them by Part II of the Safeguarding of Industries Act, 1921, have referred the matter for inquiry to a Committee constituted for the purposes of that part of the Act and consisting of:—

Mr. Arthur Balfour, J.P. (Chairman), Sir Cecil L. Budd, K.B.E., Professor D. H. Macgregor, M.A., Mr. Frank Moore, and Sir Douglas Newton, K.B.E.

The Committee are directed, after ascertaining the facts, to report to the President of the Board of Trade (a) whether the conditions specified in Section 2, Sub-section (1) of the Safeguarding of Industries Act, 1921, are fulfilled in respect of all or any particular varieties of Toys; (b) on the effect which the imposition of a duty under Part II of the Act on goods of the class or description covered by the complaint would exert on employment in any other industry being an industry using goods of that class or description as material; and (c) whether in the opinion of the Committee production in the industry manufacturing similar goods in the United Kingdom is being carried on with reasonable efficiency and economy.

The Committee propose to hold their first sitting for the taking of evidence at 2.30 p.m. on Friday, the 3rd of February, 1922, at the Hotel Windsor (Mines Department), Victoria Street, London, S.W. 1.

The Secretary to the Committee is Captain S. E. J. Brady, M.B.E., Board of Trade, Great George Street, London, S.W. 1, to whom all communications should be addressed.

Board of Trade,

Great George Street,

London, S.W. 1.

## FOOD CONTROL.

ORDER DATED 3RD JANUARY, 1922, MADE BY THE BOARD OF TRADE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF FOOD (CONTINUANCE) ACT, 1920 (10 AND 11 GEO. 5, Ch. 47), AND THE MINISTRY OF FOOD (CESSATION) ORDER, 1921, REVOKING THE FOOD FOR MOTHERS AND CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) ORDER, 1918.†

In exercise of the powers conferred upon them by the Ministry of Food (Continuance) Act, 1920, and the Ministry of Food (Cessation) Order, 1921, and of all other powers enabling them in that behalf, the Board of Trade hereby revoke, as on 14th January, 1922, the Food for Mothers and Children (Scotland) Order, 1918.†

By Order of the Board of Trade,

Frank H. Coller,

Secretary to the Food Department. 3rd January, 1922.

† S.R. & O. 1918, No. 1095.

The Secretary for Mines, on behalf of the Board of Trade, has made Regulations dated 16th January, 1922, under Section 7 of the Mining Industry Act, 1920, for the constitu-

tion of Committees and Boards under Part II of the Act.

These Regulations have been issued as Statutory Rule and Order, 1922, No. 44, and may be purchased through any bookseller, or direct from H.M. Stationery Office (price 3d., with postage 4d.) at any of the following addresses:—Imperial House, Kingsway, London, W.C. 2; 28, Abingdom Street, London, S.W. 1; 37, Peter Street, Manchester; 1, St. Andrew's Crescent, Cardiff; 23, Forth Street, Edinburgh; or from Eason and Son, Ltd., 40-41, Lower Sackville Street, Dublin.

Mines Department, 46, Victoria Street, S.W. 1. 20th January, 1922.

## UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACTS, 1920 AND 1921.

DECISIONS OF THE HIGH COURT ON REFERENCES MADE UNDER SECTION 10 (I) OF THE 1920 ACT.

## CONTRIBUTIONS NOT PAYABLE.

On the 13th January, the Minister referred to the High Court for decision the question whether persons employed as:—

Cleaner of a Solicitor's Office, whose duties consist in cleaning and dusting the said offices, and in making fires before and after office hours.

Cleaner of a Public Elementary School employed by the Local Education Committee of a County Council.

Caretaker employed by the Standing Joint Committee of a County Council, to take charge of their offices,

were or were not employed persons within the meaning of the Act of 1920.

The Judge held that the employment of the persons in question was employment in domestic service, and was not employment in a business carried on for the purposes of gain, and that the employment of each was accordingly excepted under paragraph (b) of Part II of the First Schedule to the Act of 1920. The persons in question were, therefore, not required to be insured.

## Contributions Payable.

On the same date the Minister also referred for decision the question whether the employment of a person as:—

Daily maid at a Private Nursing Home who does general domestic duties and cleans the patients' bedrooms, but does not herself reside at the said Nursing Home,

was or was not employment within the meaning of the Act of 1920.

The Judge held that the employment of the daily maid in question was employment in domestic service, but being in a trade or business carried on for the purposes of gain was not excepted under paragraph (b) referred to above. Contributions were, therefore, payable in respect of her.