in August, 1930, but it was overlooked until the question arose of the charges for lighting the institutions. The main object of the Bill is to put that omission right. The second point is that it lays down that Government institutions should enjoy the same rates of reduction as the public in New Amsterdam.

Mr. SMELLIE seconded.

Mr. ELEAZAR: Everyone expects me to support this Bill and I do so very heartily, but I wish to draw Government's attention to what I will call by a mild name so as not to provoke the ire of Government against the Municipality. Are Government so finicking as to take advantage of an omission to apply for an extension of the Lighting Order to bind the Council to give them current cheaper than to the community? I do not know if that does not out-Shylock Shylock. Shylock himself would not want to do that. Government have been getting power at 25 cents per unit, while the community has been paying 30 cents per unit. Because in these times of stress the Council think they should reduce the price of current, which is exceedingly high, Government say we should reduce it to 20 cents to them. I implore Government not to force the Council into giving them a concession which is denied to the residents of the town. Even in Georgetown people get electricity cheaper than in New Amsterdam because the community there is so small. The Mayor's chain is the last thing we have in the locker. Suppose we say "No" to this concession, are you going to take that chain away? (Laughter). Your Excellency, a little nonsense now and then is said by the best of men (Renewed laughter). Whenever it is thought opportune to reduce the cost of current commensurate with the necessities of circumstances Government will share the benefit to the community. I ask Government not to insist upon this concession.

Mr. LUCKHOO: I should like to support the appeal made by the hon. Member with respect to the objectionable feature of this measure. When we consider the history of the amalgamation scheme Government should do everything

in its power to assist the efforts of the Municipality to strengthen our position not only in respect of the electricity and water works but also sanitary matters. It was an unfortunate omission that the Order was not renewed at the proper time, and that omission should not be taken advantage of by asking us to bargain with Government. When the cost of the scheme, \$130,000, and the efforts now being made to reduce it are considered, we should receive some consideration from Government. The ratepayers pay 30 cents per unit while Government has been enjoying a preferential rate of 25 cents. Now that in the interest of the ratepayers it is sought to reduce the charge to 25 cents Government asks that it should also be reduced in respect to the institutions to 25 cents per unit. We have pointed out that the reduction is a tentative measure to induce a greater use of electricity and increase our revenue. Government claims to be the largest consumers. I am not sure that it is so, but, at any rate, Government should not press for the reduction. The Town Council recently received a report by Mr. Aitken recommending certain improvements and we are asking Government for permission to raise a loan of \$15,000 for that purpose. That would mean an added burden to the Municipality. We urge that the Municipality is a part of Government and that the concession should not be insisted on.

Mr. CRANE: I know nothing about the internal affairs of New Amsterdam and do not desire to say anything on that aspect of the question. I am only concerned with the Bill from the point of view of its status in this House. It does not seem to me that a Bill of this kind is at all necessary. Section 5 of the Electric Lighting Ordinance, Chapter 78, makes provision for the Governor-in-Council to authorise any Local Authority, which is defined to mean the Municipalities of Georgetown and New Amsterdam, to supply electricity for any public or private purposes within any area, so it is quite clear that the Governor-in-Council has ample power to make an Order authorising the Municipality to supply electricity for either purpose. The recitals in this Bill declare that such an Order was made in 1900, that it was amended on the 10th May, 1921, that it expired on the 22nd August, 1930, and that it has not been renewed. The terms of an Order may be

varied from time to time in keeping with modern equipment for the supply of electricity, and the fact that on the 22nd August, 1930, the Governor-in-Council did not renew the Order does not take away its power to make the Order. The only necessity for this Bill is clause 3. Government's legal adviser is bound to advise that clauses 1 and 2 are unnecessary. I agree with the view that Government is using the strong arm in order to get electricity at its own price. I suggest respectfully that this Bill be withdrawn. There is no necessity for it as Government is amply provided with power to authorise the New Amsterdam Town Council to supply electricity.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The position is that in the Electric Lighting Ordinance the Governor-in-Council has power to authorise by an order or licence any local authority, company or person to supply electricity within an area. There are certain provisions with regard to the manner an Order is to be obtained and certain things done under it. The important thing in all these matters is that the provisions of the statute are to be carefully obeyed, and if there is an omission what takes place is that someone instead of acting in pursuance of the law is acting without legal authority. In other words, you require sanction of the law to supply electricity. If any person attempts to supply electricity to another without an Order or licence he is committing an illegality. An order was granted to the Municipality of New Amsterdam to supply electricity. That Order expired in 1930. The position was that from the date of its expiry New Amsterdam has been supplying electricity without legal authority or sanction, and, more than that, it has been levying rates without legal sanction. Careful provision is made with regard to the duration and renewal of licences. Whatever the duration of this licence was it expired in 1930. Among other powers the Governor-in-Council, on the application of the undertakers, may grant an extension of an order for a period not exceeding 20 years at any time within one year previous to the expiry of the order or any extension thereof. It follows, therefore, that the Governor-in-Council had no power to grant an extension of the New Amsterdam Lighting Order unless that extension was granted.

Mr. CRANE: I spoke both on the extension and the granting of a new order. I knew it as well as anybody else.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: To continue, the Governor-in-Council had no power to grant an extension of the Order unless that had been done within one year prior to the expiry of the old Order. That was not done and it follows, as I said before, that there was no legal authority for the supply of electricity by New Amsterdam after the date of the expiry of the Order. That has to be set right, viz., the illegality that has been committed since the date of expiry of the Order of levying rates for the purpose of electricity and for the supply of electricity. The position is that there is no power to grant a new Order. Matters like this are considered by the Governor-in-Council and Government in effect say "We would have granted an extension of this Order having regard to the circumstances, but as our power to grant an extension has expired we ask the Legislature to sanction by statute (the only way in which it can be done) an extension of the Order from the date of its expiry. That is what is asked for in clause 2. The fact that the Order had expired was discovered some time after it had expired.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I feel somewhat at a disadvantage to meet the strong representations of the present Mayor and ex-Mayor of New Amsterdam. This provision is really intended to safeguard the ratepayers in future. So long as it is an experiment on the part of the Council to reduce the rate from 30 to 25 cents it is not the intention to ask that the amount paid by Government should be reduced, but if at any time the permanent and basic rate in regard to the public is reduced to 25 cents Government considers that it should have the same percentage of reduction as was included in the Order of 1921. If that is regarded as the position Members representing the Council of New Amsterdam will, I think, be prepared to accept it. I may say in this particular connection that the Mayoral Chain is in no jeopardy at all. One realises that uneasy rests the head upon a chain, but I do not think hon. Members need have any fear that their chain will be jeopardised in any way.

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—Government institutions to enjoy reductions in charge for energy.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I ask that this clause be deleted or amended. The price of current in New Amsterdam, I have heard, is the highest in the world, and as it has not been contradicted I take it to be correct. I do not think Government should insist on getting light at less than the ordinary consumer, and it is not fair.

Mr. LUCKHOO: As far as I am concerned I accept the assurance of the Colonial Secretary, but I do not see the necessity for incorporating this clause in legislation. It might be made the subject of private correspondence. And it is made retrospective. Supposing another Colonial Secretary claimed a reduction from 1932, we shall have no defence. We should not be tied down hand and foot, and I think the Council deserves better treatment than that. We have replaced uneconomic machinery for the good of the community and I think we should be helped by Government rather than be bound down by legislation with respect to our charge.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: One sympathises with the efforts made by the representatives of New Amsterdam to do the best for the town and also its revenue, but Government has certain duties to perform to the rest of the taxpayers of the Colony. The amount of electricity used in the public institutions and other buildings is considerably in excess of what is used in the town except by the Municipality in its own pumping and other operations. I therefore think it is only reasonable that Government should ask that if the Town Council reduce the rate to the public to 25 cents they should reduce Government's to 20 cents. They said the reduction is only a temporary measure. As long as it is a temporary measure it is alright, but should the Town Council reduce it to 20 cents to the public it should be 5 cents less to Government.

The Committee divided on the question that the clause stand part of the Bill and voted:—

Ayes—Messrs. Anderson, Dr. Singh, Webber, Cannon, Major Craig, D'Andrade, Bayley, Wood, Professor Dash, Major Bain Gray, Millard, Dias, Dr. Kelly, the Attorney-General and the Colonial Secretary—15.

Noes—Messrs. Seeram, Eleazar, Crane and Luckhoo—4.

The Council resumed.

Notice was given that at the next meeting of the Council it would be moved that the Bill be read the third time (*Colonial Secretary*).

DRAINAGE AND IRRIGATION BILL.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I move the second reading of "A Bill to amend the Drainage and Irrigation Ordinance by validating the proceedings with respect to the declaration of certain areas as declared areas: by vesting the works area in a declared area indefeasibly in the Director of Public Works; and by providing for the deposit with the Registrar of Deeds of copies of Orders in Council declaring areas to be declared areas." This Bill sets right some irregularities which took place on the Drainage and Irrigation Ordinance, Chapter 165. Section 9 of that Ordinance provides that by an Order of the Governor-in-Council an area may be declared a declared area. Section 3 provides that where it appears to the Governor-in-Council that any area of land is suitable for irrigation and drainage it becomes the duty of the Director of Public Works to make certain plans and surveys which have to be deposited with the Governor-in-Council. When that has been done the Director holds a meeting of the people interested when the plans are exhibited and everybody knows what has happened. After that the Governor-in-Council considers the plans and estimates and they are laid before the Legislative Council, and after the Council approves of the plans and estimates the work is carried out. Everything turns on the plans and specifications, and the idea contemplated under the Ordinance was that there shall be special surveys made for the purpose of these plans and specifications. What happened was that instead of original plans being made for the various schemes which had been made from time to time, tracings were made of copies of plans and action

was taken on these tracings and everything done as if they were the original plans. It becomes necessary to validate these. It is much too expensive now to embark on a survey of these lands, and the Director of Public Works has not the staff to do so. The areas have been declared and it is proposed by this Bill to validate the orders which have been made in respect of the various areas as if the plans had been properly made. An opportunity would then be available to every interested party to look at these plans and see how his land is affected by the works. The lands are vested in the Director and shall remain so vested notwithstanding any subsequent dealings with lands forming part of the works area to which the Director is not a party.

Mr. CRANE: This matter of irrigation and drainage is a very important one and was dealt with by this Council in 1927 very comprehensively. The present Bill is to validate certain acts of Government which appear not to have been regular under the Ordinance. I am at one with Government that it can hardly be said that the money and the time of officers at the present time are available. The question is, however, whether in view of the omission on the part of Government to prepare these plans in certain cases, this particular measure is going to do what the title says is to be done. Section 3 of the Principal Ordinance merely enacts that the Director may inspect an area, and, if he is satisfied that the land is suitable for treatment under the Ordinance, he would then make a survey of and prepare a plan showing the works area. I am drawing attention specifically to the words "works area." There are two areas referred to in the Ordinance. "Declared area" includes all private lands of the proprietor. The "works area" seems to be the lands, trenches, kokers and sluices which are used immediately as drainage works. The Governor-in-Council does not define the works area but declares the general area. If the plan was not made in certain cases, as we are told, how can land part of the private property of individuals be vested in the Director of Public Works. We are saying that notwithstanding that has not been done vestings shall take place and a person who buys that property afterwards can go to the Registrar's Office and see what has been vested in the Director.

Clause 4 does not say even now that a plan shall be prepared. The Registrar has not a copy of the plans but a copy of the Orders in Council.

The works areas have never been defined and they must be defined in a plan and not in an Order in Council. This Council cannot allow legislation of this sort to be passed when it means that people will have to spend a good deal of money in litigation to decide what are their rights when they purchase property under an instrument of that kind. This Bill does not set right any of these works. This drainage question should be reconsidered by Government (Hear, hear). What was the scheme of the 1927 enactment? As shown by section 11 of the Ordinance there should have been compensation in certain cases for lands taken away. Government has never had money to comply with the Ordinance and a slipshod method of dealing with the matter was adopted in all districts. The people willingly co-operated with Government but there was no scheme under the Ordinance. In view of the fact that Government has been unable to carry out the Ordinance the question is whether section 10 should be allowed to remain on the statute book. The vesting should not be in the Director of Public Works but in the Drainage Authority consisting of persons whose estates fall within the declared area. I am objecting to this form of land acquisition. The land is only required for drainage purposes. Apart from that Government has no right to the land, legally or morally, and everything can be done by placing it under the control of the Drainage Authority. I myself have no objection to clause 2. Government may declare what has been done to be regular despite the fact that the survey and plans were not made and other things not done. When the Authority ceases to exist the land should return to the owner of it. Owners of land have asked me to appeal to Government to put the whole Ordinance in the melting-pot. It is therefore my duty to suggest, unless Government can satisfy us that it is a matter of urgency, that this Bill be not put through now but postponed and further consideration given to it.

Mr. WEBBER: In view of the remarks of the hon. Member I am hoping that Your

Excellency will make an early pronouncement as to the postponement of this debate. A very strong point has been made with regard to alienating land that is not defined. By way of illustration you are vesting 10 acres of my land in the Director of Public Works, and you do not tell me where the land is situated and the Registrar cannot inform me. A man has the right to know what you are taking away from him. I abhor the term "indefeasible title," and to close the door arbitrarily to a man's right is a great injustice. Government should defer consideration of the subject in deference to the wishes of the Electives and give us a further opportunity to discuss it.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I think Your Excellency has heard sufficient, even with the coping stone that the hon. Member for Western Berbice has put on, to warrant this Bill being held over for further consideration at the hands of the Attorney-General. We know Your Excellency's good intentions and wish you would be here forever. But what is going to happen when you are not here? Only yesterday I had a case before the Magistrate of an old man of about 75 years of age. A few years ago a certain area was partitioned and a part of it reserved for a dam. The partition officer left out a number of coconut trees of the old man and assigned the land upon which they are to a young man. As far as I can see the old man has no alternative but to give up his land. He paid me to tell him the truth, and I told him (Laughter). These are the evils that this thing works. Vest the land in the Authority and not in the Director of Public Works.

Major CRAIG (Director of Public Works): There seems to be some misunderstanding with regard to the plans lodged with the Registrar. Plans were prepared for surveys in accordance with the Drainage Ordinance and those plans indicate to scale the declared area within which there is the works area. The declared area has been bounded by a description north or south and west and the works area is generally approximately 200 roods south of the public road. That works area is indicated on the plan deposited with the Registrar and is shown by a pink border. The various trenches that were excavated, some new and some reconstructed, are

indicated by lines on the plan. The different trenches are not defined by boundaries, as the Registrar demands under section 48 of the Principal Ordinance, and it is those trenches that will take a considerable time to make a correct survey of. One would have to give very arbitrary measurements of these trenches as it depends entirely on the area of land to be drained according to the width and depth. The areas occupied by the pumping stations are very easily defined, also the areas occupied by the sluices can very easily be indicated on the plan. The plans deposited with the Registrar indicate very clearly the declared area and the works area, and the trenches themselves are outlined generally in blue ink, and there are definite indications of the work done for the money voted for the various drainage works.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: To supplement what has been stated by the Director of Public Works, the explanatory memorandum states that "many of these orders have been made. There are, however, certain conditions under the Ordinance to be complied with before an order may properly be made, one of which is the making of a survey and the preparation of a plan showing the area to be declared and the works area. In certain cases where orders have been made it has been brought to Government's notice that this condition was not complied with. A survey was not made, but plans, purporting to be plans of the area, were prepared by making tracings from existing plans and what purported to be the works area was delineated on these plans. The works area so delineated, however, did not include all the works which fall under the definition of "works" in section two of the Ordinance. To make surveys and prepare plans, which might be substituted for the plans already made, would entail a large expenditure of time and money. Neither the staff to do the work nor the wherewithal to pay for it is now available. In the circumstances clause two of the Bill aims at validating the orders made though a condition precedent was not complied with." The Director of Public Works might give a further explanation.

Major CRAIG: Most of the plans were prepared before I assumed office. That is not stated by way of any excuse for any

dilatoriness on the part of Government. I understand that these plans were made from various plans of surveys of the district and any assistance required so far as the drainage works are concerned were made by a qualified Surveyor in the Public Works Department.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The point we all desire information on, and which is very important, is whether Surveyors were sent out to make plans for this specific purpose or whether the plans were made from other surveys.

Major CRAIG: These plans were compiled from various surveys and in so far as additional information was required a qualified Surveyor of the Department was directed to get that information.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That makes the position clear. The trouble really arose when the Registrar came to annotate the transport. There were no plans which could be lodged either with the Department of Lands and Mines or the Registrar because they were not original plans. The hon. Member for Demerara River referred to clause 4 which repeals the existing section 48. The object of that section was that the Director of Public Works shall deposit a copy of every order with the Registrar. The intention was that where an order was made under section 9 after these matters were submitted to the Legislative Council reference to the order would include reference to the plans and specifications. The idea seemed to have been that after the lodging of a copy of the order with the Registrar anybody looking at the order would have reference to the original plans of the original order. There seems to be a good deal of force in the remarks of the hon. Member for Demerara River and to carry out what is intended I venture to think that an addition should be made to it. A declared area includes the works area. "Works" is very comprehensive and means "any machinery, reservoir, canal, trench, sluice, koker, aqueduct, weir, conservancy, dam, lock, road, or any work, construction, thing or excavation, etc., of a declared area," and "works area" means "the land intended and used for the erection and construction of works for the service of a declared area, and includes all works made,

erected and constructed thereon." It therefore seems to follow that the definition of works area involves the land on which the necessary works for the services of the declared area are constructed apart from the engines and so on. There can be no question of anybody's title arising in connection with either buildings, erections or the canals constructed, and it is essential for the proper maintenance of these works that they should be vested in an authority. There must be some individual, or body or corporation, in the position to exclude anyone else from interfering with

the works. What the Ordinance has done is to make a corporation sole of the Director of Public Works, and it is not dealing with the particular individuals. Under the Ordinance he is the officer concerned with the collection of the drainage and irrigation rates as well as the imposition of these rates, and so it was vested in him as one special officer instead of in an authority of people.

The Council at this stage adjourned until the following day at 11 o'clock.