

*10th November, 1932.*

---

**PRESENT:—**

HIS EXCELLENCY THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT (HON. MR. W. T. SOUTHORN, C.M.G.).

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (HON. MR. E. R. HALLIFAX, C.M.G., C.B.E.).

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (HON. MR. C. G. ALABASTER, K.C., O.B.E.).

THE SECRETARY FOR CHINESE AFFAIRS (HON. MR. A. E. WOOD).

THE COLONIAL TREASURER (HON. MR. E. TAYLOR).

HON. MR. E. D. C. WOLFE, C.M.G., (Inspector General of Police).

HON. COMMANDER G. F. HOLE, R.N., (Retired) (Harbour Master).

HON. DR. A. R. WELLINGTON, (Director of Medical and Sanitary Services).

HON. MR. R. M. HENDERSON, (Director of Public Works).

HON. SIR HENRY POLLOCK, KT., K.C.

HON. MR. W. E. L. SHENTON.

HON. MR. R. H. KOTEWALL, C.M.G., LL.D.

HON. MR. J. P. BRAGA.

HON. MR. J. J. PATERSON.

HON. MR. T. N. CHAU.

HON. MR. W. H. BELL.

MR. R. A. C. NORTH (Deputy Clerk of Councils).

**ABSENT:—**

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GENERAL OFFICER COMMANDING THE TROOPS (MAJOR-GENERAL J. W. SANDILANDS, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O.).

HON. MR. S. W. TS'O, O.B.E., LL.D.

**MINUTES.**

H.E. THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT.— With reference to the minutes, there is one printer's error. In item 9, clauses 5, 6 and 7 should be Clauses 4, 5, 6 and 7.

Subject to this amendment, the minutes of the previous meeting of the Council were confirmed.

**PAPERS.**

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY, by command of H.E. the Officer Administering the Government, laid upon the table the following papers:—

Rescission and substitution of rule 9 of the rules regarding Kerosene oil business in the New Territories made under section 6 of the New Territories Regulation Ordinance, 1910.

Rescission and substitution of regulations made under section 5 of the Dangerous Goods Ordinance, 1873.

Order under the Public Health and Buildings Ordinance, 1903.

Order under section 2 of the Emergency Regulations Ordinance, 1922.

Rescission and substitution of Regulation 7 under section 23 of the Waterworks Ordinance, 1903.

Amendments of the regulations made under section 14 of the Merchandise Marks Ordinance, 1890.

Rescission and substitution of Appendix A and Appendix B of the regulations made under section 36 of the Tramway Ordinance, 1902.

Rescission of the Order of the 7th July, 1932, published in the *Gazette* of the 8th July, 1932, as Government Notification No. 448, declaring Amoy an infected place.

Rescission of the Order of the 2nd September, 1932, published in the *Gazette* of the 9th September, 1932, as Government Notification No. 570, declaring Foochow an infected place.

Amendments of the regulations made under section 4 of the Nurses Registration Ordinance, 1931.

The Air Navigation Directions (Hong Kong), 1932.

Rescission of the exemption granted under regulation 16 of the Places of Public Entertainment Regulation Ordinance, 1919.

**MOTIONS.**

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—I rise to move "That the rules dated the 15th day of October, 1932, made by the Chief Justice under section 114 of the Bankruptcy Ordinance, 1931 be approved."

By section 114 of the Bankruptcy Ordinance, No. 10 of 1931, the Chief Justice is empowered, with the approval of the Legislative Council, to make general rules for carrying into effect the objects of that Ordinance.

The Rules on the Table have been made by the Chief Justice and now come before this Council for approval. Since they were printed certain small verbal and typographical errors have been pointed out by the honourable member representing the Justices of the Peace. They are:—

- (i) In rule 23 on page 5 correct the misspelling of the word "transcript" and substitute "under this Rule" for "under Rule 23".
- (ii) In rule 38 on page 7 delete the figures (1) (b).
- (iii) In rule 51 (2) on page 9 substitute "in the order of priority" for "in the priority".
- (iv) In rule 55 on page 10 correct the misspelling of "affidavit".
- (v) In rule 80 (2) on page 13 insert a colon after the bracket.
- (vi) In rule 91 on page 15 insert a comma after "any creditor".
- (vii) In rule 127 on page 20 substitute "keep a register" for "keep a book (in these Rules called the register)".

These trifling amendments have been accepted by His Honour the Chief Justice. I therefore move that subject to the above amendments. the rules dated the 15th day of October, 1932, made by the Chief Justice under section 114 of the Bankruptcy Ordinance, 1931, be approved.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded and the resolution was agreed to.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—I rise to move that the scale of fees and percentages dated the 15th day of October, 1932, prescribed by the Chief Justice under section 115 of the Bankruptcy Ordinance, 1931, be approved.

These fees and percentages are on pages 119 to 123 on the printed form in front of members.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded and the resolution was agreed to.

### **OPIUM AMENDMENT ORDINANCE, 1932.**

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the first reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the Opium Ordinance, 1932." He said: This is a very short Bill and its effects are fully explained in the memorandum attached.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded and the Bill was read a first time.

#### **Objects and Reasons.**

The "Objects and Reasons" for the Bill were stated as follows:—

In Article I of the Opium Agreement signed at Bangkok on the 27th of November, 1931, it was provided that the retail and distribution of opium should take place only from Government shops or, where local circumstances make the establishment of Government shops difficult, from shops managed under Government supervision, by persons appointed by the Government for that purpose and remunerated by a fixed payment and not by a commission on sales.

This Ordinance accordingly adds a proviso to section 10 of the principal Ordinance making it clear that the power to appoint suitable persons to sell prepared opium is to be exercised only where local circumstances make the establishment of Government opium shops difficult.

This Ordinance adds a sub-section to section 13 of the principal Ordinance to give effect to Article III of the Bangkok Agreement which requires that prepared opium should be sold only for cash.

The proviso to section 20 of the principal Ordinance, which permitted passengers under special permit to carry small quantities of prepared opium for personal consumption on the voyage, is repealed. No special permits have been issued and the proviso is considered to be in conflict with Article 6 of the Geneva Prepared Opium Agreement of February, 1925, under which His Majesty's Government have undertaken to prohibit, without exception, the export of opium from any possession or territory into which it is imported for the purpose of smoking.

The repeal of the proviso to section 20 has rendered necessary the consequential repeal of references thereto in sections 13 (2) and 22 of the principal Ordinance.

### **THE POLICE FORCE ORDINANCE, 1932.**

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the first reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to consolidate and amend the law relating to the establishment and regulation of the Police Force." He said: This is merely a consolidating Bill but there are certain amendments. The more important ones are drawn attention to in "Objects and Reasons" and all are specially noted in the Table of Correspondence.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded and the Bill was read a first time.

#### **Objects and Reasons.**

The "Objects and Reasons" for the Bill were stated as follows:—

This Ordinance consolidates and to some extent amends the law for the establishment and regulation of the Hong Kong Police Force. A Table of Correspondence is attached which indicates the source of each section and the nature of the various amendments.

Section 16, as substituted by No. 18 of 1929, has been omitted, and a general power in the Inspector General to make regulations governing leave and passages for subordinate members of the force and members of the civilian staff has been added to (new) Section 12.

By Section 28 the new offence of wilfully giving false information to the police, with intent to defeat or delay the ends of justice, has been created. The case of *Bastable v. Little* (1906, 1 K.B., 59) goes to show that wilful misleading may amount to obstruction of a police officer (s. 34 of the Offences against the Person Ordinance, 1865), but it seems better to have the offence clearly defined.

### **THE PRISONS ORDINANCE, 1932.**

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the first reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to consolidate and amend the law relating to Prisons." He said: This is also a consolidating Bill and its amendments are explained both in the memorandum, under "Objects and Reasons" and in the table of correspondence.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded and the Bill was read a first time.

#### **Objects and Reasons.**

The "Objects and Reasons" for the Bill were stated as follows:—

This Ordinance consolidates and amends the law relating to Prisons. The source of each section and the nature of the amendments are shown in the attached Table of Correspondence. The principal amendments are the following:—

1. In section 4 a new sub-section (s.s. 4) has been introduced to allow of the transfer of a prisoner from and to a prison to and from any place at which his attendance is required for the purposes of any form of statutory procedure, *e.g.*, in the case of a convicted prisoner, for examination at the Secretariat for Chinese Affairs under the Deportation Ordinance, or to give evidence before a Magistrate, etc.

2. Sub-section (5) of section 7 has been omitted, the view of the Superintendent of Prisons being that "a modern prison cannot be run on the 'silent' system. At work, at exercise and in hospital prisoners talk. To prevent them communicating with one another is impossible. Talking in reason is not objected to by the prison administration, and excessive talking can be dealt with under the Rules."

3. (a) In section 8 the latter half of s.s. (1) and the whole of s.s. (2) have been omitted as unnecessary. Except for one or two cells in Victoria Gaol, which are larger than the average and are almost invariably used to accommodate three or more prisoners, the cells are all of much the same size. In the new prison the cells will be of uniform size. There is and will be therefore no distinction in size or type between a cell used for separate confinement of prisoners and any other cell. As regards s.s. (2) the Superintendent of Prisons is of opinion that any cell which is fit for a prisoner to be confined in is also fit for him to be punished in.

(b) The last three lines of s.s. (3) have also been omitted for the same reason as above.

(c) For the same reason in s.s. (4) a short provision forbidding alteration of an approved cell without the Governor's consent has been substituted for the old sub-section.

4. Section 18 (old 19) has been redrafted to conform with the existing practice by which two visiting justices are appointed twice a month to visit a particular prison.

5. Section 19 (old 20) has been amended by the omission in line 3 of "of summary jurisdiction" and the substitution of "any" for "a" before "court", since the Supreme Court in its criminal jurisdiction has in some cases (*e.g.* manslaughter) power to fine.

### **THE COMPANIES ORDINANCE, 1932.**

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the second reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to consolidate and amend the law relating to Companies."

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded and the Bill was read a second time.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—It is usual at this stage to move that the Council go into committee to consider the Bill clause by clause but in this Bill in addition to the title and enacting clauses there are the introductory sections, followed by 15 Parts and 10 Schedules.

It will take a considerable time to read the marginal notes of all the 357 Sub-sections and so, if no member objects, I will move the suspension of so much of Standing Order 27 as requires the Bill to be considered by clauses and that thereafter the Bill be considered, first by the two introductory sections, then by each of the 15 parts, then by each of the 10 schedules and finally by its Enacting Clause and Title.

I may add that though there are a number of small amendments to be moved, they are mainly typographical and none are material under Standing Order 28 (1).

I therefore move the suspension of so much of the Standing Order as requires us to consider this Bill clause by clause.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded and the resolution was agreed to.

Council went into committee to consider the Bill in the manner outlined by the Attorney General.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (on consideration of Part II).— In Section 37, sub-section three on Page 12, I move that the words five hundred dollars be substituted for five hundred pounds.

This was agreed to.

HON. MR. BRAGA.—On Section 44 I would like to make a few remarks concerning sub-section three on page 17. Speaking from a lot of experience of company law, I find that the fine not exceeding \$500 for every day during the period of the default in filing a return of allotments appears to be excessive. Sometimes an allotment may cover a few shares only, and sometimes it may cover many thousands of shares. In the latter case, it may not always be easy to complete the return within the stipulated time.

It has happened that an issue of new shares has coincided with the payment of a dividend immediately following the annual meeting. Without knowledge of the enormous amount of detail work involved when a new issue of shares synchronises with the payment of a dividend, it is not easy to realise the great difficulty experienced in complying with all the requirements of the Companies Ordinance in connexion with the filing of returns of allotments as well as annual returns of shareholders.

I suggest that Section 44 Sub-section (3) be so amended as not to be made applicable to allotments of shares issued upon an increase of capital of a company, but that a return of such allotments shall be forwarded to the Registrar within six weeks of date of allotment, with a penalty, say a default fine, for failure to forward the return of allotments as in the case of annual returns of shareholders, etc., covered by Section 109.

In its present form it will be a great hardship to the company directors and officers of the company to comply with the law.

H.E. THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT.— Mr. Braga, can you put your amendment in a definite form? I cannot quite follow what form the amendment is to take.

HON. MR. BRAGA.—I am speaking from practical experience and I think you could allow more than six weeks.

H.E. THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT.— Will you move an actual amendment?

HON. MR. BRAGA.—I move that sub-section 3 of Section 44 be amended by the substitution of "eight weeks" for the words "six weeks."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The fine, of course, is at a two shilling exchange, exactly the same as under the English Act. We have, however, been more generous in drafting than the English Act which allows one month. We allow six weeks. We have, therefore, departed from the English Act and I have, personally, no objection to making the six weeks into eight weeks if other members are in favour of it. I am not prepared to alter the penalty because it is not exceeding £50 and the Court can take mitigating circumstances into consideration. If other members think six weeks is not enough I am prepared to extend it.

HON. SIR HENRY POLLOCK.—I support Mr. Braga's suggestion.

HON. MR. W. E. L. SHENTON.—This ordinance has received very careful consideration by a sub-committee of the Law Society and they do not suggest the alteration of six weeks. I am prepared therefore to accept the six weeks.

HON. SIR HENRY POLLOCK.—I can understand that there may be exceptional pressure on the officers of the company, therefore I suggest eight weeks in each case.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—I am prepared to accept that amendment.

The amendment substituting "eight weeks" for "six weeks" in clause 44 (1), (2) and (3) was passed.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—I move that in penultimate line of section 151 on page 68 Part IV "forty-five" be substituted for "forty-four."

This was agreed to.

HON. MR. BRAGA (on consideration of Part IV).—On page 40, Clause 98, sub-section 2, does the word "words" include figures?"

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—It is exactly as in the English Act and will be governed by the same interpretation.

HON. MR. BRAGA.—Will the company be entitled to charge on the individual numbers or as a whole.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—I take it a set of figures like 144 would be one word.

HON. MR. PATERSON.—Do not the cable companies take five figures as one word?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The sub-section as amended is exactly in the same form as in England which gives no difficulty there. I would not like to answer these questions off hand.

HON. MR. BRAGA.—In the following paragraph 10 days appears to me to be much too short a period in which to make a copy of the register or of a large part of the register. I think "within a reasonable period" would be better than "ten days."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—There again we are using the same words as they use in the English Act and have used since 1929. The Act of 1929 re-enacted the Act of 1908. You will see that it has been in the English Acts for more than a quarter of a century without any trouble.

HON. MR. BRAGA.—The tendency is for companies to grow and the number of shares increases with certain companies and it may not be fair on the clerical staff of a company to have to complete it within ten days. I don't think the principle will be altered at all.

H.E. THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT.— Will you move a definite amendment?

HON. MR. BRAGA.—Yes. I move that the latter part of the sub-section read "for every hundred words and/or figures or fractional part thereof required to be copied."

HON. SIR HENRY POLLOCK.—Is every single figure to count as a word?

HON. MR. SHENTON.—The clause as drafted is interpreted by settled practice.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—It is word for word with the English Act.

The amendment was defeated.

HON. MR. BRAGA.—I also move that the words "within ten days" be substituted by "within a reasonable period after the day on which the requirement is received by the company."

HON. MR. SHENTON.—That is dangerous.

The amendment was rejected.

HON. MR. BRAGA.—My next amendment is in reference to section 109 sub-section 1. The sub-section says that the Annual Return must be completed within twenty-eight days after the ordinary yearly meeting. This means that the Company will have only fourteen days in which to make up the list of shareholders if Section 107 (1) is allowed to stand. Fourteen days is far too short a period, especially in the case of a company having hundreds of shareholders with possibly a couple of thousand transfers in the course of the year, to be entered in the list of shareholders. It should be borne in mind that the six weeks or so immediately before and after the ordinary yearly meeting is generally the busiest period of the year for a company which pays a dividend. The effect of the new Ordinance would be to make things even more difficult than they are already.

It is very strongly urged that the Ordinance be amended so as to provide that the list of shareholders be the list of shareholders at the date of the ordinary yearly meeting and that the Annual Return must be forwarded to the Registrar within six weeks from the date of the ordinary yearly meeting.

I also wish to refer to Clause 107, sub-section 1. In the past, the Annual Returns contain a list of all persons who at the date of the Ordinary yearly meeting were members of the Company. It would be giving the company a great deal of extra work if the list of shareholders had to be made as at the fourteenth day after the ordinary yearly meeting. Dividends are generally payable to the registered holders at the date of the ordinary yearly meeting. before which date the register has to be completely balanced and a list of all shareholders prepared for the purposes of the dividend. The new Ordinance will now make it necessary for the company to balance its register all over again and prepare an entirely new list of shareholders within a matter of a fortnight after the ordinary yearly meeting. It would be far more convenient if the company were required to supply a list of shareholders as at the date of the ordinary yearly meeting and not on the fourteenth day after the ordinary yearly meeting.

The effect of the new section will be that the company will have to duplicate the closing of its register to be able to comply with the requirements of the new clause. In other words, you will have to close your register on the day of the meeting and then again 14 days thereafter. To comply with this new sub-section, it will be a very real hardship effecting no practical purpose whatever, and would involve difficulty on the part of the secretarial staff to comply with the new section in so short a period. Fourteen days is altogether too short especially when it comes to a question of the date of new issue synchronising with the closure of the year's accounts. The old ordinance presented no difficulties. As proposed now, you have to do the same work twice.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—I would like more time to consider this amendment. The old Ordinance set as the day for a return of the list, the day of the annual meeting. The new Bill says 14 days after. This Bill follows exactly word for word the English Act. There was evidently some good reason in England. I am sorry to have such short notice to alter it and depart from the English precedent, unless some good reason is shown. They are apparently able to work it in England where companies are bigger than here.

H.E. THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT.— Why do you say the work is duplicated?

HON. MR. BRAGA.—For the simple reason that you have to close your register of shareholders in the case of a company paying a dividend, by the date of your annual meeting. Under the new ordinance you will have for the purpose of supplying a return to the Registrar, to do the same thing 14 days after your annual meeting. If you are called upon to make a separate return 14 days afterwards all the work will have to be done again.

HON. MR. SHENTON.—I see no reason why we should depart from the English practice.

HON. MR. BRAGA.—I have no knowledge of English practice but I know something of the practical work of companies and this will be a real difficulty. I do not think it will be the intention of the law to drag up directors and fine them because they are late in returning a list of the register.

HON. MR. SHENTON.—There is no difficulty at home so I do not see there can be any difficulty out here.

HON. MR. BRAGA.—It does not follow. Chinese shareholders in Hong Kong are hard to trace. There is great difficulty in tracing these people.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Bill will not come into force before next July and you will have all that time to consider it.

HON. SIR HENRY POLLOCK.—It does seem to me that the company must do the work twice. They must make out a list of shareholders for the annual meeting and now it is proposed that a list should be sent in 14 days afterwards.

HON. MR. SHENTON.—Is there any reason why it should be different from the home practice?

HON. SIR HENRY POLLOCK.—Is there any reason why companies should be put to greater trouble than they need be unless there is a very good reason? Of course there may be excellent reasons for the 14 days.

HON. MR. BRAGA.—It is not a question of principle. It is a question of how it is going to work in practice. I cannot hope to know anything about English practice, but I think I can speak with some experience of local practice.

HON. MR. PATERSON.—Unless some good reason is forthcoming the clause relating to 14 days seems vexatious. If there is a good reason, I would like to hear it. Just now, I think it is only duplicating work.

H.E. THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT.— Have you put your amendment in writing, Mr. Braga?

HON. MR. BRAGA.—No. I have not.

H.E. THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT.— Would this be right—"That the words 'on the 14th day after the' in the third and fourth lines of s.s. (1) clause 107 be deleted and that the words 'on the day of the' be inserted?"

HON. SIR HENRY POLLOCK.—Will that correspond with the present law in Hong Kong?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Yes, under section 27 (1) of the 1911 Ordinance. In the Act at home they have "14 days after" and we have copied it in the Bill. They must have had some good reason for doing it at home and we have heard of no trouble over it.

H.E. THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT.— Did they alter the English practice?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—It is not quite clear.

HON. MR. SHENTON.—I would like to point out that this alteration as suggested by Mr. Braga will place secretaries of companies in very great difficulties. They will be working on the English text books and if we make alterations you will find secretaries getting into a great deal of trouble. Secretarial guides and books will be quite out of keeping with our Ordinances in this Colony.

HON. MR. BRAGA.—I am sorry to contradict my honourable friend, Mr. Shenton, but I advisedly referred to certain secretaries of companies before coming here to-day and the objections I have just raised are entirely supported by the secretarial departments of many of the most important companies. The fact remains that in practice I have had quite a lot to do with local ordinances and the suggestion I make is from long experience.

HON. MR. SHENTON.—This Bill has received consideration by all chartered accountants in this Colony and there was no objection raised by any chartered accountant.

HON. MR. BRAGA.—This Clause has nothing to do with accountancy. It is not for chartered accountants to say .....

HON. MR. PATERSON.—I agree with Mr. Braga.

H.E. THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT.— The Government is of an entirely open mind on this amendment and will put it to an open vote.

HON. SIR HENRY POLLOCK.—The only observation I have to make is this—Let us accept the amendment suggested by Mr. Braga which will bring us back to the date of returns in the present Company Ordinances. Then if there is any reason given by the authorities at Home for the change, an amending ordinance may be introduced.

HON. MR. BRAGA.—That is a practical way out of the difficulty.

The amendment was carried, the Hon. Mr. Shenton being the only dissident.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (on consideration of Part V).— There are three amendments:—

- (i) In penultimate line of section 248 on page 96 substitute "that section" for "those sections."
- (ii) In section 251 (4) on page 98 delete the last part "and in the case ..... general rules".
- (iii) In section 277 (7) on page 111 seventh line after "director or officer of the company" insert the words "or, if there is no director or officer of the company".

These were agreed to.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (on consideration of Part VI).— The amendment to this section is the insertion of the words "Part VI" above "Receivers and Managers" as a heading to section 283 on page 112.

This was agreed to.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (on consideration of Part VIII). —I move that the title of Part VIII be amended by the substitution of "Ordinance" and "Ordinances" for "Act" and "Acts"; also "ordinance" for "order" in the first marginal note and third marginal note.

These were agreed to.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (on consideration of Part X).— I have another amendment. In section 313 (1) (c) (i) on page 121 substitute "(I) If a creditor by assignment or other" for "(i) If the company is dissolved or has". There has been a printer's error here and a line put in the wrong place.

This was agreed to.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (on consideration of Part XV).— There are two amendments:—

- (i) In section 350 (4) at the top of page 138 insert "Hong Kong or" before "Shanghai"
- (ii) In section 352 (3) on page 138 4th line of the sub-section after "shall be paid" add "in Hong Kong currency". I think the currency in which the money should be paid should be Hong Kong currency.

This was agreed to.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (on consideration of Schedule One).—I move that at the end of the fifth paragraph of Table D on page 162 the words "two hundred dollars" be substituted for "twenty pounds."

This was agreed to.

THE SECRETARY FOR CHINESE AFFAIRS.—Will that part relating to 14 days have to be changed in the schedule?

H.E. THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT.— Yes. Alterations will be made in the sixth schedule on page 172.

On Council resuming,

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—During committee a number of amendments have been made to the Bill. I propose that we do not take the third reading to-day but instead that the Bill be published in the *Gazette* as amended in this Council. At a later date we will take the third reading or re-commit any clause to committee and then take the third reading.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded, and the motion was carried.

H.E. THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT.— Council stands adjourned *sine die*. There will be a meeting of the Finance Committee on Wednesday next at 12.30 p.m.

---