

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

*Tuesday, 15th August, 1933.*

The Council met 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. T. Millard, C.M.G. (Acting).

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

The Hon. T. T. Smellie, O.B.E. (Nominated Unofficial Member).

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

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. E. F. Fredericks, LL.B. (Essequibo River).

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

The Hon. J. A. Henderson, M.B., Ch.B., B.Sc. (P.H.) (Edin.), D.T.M. & H. (Edin.), Surgeon-General.

The Hon. F. Birkitt, Postmaster-General.

The Hon. E. F. McDavid, M.B.E., Colonial Treasurer (Acting).

The Hon. P. W. King, Official Receiver.

The Hon. H. P. Christiani, F.R.G.S., Commissioner of Lands and Mines (Acting).

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

The Hon. N. Cannon (Georgetown North).

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

The Hon. J. Eleazar (Berbice River).

The Hon. J. Gonsalves (Georgetown South).

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

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

The Hon. Peer Bacchus (Western Berbice).

The Hon. W. S. Jones (Nominated Unofficial Member).

The Hon. H. G. Seaford (Nominated Unofficial Member).

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

### MINUTES.

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on the 28th June, as printed and circulated, were confirmed.

### MEMBER SWORN.

The following Member took and subscribed to the oath:—

Mr. H. P. Christiani (Acting Commissioner of Lands and Mines).

### ANNOUNCEMENTS.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Mr. T. Millard): I am the bearer of the following Messages from His Excellency the Governor to the Council:—

#### MESSAGE No. 15 of 1933.

Honourable Members of the Legislative Council,

I have the honour to inform the Council that Messrs. Booker Bros., McConnell & Co., Ltd., have applied for the refund of a sum of \$417 60, being the amount of excise duty paid on 104.5 liquid gallons of bitters manufactured in the Colony as it has been found that the bitters are unsuitable for sale and permission is sought to destroy the quantity named.

2. I have consulted my Executive Council in the matter and with their advice I invite this Council to approve of this refund. The bitters will be destroyed in the presence of a Government Officer.

EDWARD DENHAM,  
Governor.

3rd July, 1933.

## MESSAGE No. 16.

Honourable Members of the Legislative Council,

I have the honour to invite the Council to approve of the payment, as an act of grace, of a gratuity of \$300 to Mrs. E. Morgan, widow of the late Sergeant No. 3844 Morgan, Armourer of the Local Forces, who died on the 14th of February, 1933.

2. Sergeant Morgan had not served sufficiently long to enable him to qualify for a pension or for his estate to be entitled to a gratuity under the provisions of the Constabulary Ordinance, Chapter 30. He was in receipt of salary at the rate of \$54 per mensem at the date of his death. The deceased rendered 9 years and 11 $\frac{3}{4}$  months faithful service and prior to his enlistment in the Police Force had served with the British West Indies Regiment during the Great War in Egypt and Palestine.

3. With the concurrence of my Executive Council I recommend that in the special circumstances of the case, a gratuity of \$300 be awarded to Mrs. Morgan.

EDWARD DENHAM,  
Governor.

6th July, 1933.

## MESSAGE No. 17.

Honourable Members of the Legislative Council,

I have the honour to inform the Council that following on the Report\* by Mr. H. S. Cooper, C.B., C.M.G., on the Transport and Harbours Department, and the recommendations thereon of the Board of Commissioners of the Department which have been approved by the Secretary of State to undertake during the current year the following extraordinary works on renewals and improvements:—

*Renewals—*

(a) Renewal of 4 $\frac{1}{2}$  miles of track ...\$ 27,000

*Improvements—*

(b) Railway Wharf Extension 15,000

(c) New Stores Building 8,000

(d) Turntable ... 6,000

(e) Machine Tools (Central workshop) 3,450

\$ 59,450

2. The attention of Honourable Members is invited to the remarks by Mr. Cooper on these requirements in the relevant paragraphs of his Report.

3. On the subject of track renewals (item (a)) Mr. Cooper recommended that a programme of annual replacement of rails should be commenced at once and stated that the matter was one of actual necessity which did not admit of postponement if the safety point is not to be passed.—Paragraph 59 of the Report.

4. Mr. Cooper's recommendations relating to the items under the head of "Improvements" are contained in paragraphs 36, 53, 61 and 70 of the Report. All of these works are considered to be urgently necessary and will result in increased efficiency and in the case of items (d) and (e) in a reduction of operating costs.

5. The Secretary of State has approved of the cost of these works being met from General Revenue pending further consideration of

future financial requirements and, if necessary, the unappropriated balances of Imperial Loan-in-Aid provisions that are available to cover any deficiency that may thereby result being drawn on for these purposes.

6. I accordingly invite the Council to approve of the proposed expenditure and to authorise the necessary provision therefor being made in the next Schedule of Additional Provision for the current year.

EDWARD DENHAM,  
Governor.

5th July, 1933.

\*Leg. Co. No. 1 of 1933.

Major CRAIG (Director of Public Works): I am the bearer of the following Message from His Excellency the Governor to the Council:—

## MESSAGE No. 18.

Honourable Members of the Legislative Council.

I have the honour to invite the attention of Honourable Members to my Message No. 12 of the 14th of March, 1933, and Resolution No. XIII. passed by this Council on the 9th of June, 1933, approving of the total cost of the works in respect of certain areas declared under section 9 of the Drainage and Irrigation Ordinance, Chapter 165, being reduced as indicated therein and to state that through an oversight certain further relief which it had been decided to afford to two areas—Johanna Cecelia to Annandale and Buxton and Friendship—was not taken into consideration when the amounts shown in the Resolution were fixed.

2. With regard to the Johanna Cecelia—Annandale area it was specially recommended in paragraphs 73 to 76 of the Austin Committee's Report that the expenditure on certain works of a permanent nature which had not been included in the original estimate and had been charged as maintenance should be added to the total cost of the works so as to charge the area with only the proportionate cost thereof, *i.e.*, 60 per cent.

3. As the loan raised under Ordinance 11 of 1929 from which the cost of the drainage works was met has been closed, it will be necessary to afford additional relief to the area to the extent of the expenditure in question which amounts to \$3,345.18. In order to make such additional relief effective the reduced total cost of the work should be \$24,935 instead of \$30,510.30 and the proportionate cost to be borne by the proprietors \$14,951 instead of \$18,306.18 as stated in the Resolution referred to above.

4. With regard to Buxton and Friendship area the local authority expended a sum of \$2,842.26 on the reconstruction of certain permanent work undertaken as part of the original scheme which it is now proposed to allow as additional relief to this area. In this case, the reduced total cost of the work should be \$37,669.90 instead of \$42,407 and the proportionate cost to be borne by the proprietors should be \$22,601.94 instead of \$25,444.20 as set out in the Resolution cited above.

5. I have consulted my Executive Council in

the matter and with their concurrence I invite this Council to approve of the reductions indicated in paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 above.

EDWARD DENHAM,  
Governor.

18th July, 1933.

#### PAPERS LAID.

The following documents were laid on the table:—

Report of the New Widows and Orphans' Fund, 1932.

Report of the Immigration Agent General for the year 1932.

Report of the Inspector of Prisons for the year 1932.

Report of the Registrar-General for the year 1932.

Report and Financial Statements of the Georgetown Chamber of Commerce for the year ended 30th June, 1933.

Report on the activities of the British Guiana Rice Marketing Board to 30th April, 1933—(*The Colonial Secretary*).

Report of the Select Committee of the Legislative Council appointed to report and advise on the position of the rice industry in regard to the exportation of rice.

Report of the Deeds Registry for the year 1932.—(*The Attorney-General*).

Report of the Commissioner of Income Tax for the year 1932.—(*Mr. McDavid*).

Report of the Post Office Savings Bank for the year 1932.—(*Mr. Birkitt*).

#### GOVERNMENT NOTICES.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY gave notice of the following motions:

##### REFUND OF EXCISE DUTY.

THAT, with reference to Governor's Message No. 15 of the 3rd of July, 1933, this Council approves of the refund to Messrs. Booker Bros., McConnell & Co., Ltd. of a sum of \$417.60, being the amount of excise duty paid on 104.5 liquid gallons of bitters manufactured in the Colony.

#### PAYMENT OF GRATUITY.

THAT, with reference to Message No. 16 of the 6th of July, 1933, from His Excellency the Governor, this Council approves of the payment, as an act of grace, of a gratuity of \$300 to Mrs. E. Morgan, widow of the late Sergeant No. 3844 Morgan, Armourer of the Local Forces, who died on the 14th of February, 1933.

#### EXTRAORDINARY EXPENDITURE.

THAT, with reference to Governor's Message No. 17 of the 5th of July, 1933, this Council approves of the extraordinary expenditure on the Transport and Harbours Department as set out hereunder:—

<i>Renewals</i> —		
Renewal of 4½ Miles of Track	...\$	27,000
<i>Improvements</i> —		
Railway Wharf Extension		15,000
New Stores Building...		8,000
Turtable		6,000
Machine Tools (Central workshop) ...		3,450
		<u>\$ 59,450</u>

and authorises the necessary provision being made therefor in the next Schedule of Additional Provision for the current year.

#### COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL gave notice that at the meeting of the Council to be held on 22nd August he would move:—

THAT the Council do resolve itself into Committee of the whole Council to discuss the Report of the Select Committee of the Legislative Council appointed to report and advise on the position of the rice industry in regard to the exportation of rice.

Major CRAIG gave notice of the following motion:—

#### DRAINAGE AND IRRIGATION.

THAT, with reference to Governor's Message No. 18 of the 18th of July, 1933, and Resolution No. XIII. of the 9th June, 1933, this Council approves of the total costs of the following areas declared under section nine of the Drainage and Irrigation Ordinance, Chapter 165, being further reduced to the extent indicated:—

AREA.	Total cost.	Reduced total cost.	Proportionate cost payable by proprietors being 60% of reduced total cost.
ESSEQUEBO COAST— Johanna Cecelia to Annandale	... \$ 43,942 30	\$ 24,935 00	\$ 14,961 00
EAST COAST, DEMERARA— Buxton and Friendship ...	... 75,303 10	37,669 90	22,601 94

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS.

Notice was given that at the next meeting of the Council leave would be asked to introduce and have read the first time the following Bills:—

A Bill further to amend the Customs Duties Ordinance, Chapter 34, by inserting therein a definition of the term "The British Empire,"—(*Colonial-Secretary*).

A Bill for regulating pensions, gratuities and other allowances to be granted in respect of service in offices held by Civil Servants in this Colony.—(*The Attorney General*).

A Bill to amend the Georgetown Sewerage and Water Ordinance, Chapter 96, by giving the Council authority to exempt from rating buildings and the lands occupied therewith used as schools.—(*Major Bain Gray*).

A Bill to amend the Sea Defence Ordinance, 1933, with respect to the amounts to be voted in pursuance of paragraph (A) of sub-section (2) of section eighteen, and with respect to rates for nineteen hundred and thirty-three.

A Bill to make provision for the raising of a Loan for the construction of Sea Defences under the Sea Defence Ordinance, 1933.—(*Major Craig*).

A Bill to make provision for the registration of Opticians, to regulate the practice of sight-testing and for purposes incidental thereto.—(*Dr. Henderson*).

A Bill to allow and confirm certain additional expenditure incurred in the year ended thirty-first day of December, 1932.—(*Mr. McDavid*).

The Colonial Secretary replied as follows:—

1. Thirty-one.

2 & 3.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY gave notice that at a later stage in the day it would be moved that Standing Order No. 11 (1) be suspended to enable the Bills to be read a first time.

## PETITIONS.

Mr. CANNON laid on the table a petition from Conrad Alexander Thomas, ex-Prison Warder, praying that he be re-instated, or some measure of relief be granted him.

Mr. LUCKHOO laid on the table a petition from proprietors in the Ulverston, Alness, Salton Country District, praying for relief in respect of drainage rates.

## ORDER OF THE DAY.

## VISITS OF EXPERTS, &amp;C.

Mr. BRASSINGTON asked the following questions:—

1. The number of experts, Commissioners, etc., who have visited the Colony to advise on works of development or in any other direction within the past twenty years?
2. The names of such experts and the objects of the visits to the Colony of each?
3. The cost to the Colony of each visit?
4. The cost to the Colony within the same period of visits abroad by officials or other persons for the purpose of representing the Colony at Conferences.

	NAME.	OBJECT OF VISIT.	COST.
1913	Mr. E. M. Bland, C.M.G.	... To consider and report upon the construction of a Railway to the Interior of British Guiana	\$ 4,448 23
1913	Do.	... To consider and report upon the construction of a Light Railway between New Amsterdam and Skeldon	5,997 18
1913	Indian Commissioners (Mr. McNeill and Mr. Chimman Lal).	To consider and report upon the condition under which Indentured Immigrants serve in this Colony	* 254 85
1913	Commissioners	... To study Venereal Diseases	59 96
1916	Mr. G. O. Case	... Engaged in the construction of Sea Defences in the Colony. Reported on the Georgetown Harbour	14,840 00
1919	Mr. C. J. Witteveen, D.P.W., Surinam	In connexion with works on East and West Coasts Sea Defences	2,400 00
1919	Major A. E. Stephenson, C.M.G., D.C.A.	To consider and report upon the work of Treasury and Audit Departments	1,062 02
1919	Mr. H. Howard Humphreys	... Consulting Engineer, Main Sewage and Drainage Scheme	6,132 12
1921	Mr. S. X. Comber	... To consider and report upon possible development of Hydro-Electric Power	1,518 76
1920	Mr. A. Beeby Thompson	... In connexion with Artesian Water Supplies for the Colony	4,797 24
1921	Prof. R. T. Leiper, M.D.	... Commission from London School of Tropical Medicine to study Filariasis, etc.	4,800 00
1921	Sir Francis Spring	... Improved access to the port of Georgetown	398 88

\* Portion of cost of visit. Balance met from Immigration Fund.

NAME.	OBJECT OF VISIT.	COST.
1921 Mr. G. F. Keatinge, C.I.E., I.C.S., to Dewan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai, 1922 and Mr. V. N. Tivary, M.A. (Deputation from India)	Scheme for Indian Emigration to British Guiana ...	* 11,654 02
1922 Mr. J. W. Spiller	... To report on Government Railways of British Guiana	1,111 14
1922 Major the Hon. E. F. Wood	... To consider and report on the lines of Constitutional Development in the B.W.I., and British Guiana	741 42
1924 Capt. A. R. Chancellor, C.B.E.	... Organisation of the British Guiana Police Force	1,260 84
1924 Members of the Yellow Fever Commission of the I. H. Board of the Rockefeller Foundation	... ..	Nil.
1924 Education Commissioners	...	Nil.
1925 Parliamentary Delegation from Improvement of Trade Canada	...	3,247 88
1925 Kunwar Maraj Singh, M.A., C.I.E., In connexion with introduction of immigrants to (Delegate from India)	British Guiana from India.	† 1,414 62
1926 Parliamentary Commissioners	... To investigate the economic condition of the Colony	Nil.
1926 Representative, South African Railway	The supply of Mora Sleepers	1,440 00
1927 Sir Harry Moorhouse, C.M.G., D.S.O.	To report upon the Civil Service of British Guiana	2,617 62
1927 Mr. John Leggate	... To consider and report how transport to the Interior of British Guiana can be improved	28,159 53
1929 Commissioners	... To enquire into and report on the Sugar Industry ...	4,500 83
1930 Sir Wilfred Beveridge, K.B.E.	... Medical and Sanitary Mission	‡ 4,251 00
1931 Financial Commissioners	... To investigate and report on the financial position of the Colony	§ 5,981 73
1931 Mr. G. O. Case	... To advise in regard to Sea Defences	1,118 96
1931 Mr. Montgomery, M.R.C.V.S.	... Investigation of Live Stock problems	Nil.
1932 Mr. Stockdale, C.M.G., C.B.E.	... To ascertain conditions of Agricultural Industry and study the working of the Department of Agriculture.	Nil.
1932 Mr. A. S. Cooper, C.B., C.M.G.	... To enquire into and report on the working of the Transport and Harbours Department	866 47

\* \$8,544 of this amount has been recovered from the Indian Government.

† Met from Colonization Fund.

‡ Met from Colonial Development Fund.

§ Met from B.G. Funds with assistance of Imperial loans-in-aid.

|| Met from Colonial Agriculture Service Fund. Figures not available.

4.

Year.	Particulars.	Amount.
1913	Reciprocity Representatives, Canada ...	...\$ 729 00
1914	Conference at Trinidad on proposed Steamship Service to Canada	207 50
1914	Mr. S. H. Bayley's visit to St. Lucia Government Lime Juice Factory	122 24
1916	Delegates to Immigration Conference, Trinidad...	235 80
1919	Delegates to Customs Conference, Trinidad	561 36
1919 to 1921	Delegation to the United Kingdom and India	* 35,699 96
1920	Captain J. M. Reid, Trade Conference at Ottawa	1,182 02
1921	Delegates to Education Conference, Trinidad ...	387 70
1921	Expenses of Conference on Public Health and Sanitation	1,734 32
1922	Expenses of Delegate to West Indian Quarantine Conference	188 63
1923	Representation—Forestry Conference, Canada ...	1,021 41
1923	Delegation to the United Kingdom and India ...	* 26,180 63
1924	Representation—Agricultural Conference, Jamaica	1,132 68
1924	Representation—Botanical Conference, London ...	31 24
1925	Representation—Ottawa Conference	6,922 63
1925	Representation—First International Congress on Child Welfare at Geneva	121 64
1925	Representation—Malaria Congress, Rome ...	158 72
1926	Mr. A. E. V. Barton, West Indian Trade Conference, Canada	720 00
1926	West Indian Conference expenses	13,101 42
1927	Colonial Office Conference	154 08
1928	Delegates to Secretary of State in connexion with amendment of the Constitution.	4,800 00
1929	West Indian Conference expenses	1,664 14

\* Met from Colonization Fund.

## DUTY ON PROFITS ON GOLD.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I beg to move the second reading of "A Bill to amend the Mining (Consolidation) Ordinance with respect to the duty on profits on gold won by milling and dredging." I think it is necessary to explain to hon. Members what this very brief Bill may not on the face of it make clear. In 1911 provision was made for the taking of duty on profits on gold won by milling, and milling was limited to mills of 10 stamps or more. In 1918 this Ordinance was amended to provide for the taking of duty in the same form in the case of gold won by dredging. Since that time there was for a period spasmodic activity in dredging, but in very recent years there has been regular activity. During that period the operation of the Ordinance on the basis of the Trading Accounts and Mining Accounts of the concerns or concern, the activities of which were directed to dredging, presented considerable difficulties, not only to the Department of Lands and Mines responsible for the assessment of the duty, but to the concern in producing accounts satisfying that Department. It was necessary to revise the accounts considerably in order to eliminate activities not concerned with dredging or directly associated with dredging. The alternative before this form of duty was introduced was royalty, as in the case of other activities in relationship to the winning of gold.

There is one concern operating by dredging and representation has been made to Government by that concern that they find it extremely difficult and a good deal of time is occupied in producing satisfactory evidence as to profits. Their willingness to pay duty in the form of royalty has been indicated. The purpose of this Bill is to provide what might prove to be a more satisfactory basis of assessment. The provisions as included in the Ordinance are certainly of a somewhat technical nature. They were framed originally to a form providing for highly stabilised mining which is not at present represented in this Colony. The proposal therefore before the Council in this draft Bill is to eliminate the provision for a special collection, on the basis of profits, and to confine the collection of taxation to the royalty. It will be seen that the Bill repeals sections 35 to 51 of Chapter 175. These are the ones to which I have

been referring, and also in section 22, there is elimination of the reference to those numerous other sections in respect to the payment of royalty. I beg to move the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. SMELLIE seconded.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the second time.

The Council resolved itself into Committee and considered the Bill clause by clause without discussion.

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—(*The Colonial Secretary*).

## RICE FACTORIES CONTROL BILL.

Professor DASH (Director of Agriculture): I do not wish to detain the Council with any lengthy remarks in connection with this Rice Factories Ordinance, (*i.e.*, A Bill to make provision for the regulation and control of rice factories and the manufacture of rice) as I think the necessity for it has been apparent for some time. At any rate, the fullest consideration has been given to this Bill during the past 18 months. It has the approval of the Rice Marketing Board and the Rice Association, both of which bodies had the opportunity of studying it.

As will be seen this Ordinance aims at improving milling conditions in the industry and, if I may say so, this is the last stronghold of inefficiency in the rice industry to be overcome. I am not suggesting for one moment that there are not a large number of efficient mills worked by equally efficient millers in this Colony, but there can be no doubt that there are an equally large number of mills which call for serious overhaul not only in respect to actual milling but in respect to general sanitation and the keeping of proper records. The absence of proper records has had additional significance during recent years in connection with efforts to extend the export trade. Furthermore, there have been a number of complaints by growers that the absence of such records prevents them from knowing the

correct outturn from padi supplied to the mill, and also in connection with weights and measures used. Of course, I am not suggesting that there are any illicit practices in vogue at any of the mills, but it must be admitted that where there are no records there is always ground for suspicion on the part of the producer and provision is made in the Bill to ensure that proper books and receipts are kept.

While provision is definitely made in the Bill for all new rice factories to come under its operation at once, the factories already in operation are given a reasonable opportunity to effect such improvements as the Ordinance requires and in this way no hardship will be inflicted. The provisions are clearly stated in the various clauses and there is hardly need to mention them in any detail at this juncture.

It will be observed that proposals are put forward for the issue of licences by the District Commissioners, and that certificates are also required in respect to public health measures and sanitation of sites. Only a small fee of \$2.00 is to be charged, indicating that there is no intention of Government to make any money out of the issue of such licences, which merely facilitate the proper registration of the mills. Provision is also made for the transfer of licences. Clause 11 indicates the records that shall be kept at a rice factory. In the same clause it will be observed that a definite system of weights is to be used in calculating the quantities of padi and rice handled at the mill. Clause 12 provides for the necessary returns to be made periodically to the Commissioners, while clause 13 allows certain authorised persons to visit and inspect the factory or any padi or rice stored therein. With these few remarks I beg to move the second reading of the Bill and when in Committee I shall have a small amendment to move in clauses 11 and 14.

Mr. DIAS seconded.

Mr. SEAFORD: As President of the Rice Growers' Association, I should like to mention to this Council that this Bill was put before my Association and carefully considered item by item. The Association have asked me, first of all, to state that unless Government are prepared to finance the rice industry they want no

legislation. I desire to make it clear that those are not my views. I want Government to know the decision come to at a meeting of the Association.

THE PRESIDENT: What Association is the hon. Member speaking of—the Rice Marketing Board or the Rice Growers' Association?

Mr. SEAFORD: The Rice Growers' Association.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. Member may proceed.

Mr. SEAFORD: At a Committee meeting of the Association it was further stated—and I may say I am in entire agreement—that if Government are going to introduce this Bill about registration we think it is very necessary that there should also be some legislation whereby the price of rice for local consumption could be fixed. I am not quite sure whether that should be done by this Council or by the Governor-in-Council, but hon. Members will observe that there is a great deal of registration necessary. A great deal of detail work is required of millers, and that detail work is asked for in the hope that Government will fix the price of rice for local sales. No doubt, it will be contended that it will raise the price of food in the Colony generally, but I wish to say that every industry is worthy of support and in raising the price of rice to the rice-grower it is equivalent to the minimum wage paid to the labourer. There are one or two items in this Bill which I shall ask to be amended when we are going through the Bill clause by clause, but I will ask Government to give an assurance that the price of rice for local consumption will also be legislated for.

Mr. ELEAZAR: This is another instance of Government interfering in matters that it knows nothing about, at the instance of persons who have their own interests to serve. The parties who are most concerned with rice have told Government that they never asked for legislation, they never required it, and they could see no good purpose to be served by it. But we have certain people who are bent upon using other people's thunder and they must have everything at their own sweet will. First of all, looking at this Bill, you find "Authority" is described in the inter-

pretation clause as “the proper Authority in control of matters relating to Public Health and Sanitation.” Where is that Authority? You are making laws for people to go to somebody who does not exist. That only shows that still-born Bill which has been relegated to oblivion is to be resurrected some day but that day is not yet. Government have come forward to-day with a Bill asking people to go to an Authority which does not exist. “Commissioner” is defined as “a Commissioner appointed by the Governor under the District Government Ordinance.” Now, sir, there is no need for this legislation in that respect, because every Local Authority has the right to give permission for the erection of a rice factory, and if that permission is not granted the people have the right to appeal to the Local Government Board as it stands at the present day, and if the Board is not satisfied that permission will not be granted. Why, then, is Government now seeking to over-ride that Authority by placing the prospective rice miller in the hands of the District Commissioner? When one goes further one finds this: that this Authority may give permission to erect a rice factory; but when that factory has been erected the person has to apply to the Commissioner for a licence.

A licence may be refused, and the money spent in erecting a factory will be literally thrown away, because the applicant might never get the permission to carry on his factory although he has the permission to erect it. No mention is made here that he should supply a plan to anybody. No mention is made as to what requirements he must comply with. The thing is monstrous in the extreme. Who are those gentlemen who are so anxious to erect these model mills? Where have you got one to show anybody? The mills that are in existence should remain until December 31, and after that day the owners will have to apply to this Authority or the Commissioner for a licence to carry on, and if for any reason of his own he says “No, you should not continue,” then you go and appeal to the Governor-in-Council. If the Governor-in-Council says, “No, it cannot continue,” then the mill will have to be demolished. A man has had considerable expense in erecting his mill which is going all the time, and then he is to be told that six months from this day he must go to a man who

knows nothing about it and submit himself to that man’s *ipse dixit*. If he does not like it then he goes to the Governor-in-Council, who is all the brains of the country, and if he is not satisfied with their decision he goes to the Secretary of State, the dispenser of all wisdom, and if he is not successful then he has to demolish that mill and pay the penalty of being recalcitrant. Can that be good law? No, sir, it can not be good law. There is far too much interference with the rice industry. The Marketing Board is only causing local sellers to get less for their rice. That is the opinion of the people growing rice. If you go and ask East Indian people about the Marketing Board they will tell you that the Board does nothing but publish the price all over the world. The prices go to India who then sell at five cents or ten cents lower. That is what the Board is doing. Nobody wants that Board. It has not been made a success yet.

Your Excellency, I see that every clause in the Bill makes reference to something other than what is contained in this Bill, and nobody knows where to find that something. Up to now no legislation has been required. You are legislating now for a licence. I do not know if Government intend to force this Bill through this Council, as it has often done in the past. The people pay nothing up to now and to-day you are seeking to legislate for a licence for which there is no provision in any of the Ordinances of the Colony. I suppose there will be some tinkering with the Tax Ordinance for each rice miller to pay so much, but before doing that you are seeking to make a law to compel the men to pay licences for which you have no authority. That is what I see in this Bill. Government is making a law at the present moment that everybody should take out a licence, and there is no authority for that at all, and up to now one does not know who to go to for that licence. When a man has got a licence and wants to transfer it he must go to the Commissioner and ask him if the person to whom he is going to transfer is a fit and proper person. The Commissioner looks at the man and says, “The man is too short or too small, or he does not walk as I would like. He is too stylish.” You are making a law to compel a man to transfer his licence to somebody you approve of. What business have you with the man to whom the transfer is being

made? I know the Attorney-General had to draft the Bill and the wording is all right. But they would not have put up with this in Jamaica—not for a moment.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Mr. Hector Josephs): They do not grow rice there. It is one of the only sins they have not got.

Mr. ELEAZAR: We want to send it there to them, and we want to send it properly. We want to give Jamaica and other places the best quality rice. When a common transfer of a licence to mill rice is refused by the Commissioner, there is no other tribunal one can look to for aid but the Governor-in-Council. Your Excellency, clause 11 does not help the position one bit. I know from experience that some of these mills take padi to be milled and there are differences over the loss of a bag or a couple of bags, or the growers not getting the requisite quantity of rice. That is a matter between the parties. A man is not bound to go to Mr. A.'s or Mr. B.'s mill, and if he does not get satisfaction it is a matter for him. The clause inflicts on the miller the necessity of keeping quite a lot of books, but that will not help the position. Government is leaving undone what it should do, and is trying to do what it has no business to do, and these poor people are left at the mercy of the buyers. They take a tin and say "This tin is supposed to hold five gallons." At first the Commissaries were very active about it, but they have now gone to sleep and thus place it in the power of the buyers to rob these people. The padi should be measured in stamped cans to hold so many gallons. The cans should be stamped under the Licence Ordinance by the Commissaries Department. It was a very wise provision, but it had gone into abeyance and is not worried with now. Government is saying that the millers must keep a book and say who is the person they are buying the padi from, while the Commissioners are cooling their heels and reading law books the whole day and are getting no wiser. Why Government wants to interfere with the people's private business I cannot say. Who is the author of this ill-conceived clause? I have not called any name, but I see everybody looking at me. (Laughter). Your Excellency, I think this Bill is ill-conceived, and whoever is the author, if he read the

clauses over and over again, he would find that it makes very good reading but its application is ludicrous. It is the man's property and he is not going to accept a false receipt, but if he agrees with the miller for any reason whatever how are you going to find out? Looking at clause 12 you want all these returns each year.

THE PRESIDENT: May I suggest to the hon. Member if there are any points on which he desires to refresh his memory with regard to this section of the Ordinance he will have the opportunity to deal with it later. We are only dealing with the principle of the Bill at the present moment.

Mr. ELEAZAR: I find the Bill has no principle at all. That is the difficulty. These people who are growing padi are not such untutored individuals that they don't know and are simply preyed upon by their more astute brethren. As a matter of fact, throughout the whole of the Corentyne Coast the people manage their own affairs. They go to the mill themselves and see to the milling. A planter takes his padi to the mill and he sees every grain of it goes through the mill. Clause 13 gives the Director of Agriculture the right to enter a rice factory and to inspect it or any padi or rice therein, or the books kept under the Ordinance. I never knew the Director of Agriculture to be an engineer of any sort at all. I do not see why he should leave the field to go into the mill. I believe it is for want of something to do. If the Department were to look after its own work it would be doing some service to the community. I do not know why he wants to visit the rice factory at all. Again, if a person refuses to allow him to meddle with his books then that person is guilty of an offence under the Ordinance. The people do not want this Bill. The grower never asked for it. There is nothing in it to help the grower in any shape or form. It seems to concern only the miller and the person who is exporting rice from this country. But they are not the people that primary consideration should be given to. Therefore I say the Bill is absolutely unnecessary and should not burden the statute-book of this Colony. When the fact is known that you have to travel far before you find a miller who is also a producer, then you would see at

once the absurdity of asking one who mills rice only to do what the Bill points to. Why should a miller take all this trouble and expense to keep books when he is only receiving fees for milling, and why should a grower be required to give all these details?

Mr. De AGUIAR: I had hoped that further consideration of this Bill would have been deferred until the Report of the Select Committee, which was appointed by Your Excellency to consider the rice industry, was discussed by this Council. As a matter of fact, when this Bill was first before this Council it was deferred until the Committee had sent in its report. That Report has now been presented, and, as I understand from the Attorney-General, it will not be discussed until next Tuesday, but Government is apparently anxious that this Bill should receive consideration by this Council now. It is for that reason that I join in the debate to-day. The object of this Bill, as I understand it, is to regulate and control rice mills operating in various parts of the Colony. With that I am in agreement, as it is extremely difficult to obtain reliable data regarding the manufacture of rice in this Colony, and my view is that the only way that information can be obtained is if this Government introduce legislation whereby the various mills would come under the control of Government. My agreement, however, is only in so far as the general principle of the Bill is concerned.

There is no doubt that when we reach the Committee stage several amendments to this Bill will be found necessary. Dealing with the Bill clause by clause, my first objection—and I have no doubt that it will find favour—is that the District Commissioners should be kept absolutely out of the Bill. I can see no reason why control should not be under the direct supervision of the Agricultural Department. May be the Head of that Department has his own opinion, and possibly some of us do not share that view, but provision may be made whereby you delegate certain powers under this Bill. I do not think the Commissioners should be given the final say or absolute control, as it appears to me, because after all the District Commissioners have the first voice in matters concerning the registra-

tion of mills. The hon. Member who has just taken his seat attempted to point out the various difficulties that would have to be met in order to carry this clause into effect. I have no intention to elaborate on the points mentioned by him, but I can perceive the various difficulties and the number of appeals that would have to be sent to the Governor-in-Council, provided that the Director is going to carry out the objects of this Bill. As regards clause 6, which provides for appeal from any refusal to issue licences, I observe that the period fixed is 21 days. Having regard to the number of mills, I am inclined to the view that 21 days is too short a time, and I am going to suggest that the period be extended to one month.

I had some comments to make on clause 11, but I observe from the remarks of the Director of Agriculture this morning that he proposes when the Bill reaches the Committee stage to make certain amendments. It is a matter of regret that he has not given any indication of what those amendments will be. Clause 11 is the most important clause in the whole Bill. It provides for the keeping of books wherein the miller would have to enter all the padi received not only on his own account from his estate but from other people for the purpose of being milled into rice on their account. It also provides for the quantities manufactured in respect of each person from whom there has been received padi and for various receipts to be given for padi purchased from other persons or received to be milled for other persons. Those of us who are familiar with the working of these mills would tell you, sir, that this clause provides a great deal of difficulties. I can see where a good many of these restrictions could be easily overridden, because I know, sir, that even tighter legislation than this has been easily overridden. I refer to the system of secret rebates that we have all heard about with respect to the price of rice fixed for export. This clause is not sufficiently water-tight to obtain information that we so require. Now, as regards returns, it is provided that once every quarter returns are to be made, and the returns to be given are in respect to the entries made in the books provided for in clause 11. Apart from the fact that this will entail a good deal of unnecessary work on the part of these millers, it seems to me that full con-

sideration was not given to this clause. To my mind it is quite necessary to call on these millers to make quartely returns, having regard to the fact that in some districts in this Colony only one crop of rice is reaped. The position could easily be met by making the returns half-yearly.

It is a pity, sir, that it is considered necessary to fix the standard weight of padi. I am dealing now with clause 14, which says "A person shall not sell, purchase, or receive padi for the manufacture of rice except at a price calculated on a bag of one hundred and forty-three pounds gross." As far as I am concerned I can fully appreciate the importance of this clause, but, as I said, I do not think full consideration was given to it. I think these weights—143 gross per bag—are necessary and advisable, but it should be clean padi because I happen to know of the malpractices by various people in supplying padi to millers. When the padi is taken to them for milling it is sometimes found to be mixed with dirt to help to give the weight required. I am going to suggest that this clause should provide that only clean padi should be calculated on the basis of 143 lbs. gross per bag.

Mr. CANNON: Your Excellency, I am not supposed to know much about rice, but I would like to ask the mover of this motion whether I am correct in that I heard him say that this matter has been under consideration for eighteen months.

Prof. DASH: Yes.

Mr. CANNON: Thank you. That being so I think it is a very unfortunate time for this matter to engage the attention of this Legislative Council. There is no doubt that things are somewhat unsettled and for us to attempt to tamper with the poor man's food, as has been indicated by an hon. Member, is not advisable. He, however, thinks the price of rice should be fixed. Well, sir, go and fix the price at an enhanced value to-day and you are only going to aggravate the position that exists at the present moment. I do not propose to say much about the Marketing Board. It is for Your Excellency to judge for yourself whether that body is giving the satisfaction which this Legislative Council and other people outside of it expected. I would suggest that you adjourn con-

sideration of this Bill for six months, practically making it two years since it first saw the light of day. Possibly, then, things may be in better shape and we should all perhaps be in a better frame of mind to suggest to the people of the Colony that they should be faced with an increased price for their staple food. I do not propose to say anything more except that I made the suggestion to Your Excellency for deferring consideration of this Bill with the hope that Your Excellency would take into consideration the serious position now in the atmosphere.

Mr. FREDERICKS: The hon. Director of Agriculture this morning made a remark which has brought me to my feet. He said that this Bill is not for the purpose of revenue but for the purpose of registration. Immediately he said that it struck me that clause 8 should not be in the Bill at all. If it is for the purpose of registration, why should there be a licence? Registration is not for revenue but for information, and licence to the best of my experience is for revenue. I therefore come to this conclusion: that the provision for a licence to be taken out at the end of the year should not be in the Bill. It is not necessary. The intention of the Bill is for registration, and if that is so there need be no clause whereby a man comes and takes out a licence at the end of each year. Another point is that about measurement by a bag. That I would never agree to. When this Bill goes into the Committee stage I am going to oppose that. You cannot talk about a bag. I would agree with a measure can. I am going to oppose the Bill in so far as that is concerned.

Another point I desire to refer to is this: the 22nd of this month is the day on which the Rice Committee's Report will be debated. I am respectfully suggesting that to deal with this Bill at the same time with the Committee's Report is the best thing which can be done. I do not agree with the hon. Member that it should be deferred for six months. The main point is that it should not be considered before the Rice Committee's Report is had, as in the present circumstances it would not be the best thing to do. The rice question in so far as the Rice Committee is concerned is a very big one, and I think the country should have

some sort of indication as to what Government intend on the Rice Committee's Report before dealing with rice milling. My suggestion is that since this Bill is for the purpose of registration and not for revenue, there should be nothing in it limiting the licence for one year, and that the measurement by can is most suitable to the country. Most important of all, the Rice Committee's Report must be dealt with prior to dealing with this Bill.

Dr. SINGH: I do hope Government will see their way to defer consideration of this Bill. We have still to scrutinise the Report of the Rice Committee, and the essentials of the Report should be embodied in the present Bill.

Mr. PEER BACCHUS: I also support the views of the hon. Members that this Bill should be deferred until the Report of the Select Committee of the Legislative Council is considered. I oppose this Bill not directly on its principle, as I agree with a portion of it. I am sorry, sir, to say here that representing my own interests as a miller I would have supported this Bill, but, fortunately or unfortunately, it happens that I represent a large number of growers. As I see it, the intention of the Bill is to limit the rice mills in this Colony, and if there is any limitation of rice mills in the Colony the facilities of the growers would be lesser. In my opinion there should be no limitation of rice mills. We have progressed fairly well during the past; we have got up to a higher standard than we were before. Some rice mills make "Super" but had to drop below that standard because they cannot get all the "Super" sold in the West Indies, and for that reason I do not see where the necessity for the Bill arises. It may be, as suggested by Mr. Seaford, the intention of the Bill was to fix the local price of rice, and if that is so then I think this Bill is premature. Government should first have a request for that from the Rice Association.

Dealing with the Bill clause by clause, we would find that the Bill either was intended to limit the rice mills of the Colony or that it was done with a lack of knowledge of conditions in the Colony. There are many districts—take the biggest rice growing district in the Colony, the Coren-

tyne Coast,—that would be hard hit if this Bill becomes law. In that district growers handle padi themselves and the millers merely turn it into rice. If this Bill becomes law the growers will not have that facility of handling their own rice and it would mean that they will have to pay handling fees to the millers which would increase the cost of production. We are for reducing the cost of production, not for increasing it. As regards the way in which growers will be safeguarded, I am in entire agreement with what is proposed. But the other part of the Bill does not seem to me as if it would benefit the growers at all. I strongly oppose the first part of the Bill because it will not benefit the growers but will increase their difficulties.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Sir, I think a few mistakes have been made with reference to the general principal of the Bill. Some hon. Members have expressed objection to it because they imagine that it contemplates the fixing of the price of rice. It is a well-known principle that a Bill cannot be refuted which contemplates anything which is not within its four corners. I can only attribute the suggestion to the fact that somehow or other mistakes have arisen in that respect. There is nothing in the Bill whatever relating to what the price of rice or padi ought to be. That is left to the judgment of individuals trading ordinarily between themselves, so that there is no force in that point so far as it is put forward by hon. Members as a ground of objection to the Bill. There is another point with regard to it. It has been suggested that the object of the Bill is merely for registration and licences should not be included in it. Licences are not always for revenue purposes. A licence is a permission to operate or do something; there may or may not be charge, it may be a big one or a small one; but the essence of it, however, is permission. Whether or not a duty is attached to the licence is a question which depends on the circumstances of each case.

I would also like to refer to the measurement of the rice. One hon. Member suggested that it should be expressly stated that the rice ought to be clean and winnowed. The moment he put that forward questions are going to arise as to who should be

judge in a particular case as to whether the rice is clean or winnowed. What is expressed there is that a person should not sell or buy or receive padi except to be of a certain weight and in a certain way. Padi does not include earth, and that seemed to be the suggestion of the hon. Member, because he says people buy padi including earth. He is quite wrong. If a man who is buying padi chooses to buy earth with it it is his own business. If a man chooses to be generous to the seller and allow earth to be included that is a matter for himself. It is clear that there is no necessity to put such a provision as it is a question of the ordinary rule of contract. The law is that you are entitled to that for which you bargain to buy, and as I pointed out padi does not include earth.

With reference to the question of weight that is a matter of difficulty as to the measure in which the rice should be sold. It has been suggested that the proper measures are cans. There are two difficulties to be faced in connection with cans. The statement has been frequently made that when a seller sells by cans he performs such operations on the cans that they do not hold the full amount. On the other hand, when the buyer buys with his own can he also performs such operations on the can whereby the can contains much more than it ought to. It is in order to escape from these difficulties that the provision is included in the Bill making the amount fixed by weight in a bag so that there would be no difficulty about the seller over-reaching the buyer or *vice versa*. The object is to protect both classes of people.

There is just one other point. In these days of the manufacture of food protection is required in the interest of the consumer so that the State should take care that proper sanitary regulations are made and are observed. The hon. Member for Berbice River thinks that these are matters of interference with people's business. Of course that sort of theory was properly held and practised in prehistoric days and down to a later period. I was not in existence then. I do not credit the hon. Member with being of the age of Methuselah. We all know the hon. Member is a student of history, but the point is, we are not living in those days fortunately

and we are endeavouring to carry out here a general principle adopted in a present-day community to protect the consumer of food, and take measures to have everything done in accordance with the best sanitary methods. We all know that in some countries very stringent provisions are made indeed with reference to the manufacture of bread. The health of the people who manufacture is considered and if no medical certificate is obtained by them every month after examination there is an offence. That exists in some countries with which I am very well acquainted and which are not very far from British Guiana. So there are stringent rules with reference to these things elsewhere.

Now, the Authority which the hon. Member for Berbice River refers to is an Authority which controls matters relating to public health and sanitation. That Authority now exists by law and it can only be an Authority existing by law. He told us that various bodies are charged with sanitation under the Local Government Board. Of course, that is so. The Bill provides no other Authority but the Authority which exists by law. If that Authority is changed the language would still apply and there will be no necessity to alter that part of the Bill in that respect. One essential of the Bill is that before a person can get a licence for his mill, he has to submit to the Commissioner a certificate from the Authority that the premises are fit to be used as a rice factory. We all know there are many factories which are up-to-date and thoroughly well-equipped, with proper provision made for a pure water supply and for the disposal of refuse, but there are some factories which are not so equipped and it is necessary that that should be the case in respect of all factories. That is a very important issue. How a provision of that kind can have the effect of limiting in any way the number of factories, as is imagined by the hon. Member for Western Berbice, I do not understand. There is nothing in the Bill which suggests the limitation of the number of mills. What it does provide for is that whatever is the number of factories you have, they are to be very thoroughly equipped and conducted on right and proper lines. That is the real essence of it. It is right that before a man is allowed to use a factory that these conditions should exist. If those people

who object think the matter out wisely and well, they would realise that it is in their interest, the interest of public health and the interest of the people who eat the goods that these things should be provided. It is because they probably have not grasped the proper principles of this measure that they object to it. I am afraid that some hon. Members who have read the Bill before probably have forgotten and therefore on the spur of the moment have taken objections which are without foundation.

I should just like to say one word with reference to another objection made, and that is in respect of the Report of the Rice Committee. The terms of reference of that Committee were specifically limited to the export price of rice. The Committee dared not go outside the scope of that. This measure deals with something entirely different, and whether rice should be exported in future in a modified form, I submit, has no bearing on the manner in which rice is to be manufactured. The other points probably have been put forward on similar misunderstanding as those to which I have referred. The object of returns, as we all know and as has been pointed out, is that we should know exactly what we are doing with regard to our rice. The object of giving receipts and keeping books and records is because there have been complaints by several people that they have not been fairly treated. Is it not a matter of business that a man who manufactures an article should have a record stating exactly how much he has given and received. There would be no question of hard bargain, no accusation of unfair dealing. It is in the interest and for the welfare of both the millers and those who mill the rice that these matters should exist. It is done everywhere else so that there should be no differences, no misunderstandings, between the parties, and so that there should be accuracy in the dealings.

**THE PRESIDENT:** To the hon. Member for Western Essequibo I suggest that he defers his remarks for a further discussion of this matter. I am struck by the remarks made by hon. Members, and I think it is certainly advisable to defer consideration of this Bill until we are all equally rice-minded next week. It is quite obvious from the learned remarks which

have fallen from the lips of the hon. the Attorney-General, who is Chairman of the Rice Committee, that rice is a subject to which a long study can be given even by the lawyers and a good deal of knowledge imparted by an exchange of opinions. I think it would be better if we defer consideration of the Bill until we have discussed the rice question next week, as we will be doing on the 22nd. The object of postponing consideration of the Bill is to give an opportunity for the country districts to study the Report, which will be ventilated in the newspapers, and every opportunity given to people outside as to those inside to express their views with regard to this important Report. As the hon. the Attorney-General has properly pointed out, it is not within the scope of the Committee to deal with the registration of mills. It is a different question, but, at the same time, as hon. Members feel if they have the benefit of the discussions of the Rice Committee before them they would be in better form to tackle the proposals of this Bill, I see no reason why the mover of this motion should not meet the wishes of hon. Members in this Council. The Bill, as pointed out, has been on the tapis for two years. It is not an urgent matter but, at the same time, it is one the Government intend to put through for discussion at this session. The Bill is no new business, and, if it is more convenient generally to discuss it later, then I would suggest that the hon. Member may move the adjournment of the discussion.

**Professor DASH:** In view of what has been said I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

**Mr. BRASSINGTON** (at the instance of the Chair): All I wanted to say is this, that to my mind this is entirely a matter of finance and until Government can render the rice industry financial assistance it is not desirable to have further control.

**THE PRESIDENT:** I think everybody has had a chance of expressing his views. The hon. Member may defer his remarks to the date when the Bill is being discussed later.

The debate was accordingly adjourned.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I beg to move the suspension of Standing Order No. 11 (1) to enable me to move the first reading of "A Bill further to amend the Customs Duties Ordinance, Chapter 34, by inserting therein a definition of the term "The British Empire." "

Mr. SMELLIE seconded.

THE PRESIDENT: I put it to the Council that the suspension of the Standing Order in respect to this Bill applies to all Bills of which notice of the introduction had been given to-day. It is merely a matter of form to enable us to deal with the second reading at the subsequent session, instead of having to adjourn.

Question put, and agreed to.

The following Bills were read the first time:—

A Bill to amend the Customs duties Ordinance, Chapter 34, by inserting therein a definition of the term "The British Empire." (*The Colonial Secretary*).

A Bill for regulating pensions, gratuities, and other allowances to be granted in respect of services in offices held by Civil Servants in this Colony. (*The Attorney-General*).

A Bill to amend the Sea Defence Ordinance, 1933, with respect to the amounts to be voted in pursuance of paragraph (A) of sub-section (2) of section eighteen, and with respect to rates for nineteen hundred and thirty-three.

A Bill to make provision for the raising of a loan for the construction of Sea Defences under the Sea Defence Ordinance, 1933 (*Major Craig*).

A Bill to amend the Georgetown Sewerage and Water Ordinance, Chapter 96, by giving the Council authority to exempt from rating buildings and the lands occupied therewith used as schools. (*Major Bain Gray*)

A Bill to make provision for the registration of Opticians, to regulate the practice of sight-testing and for purposes incidental thereto (*Dr. Henderson*).

A Bill to allow and confirm certain additional expenditure incurred in the year ended thirty-first day of December, 1932. (*Mr. McDavid*).

Notice was given that at the next meeting of the Council it would be moved that the Bills be read the second time.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL gave notice that at the Committee stage he would move the following amendments to the Bill regulating pensions, &c., of Civil Servants:—

I.—Regulation 20.—by inserting in the third line after the word "Regulations" ("which Schedule may be varied by Order in Council by the addition thereto or the removal therefrom of any Government)."

II.—Schedule I.—by the insertion of "Kenya-Uganda Railways and Harbours."

III.—Schedule II.—by inserting after "Federated Malay States." "Kenya-Uganda Railways and Harbour Administration."

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