

OFFICIAL REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS**Meeting of 22nd February, 1956.****PRESENT:**HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR (*PRESIDENT*)

SIR ALEXANDER WILLIAM GEORGE HERDER GRANTHAM, G.C.M.G.

THE HONOURABLE THE COLONIAL SECRETARY

MR. EDGEWORTH BERESFORD DAVID, C.M.G.

THE HONOURABLE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

MR. ARTHUR HOOTON, Q.C. (*Acting*).

THE HONOURABLE THE SECRETARY FOR CHINESE AFFAIRS

MR. BRIAN CHARLES KEITH HAWKINS, C.M.G., O.B.E.

THE HONOURABLE THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY

MR. ARTHUR GRENFELL CLARKE, C.M.G.

THE HONOURABLE THEODORE LOUIS BOWRING, C.M.G., O.B.E.

(Director of Public Works).

DR. THE HONOURABLE YEO KOK CHEANG, C.M.G.

(Director of Medical and Health Services).

THE HONOURABLE DAVID RONALD HOLMES, M.B.E., M.C.

(Director of Urban Services).

THE HONOURABLE PATRICK CARDINALL MASON SEDGWICK

(Commissioner of Labour).

DR. THE HONOURABLE CHAU SIK NIN, C.B.E.

THE HONOURABLE CHARLES EDWARD MICHAEL TERRY, O.B.E.

THE HONOURABLE LO MAN WAI, C.B.E.

THE HONOURABLE NGAN SHING-KWAN, O.B.E.

THE HONOURABLE DHUN JEHANGIR RUTTONJEE.

THE HONOURABLE CEDRIC BLAKER, M.C., E.D.

THE HONOURABLE KWOK CHAN, O.B.E.

DR. THE HONOURABLE ALBERTO MARIA RODRIGUES, M.B.E., E.D.

MR. CHARLES RAYMOND LAWRENCE (*Deputy Clerk of Councils*).**ABSENT:**

HIS EXCELLENCY THE COMMANDER BRITISH FORCES

LIEUTENANT-GENERAL WILLIAM HENRY STRATTON, C.B., C.V.O., C.B.E., D.S.O.

MINUTES.

The Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 25th January, 1956, were confirmed.

OATH.

MR. PATRICK CARDINALL MASON SEDGWICK took the Oath of Allegiance and assumed his seat as a Member of the Council.

PAPERS.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY, by Command of His Excellency the Governor, laid upon the table the following papers: —

<i>Subject.</i>	<i>G.N. No.</i>
Sessional Papers, 1956: —	
No. 6—Annual Report by the District Commissioner, New Territories for the year 1954/55.	
No. 7—Annual Report by the Director of Commerce and Industry for the year 1954/55.	
No. 8—Annual Report by the Director of Medical and Health Services for the year 1954/55.	
Vehicle and Road Traffic Ordinance.	
Vehicle and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1956	A. 2
Tramway Ordinance.	
Tramway Working (Amendment) Rules, 1956	A. 3
Penicillin Ordinance.	
Penicillin (and other Substances) (Amendment) Regulations, 1956	A. 4
Urban Council Ordinance, 1955.	
Urban Council Elections (Procedure) (Amendment) Regulations, 1956	A. 5

<i>Subject.</i>	<i>G.N. No.</i>
Urban Council Ordinance, 1955.	
Urban Council Elections (Registration of Electors) (Amendment) Regulations, 1956	A. 6
Urban Council Ordinance, 1955.	
Urban Council Elections (Designation of Polling Station) Regulations, 1956	A. 7
Workmen's Compensation Ordinance, 1953.	
Workmen's Compensation (Exception of Prisoners) Order, 1956	A. 9
Dentists Registration Ordinance.	
Dentists (Registration and Disciplinary Procedure) Regulations, 1956	A. 10
Ferries Ordinance.	
Excluded Ferries (Ngau Tau Kok/Causeway Bay) Regulations, 1956	A. 11

RESOLUTION REGARDING THE FUTURE OF BROADCASTING IN HONG KONG.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved the following resolution: —

Resolved that this Council accepts the five recommendations put forward in Sessional Paper No. 2 of 1956 on the future of broadcasting in Hong Kong.

He said: —Your Excellency: Since the problem presented by Radio Hong Kong is fully examined in the Sessional Paper which is the subject of this resolution as are the reasons which lead to the conclusions which the Government has put before this Council for acceptance, I do not wish to waste the time of honourable Members by repeating them at length. I think everyone will agree that the present position is unsatisfactory and that the service provided by Radio Hong Kong is inadequate. The steps required to remedy this position and to improve the

service are summarized in the second, third and fourth recommendations in paragraph 58 of the Sessional Paper. So far the matter is fairly straightforward and I do not suppose that anyone would be disposed to quarrel with the desirability of adopting these measures. These improvements will however cost money and the question therefore arises of who is to pay. Up to now, taking into account a proportion of the royalties received from Rediffusion together with the receipts from licence fees there has been broad equation between the revenue and expenditure in respect of this service. If the improvements recommended are introduced without a corresponding increase in revenue—and there is no reason to suppose that they will of themselves lead to a large increase in the number of receiving sets in use and so to increased revenue—then the service will in effect be receiving a considerable subsidy from the taxpayer. Is it right therefore that a service of this kind to a limited section of the public should be subsidized from public funds? The only alternative way of effecting these necessary improvements to Radio Hong Kong without accepting such a subsidy would be to dispose of the station to commercial interests which might be expected to operate an extended service through sponsored programmes without any additional expenditure falling on public funds. The main question therefore on which this Council is asked to express its opinion today is whether or not Radio Hong Kong should remain under public ownership albeit with a subsidy from public funds though it is suggested that this subsidy might be reduced by the introduction of a limited number of commercially sponsored programmes. For reasons which are set out in the Sessional Paper and notably because of the existing and potential importance of broadcasting as a channel of mass communication the Government after mature deliberation has concluded that it should so remain under public ownership and it is this policy which honourable Members are invited to endorse today.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL seconded.

MR. M. W. LO: —Your Excellency: I rise to move the amendment to the resolution before Council standing in my name. In speaking on broadcasting, the subject matter of this afternoon's debate, one thing struck me forcibly. Broadcasting, this modern medium of communication with all its potentialities, has for listeners one striking advantage over direct speech, this ancient mode of communication at meetings. A Radio listener,

hearing what does not appeal to him, has a simple remedy. He can just turn off the darn thing. But for the poor audience at meetings, there is no alternative but to endure the speaker, however dull and tedious he may be. Although in the course of a long and uninteresting discourse, I suppose it is pardonable to close one's eyes now and again. I don't mind confessing that I have on some occasions been guilty of this venial lapse.

Sir, bearing in mind this great advantage of broadcasting, I wish, if I could, to avoid a long speech. But as we are debating on the important subject of the future of broadcasting in Hong Kong, and on the recommendations of Government's White Paper calling for an estimated capital expenditure of over a million dollars and an estimated recurrent expenditure of about \$450,000.00, and as I am of the opinion, which, I understand, is shared by my Unofficial Colleagues that the Recommendation No. 5 of the White Paper should not be accepted, and that No. 1 and No. 3 should be accepted with certain modifications, I have no option but to speak at some length to justify the stand we take on this matter.

Sir, I agree with the White Paper's conclusion that the further development of Radio Hong Kong should take place under the continuing public control and that it should for the time being continue as a Department of Government, and I agree with the statement in the White Paper that Radio, as a medium, has two prime functions: one to entertain, the other to inform and to educate. But while it may be difficult in practice to draw the line between these two functions, the justification for Government's expenditure on Radio Hong Kong should be in the field of news, cultural and educational programmes.

As regards Recommendation No. 3, I am not at all convinced that it is necessary for Radio Hong Kong to have such powerful transmitters as 10 kilowatt. I suggest that it may be to Government's advantage and at no cost to seek tenders from responsible manufacturers to make recommendations and to supply transmitting equipment powerful enough for Hong Kong's needs.

As regards Recommendation No. 5, the question is whether Radio Hong Kong, with its primary function to inform and educate, and with its present organization, should go in for commercially sponsored programmes. Sir, I would say the answer is no.

The reason given in the White Paper for the introduction of commercially sponsored programmes and advertising is to partially fill the gap of broadcasting expenditure and revenue from listeners, and it is suggested that there should be about 2½ hours of sponsored programmes daily during the peak listening hours. Let us assume for the purpose of arguments that Radio Hong Kong has two functions: to inform and to entertain. But even with an all-day transmission, it is impossible for any one broadcasting station to fulfil both these functions successfully. The British Broadcasting Corporation itself has three channels in an endeavour to satisfy its home listeners. Radio Hong Kong attempts to give satisfactory service in one channel in three Chinese dialects (Cantonese, Mandarin and Fukien). To ensure its successful role to entertain as well as to inform, it would have to make available a minimum of six distinctly different types of programmes (one entertainment and one educational in each dialect), and this, without taking into consideration the diversity of interests of listeners in each dialect group. Even Rediffusion, successful as they are, have plans to establish a further channel to serve their Mandarin and Fukien Subscribers. Obviously for Radio Hong Kong, its role as provider of informative service is of paramount importance.

It is stated in paragraph 46 of the White Paper that the peak listening hours are between 7 p.m. and 10.30 p.m. each day, and that the requirements of advertisers would be about 2½ hours daily, and that advertisers would want their programmes broadcast during this period. This would mean that 71% of the peak listening hours would be held by commercial sponsors if the air time could be successfully sold.

Radio Hong Kong's head staff consists mainly of B.B.C.'s trained personnel. By tradition and policy, B.B.C. is against commercializing broadcasting stations. Can the personnel trained by them efficiently cope with the insatiable demands of the sponsors or their advertising agencies? If not, will additional personnel be engaged to look after this particular undertaking? If this extra personnel is necessary, then what would be the approximate net gain to Radio Hong Kong from its fees from sponsors?

Sir, I hold the view that there is an alternative to Radio Hong Kong branching out into commercially sponsored programmes, and that is to permit the operation by private enterprise

of a commercial broadcasting station. Surely in a City of the size and importance of Hong Kong, there is room for the establishment of this type of private enterprise. What can such a station do? It can provide a whole day entertainment to Radio owners thereby filling in a much needed gap; it will enable Radio Hong Kong to concentrate on its role of education and information; it will increase the revenue of Radio Hong Kong as a result of increased licences; in an emergency it will give Government an extra effective stand by and all this with no extra expense to the tax payer.

Of course, such station should only operate under licence from Government, and under control in regard to observing standard of decency, avoiding racial or religious issues and preventing the station being used as a medium for political propaganda.

Sir, with these remarks, I beg to move the following amendment standing in my name: —

Line 1, substitute the words "first four" for the word "five", and insert the following after the words "Hong Kong":

“ subject to the provisos: that, as regards recommendation No. (1), it should be understood that the justification for subsidizing Radio Hong Kong, to the extent of meeting any excess of expenditure over and above the receipts from licence fees and Rediffusion, lies in the educational, cultural and informatory aspects of the programmes of Radio Hong Kong rather than in their value as pure entertainment, and that, as regards recommendation No. (3), alternative, less costly methods of achieving full coverage of the whole Colony than by means of a powerful transmitter of 10 kilowatts should be examined.

2. This Council does not accept recommendation No. (5). In lieu thereof, it considers that Government should invite applications for the establishment of a new station for the broadcasting of commercially sponsored programmes under licence from Government, and subject to such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may think fit to impose.”

MR. KWOK CHAN: —Your Excellency: I rise to second the amendment proposed by my honourable Colleague Mr. M. W. Lo to the resolution now before Council.

In regard to broadcasting in Hong Kong it has become sufficiently clear that as far as the services provided by Radio Hong Kong are concerned steps to remedy certain shortcomings, such as insufficient coverage of the Colony, and to stimulate greater interest amongst listeners by methods such as the introduction of all-day broadcasting and an improvement in the variety and scope of the programmes, are a matter of urgency that calls for Government's early attention.

Of late we so frequently find Chinese listeners devoting so much time and attention to Chinese programmes provided by stations outside Hong Kong that we feel we cannot afford to lose any more time in bringing our own programmes up to a standard which will be more attractive to listeners.

For this reason we welcome the presentation of Sessional Paper No. 2 of 1956 which embodies recommendations on this subject directed towards improvements of Radio Hong Kong.

I have no doubt that there can hardly be any disagreement over Recommendations (2) and (4), and I am confident that these two recommendations will receive the acceptance of Council.

Turning back to Recommendation (1), in which a basic departure from the principle that revenue from licence fees should cover the cost of broadcasting was recommended, I presume that in making this recommendation the question of financing the improvements of the broadcasting service and of meeting its additional operating cost was taken into account.

I agree with the proposer of the amendment that provisos should be added to this recommendation, making it clear that the justification for subsidizing Radio Hong Kong, to the extent of meeting any excess of expenditure over and above the receipts from licence fees and Rediffusion, lies in the educational, cultural and informatory aspects of the programmes of Radio Hong Kong rather than in their value as pure entertainment. This will ensure that money spent in this direction serves a useful purpose from which listeners will derive real value and benefit.

Generally speaking, Recommendation (3) in regard to the installation of 10 kilowatt transmitters to command full coverage of the Colony should be accepted as a move in the right direction, and is both necessary and urgent. With the present equipment it has been found that reception in certain districts has been poor, and in some places particularly difficult. Steps to remedy this shortcoming must be accepted as necessary, but for the sake of economy, we urge that the possibility of finding alternative methods of achieving full coverage other than costly 10 Kilowatt transmitting sets should be thoroughly explored.

Subject to the foregoing proposed qualification I think there should be no serious disagreement over the first four recommendations.

Recommendation (5) is of a different nature and requires very careful consideration. It involves the introduction of commercially sponsored programmes on both transmissions. As a matter of policy I think it is basically wrong for a government department, which is what Radio Hong Kong now is and probably will continue to be, to embark upon an undertaking which is decidedly a commercial enterprise. Commercially sponsored programmes are a form of advertising. Apart from the objection to competing with commercial interests, there remains the question of whether the existing staff of Radio Hong Kong is capable of running smoothly a quasi-commercial enterprise or not. Advertising is a form of business which requires specially trained personnel, and if Radio Hong Kong were to take it up, it is almost certain that a special set-up would have to be added which would incur large additional operating costs.

If the introduction of commercially-sponsored programmes is intended to be a means of covering in part the additional running cost of Radio Hong Kong following the introduction of improvements, it would be simpler for Government to consider applications for the establishment of a new station for the broadcasting of commercially sponsored programmes under licence from Government, and subject to such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may think fit to impose. In many places of the world commercially-operated stations running side by side with Government stations are permitted, and I do not see any reason why we in Hong Kong might not do the same.

Sir, I am in complete agreement with Mr. Lo on his proposed amendment to the resolution and I beg to second it.

DR. CHAU SIK NIN: —Your Excellency: It is fundamentally wrong for Government to compete with private enterprise and the acceptance of advertising would certainly not be consonant with official dignity. Government cannot preserve its prestige if it gets mixed up with "Dr. Killem's Cure-all" or "Messrs. Purple Stripes Natty Pyjamas" and I do not like to think of what is going to happen to the Colony's administration if the Honourable Colonial Secretary has to spend his time arbitrating between the Controller of Broadcasting and Advertisers.

It is in the British tradition for Government to operate official broadcasting stations and I am in favour of Radio Hong Kong remaining a Government Department. Government should have a medium through which official views can be expressed, but such a broadcasting station must, as a matter of Colony prestige, keep its programmes on a high cultural plane. These programmes must be educational as well as informative.

It has already been proved that no one station can adequately cope with the dual functions of radio—that of giving information and providing entertainment. Where we have as in Hong Kong, several dialects and a variety of provincial backgrounds and interests to cater for, the task is simply impossible through a single channel. The proposal to extend the hours of Chinese broadcasting is welcome, but even with this additional time, it will not be possible for Radio Hong Kong to do more than to fulfil the primary function of Government sponsored radio—that of informing and educating.

Commercial broadcasting sets out to entertain, to cater for the crowd. With a population of 2½ millions, there is room for both official and commercial stations. Great fears have been expressed that programmes emanating from an independent station might not be in the public interest. This is an unfounded fear. Government can impose the requisite controls to ensure that nothing unwholesome goes over the air, and keen businessmen themselves realize that their income depends on maintaining public goodwill. Programmes of dubious character will certainly not enhance the reputation of the sponsor or the products he advertises—the success of American and Continental commercial stations gives proof of this.

My honourable Friend, Mr. M. W. Lo has very ably expressed his views on this important subject of broadcasting, views which I wholeheartedly endorse, and I support the amendment as proposed by him.

MR. NGAN SHING-KWAN: —Your Excellency: There is no doubt in my mind that action must be taken to improve local broadcasting. The inadequacy of existing programme schedules and the poor reception in districts only a few miles from the source of transmission are established facts with which the public are already too familiar and which are fully dealt with in the comprehensive statement prepared by the Colonial Secretariat and referred to as Sessional Paper No. 2 of 1956. I do not, therefore, intend to dwell on these points, but I would like to say a few words regarding the proposed amendment to Recommendation No. 5 of the White Paper, which if adopted will mean that, instead of introducing sponsored programmes over Radio Hong Kong, Government will invite applications from private undertakings for the operation of a commercial radio station.

This is not, of course, something new. Commercial broadcasting systems have been operating successfully in other parts of the world for many years now and I believe it should be possible to build up a popular station in Hong Kong on similar lines. The advertising of goods and services over the air is not so common here as in the western world, but one has only to listen to Rediffusion to realize that local concerns are catching on very quickly and it is reasonable to assume that the demand for sponsored programmes will increase as our local manufacturers give more attention to this aspect of sales promotion.

An added advantage of a commercial station is that it will not involve Government in additional recurrent expenditure for broadcasting from the general revenue and we may in fact anticipate, that, with a new transmission catering to popular taste, there will be a revival of interest in local radio and that applications for licences will increase, thus bringing in more revenue.

I would, however, like to consider for a moment what effect all this will have on Radio Hongkong. It appears that under the proposed arrangement Radio Hongkong should be able to continue side by side with the commercial station, but devoting a greater proportion of its transmissions to programmes of an

educational and cultural nature, although it is unlikely to leave the entertainment side entirely to the commercial undertaking, as it obviously could not expect to retain the interest of listeners on such a basis.

Local broadcasting has been the subject of considerable criticism in recent years and if the proposal to establish a commercial station meets with the approval of this Council, the public will I am sure look to Government to act in the matter without undue delay.

MR. D. RUTTONJEE: —Your Excellency: I rise to support the amendment of my honourable Friend, Mr. M. W. Lo.

The principle that the cost of broadcasting should be limited to the amount of revenue obtained from licensing has already been discarded—the present annual cost of Radio Hong Kong is given as \$1,600,000 whereas recurrent revenue from radio licence fees is only \$1,000,000. The gap of \$600,000 will be increased a further \$600,000 to \$1,200,000 if, as is apparent, the proposed revised hours of broadcasting are adopted. It has been well argued that royalties paid to Government by Rediffusion (H.K.) Ltd. amounting to about \$800,000 annually might legitimately be considered as broadcasting income and as such used to partially offset this gap. If this principle is accepted, then royalties resulting from the operation of a commercial broadcasting station (which might be visualized as being fairly substantial) would likewise accrue towards the cost of maintaining and improving Radio Hong Kong programmes. Furthermore, with a wider choice of programmes, it is reasonable to expect an increase in licence holders.

From the taxpayer's point of view, therefore, the establishment of a commercial broadcasting station has everything to commend it, and on the face of it, it does not appear equitable that the non-radio owning taxpayer should be called upon to subsidize Radio Hong Kong for the benefit of 50,000 radio listeners.

Government should still retain Radio Hong Kong as an official broadcasting station, and I should like to see not only an increase in the Chinese hours of broadcasting, but an improvement too in the English language broadcasts. It is possible that revenue resulting from the licensing of a commercial radio station will make this possible.

DR. A. M. RODRIGUES: —Your Excellency: The reasons for the proposed amendment to the Resolution before Council have been fully explained by honourable Members who have just addressed this Council. As regards the first four recommendations I have only to affirm my agreement with all that has been said.

I also agree with honourable Members' views regarding commercially sponsored programmes on Radio Hong Kong as being undesirable. To justify the confidence placed upon it by the sponsors and to give full value for the cost of advertising, a sponsored programme must enjoy full public popularity. Past experience has shown how difficult it is to please the listening public. Add to these the sponsors and advertisers waving a big stick, marked with the threat of withdrawal of patronage if their wishes are not met, and we would have an intolerable situation and interference with autonomy.

I prefer the alternative, but would here express the hope that in view of this alternative the English Programme should receive a 'New look' in a slightly extended and intensified programme, concentrating on the educational, cultural and inforamatory aspect of broadcasting, much of which incidentally is still entertainment.

I would also like to see the formation of separate small committees for the English and Chinese programmes. If past advisory committees have not been eminently successful it has been, in my opinion, due to one overall committee which was too large and unwieldy for serving both programmes.

Sir, when the question of a new station to be run by private enterprise was first brought up, I received it with some misgiving.

I asked myself then,

"Would this really help increase the number of radio listeners appreciably?"

"Might it not remove the justification for the increase of broadcasting hours on Radio Hong Kong?"

I have drawn the conclusion that as the types of programme will be different there will be no clashing of interests of the two stations and that there will be an increase of listeners through effort and inducement made by the sponsors themselves, with a resultant increase in licence fees.

Among further questions which came to my mind were:

"What would be the basis for the selection of the right applicant?"

"Will it eventually become a public corporation?"

"Will there be interchange of programmes with Radio Hong Kong?"

"To what extent will Government be able to exercise control over it?"

As an afterthought I realized, Sir, that these were matters concerning 'Practice' rather than 'Principle', and as has been rightly pointed out, is a matter for the Governor in Council. I say confidently, therefore, Sir, and with respect, that the questions will be adequately dealt with.

I accept, therefore, in principle, the alternative suggestion to recommendation No. 5 and support the amendments as put forward by my honourable Friend.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: —Your Excellency: The amendment moved by my honourable Friend, Mr. M. W. LO, and supported by other speakers in this debate is acceptable to Government. In accepting the amendment there are one or two observations I would wish to make on its terms. Firstly, Sir, the principle expressed that the justification for subsidizing Radio Hong Kong lies in its educational, cultural and informatory aspects of its programmes is one with which I would not quarrel, but insofar as it is intended to affect the programmes themselves and insofar as it is possible to differentiate between programmes for pure entertainment and programmes which have a cultural or educational content, I think it will have to be remembered that if Radio Hong Kong is to attract and to retain its listening public then it will have to have balanced programmes which will encourage the public to tune in to Radio Hong Kong.

On the second point of the first half of the amendment, Sir, we are very ready to re-examine the need for a 10 Kilowatt transmitter to see whether it is possible to provide full coverage without going to that expense, but I would remind the Council that this recommendation which has been included in the Sessional paper is one made by a technical expert brought out

from the United Kingdom, who is the Secretary of State's technical adviser in these matters, and it is a matter on which we may not be able to get any better technical advice than that, but it will certainly be looked into.

Turning, Sir, to the recommendation No. 5 which it is now proposed to reject, the suggestion that Radio Hong Kong should undertake commercially sponsored programmes was as has been pointed out, put forward solely from the point of view of reducing the gap between expenditure and revenue; and if, as has been suggested, the introduction of a commercial station will lead to a larger number of receiving sets and so to increased revenue from licence fees, I entirely agree that that is a more satisfactory way of increasing the revenue.

As regards the commercial station itself, the Government would certainly wish to ensure that there are safeguards as to its programmes and there will, as has been recommended, be included in the conditions imposed by the Governor in Council on the licence. There may be technical difficulties in providing for an additional broadcasting station in Hong Kong, from the point of view of finding a suitable site which will not interfere with other signal traffic. That is a consideration which applies also to the provision of more powerful transmitters for Radio Hong Kong. The question is under examination at the present time and the acceptance of the recommendation to invite applications to operate a commercial station must be understood as subject to the ability to overcome any technical difficulties in that field.

Lastly, Sir, I would only say that if a commercial station is to be set up to run side by side with Radio Hong Kong, it will in fact be in competition with Radio Hong Kong in the sense that it will be attempting to attract the listening public, and therefore if Radio Hong Kong is to continue to operate and to serve the public, then it will require to be given the necessary resources to compete with the commercial station.

With those observations, Sir, I would only repeat Government is prepared to accept this amendment.

The amendment as proposed was put and agreed to.

The original motion as amended was put and agreed to.

OFFENSIVE TRADES (AMENDMENT) BY-LAWS, 1956.

MR. D. R. HOLMES moved the following resolution: —

Resolved that the Offensive Trades (Amendment) By-laws, 1956, made by the Urban Council on the 24th day of January, 1956, under section 4 of the Public Health (Sanitation) Ordinance, 1935, be approved.

He said: —Your Excellency: These by-laws represent the final stage in a series of amendments of legislation designed to transfer from the Urban Council to the Commissioner of Labour certain functions related to factories and similar undertakings. The first stage of this process was the enactment in August last year of the Factories and Industrial Undertakings Ordinance 1955. The second stage, which was carried out by this Council at the end of 1955, was to amend the Public Health (Sanitation) Ordinance 1935 in such a way as to remove from the Urban Council those powers and duties which had become superfluous as a result of the new Factories Ordinance. The final stage is to bring the subsidiary legislation into line, and that is what this motion seeks to do. The amending by-laws which are now before Council will have the effect, if they are approved, of removing from the Urban Council's by-laws all reference to "dangerous trades" since the requirements in respect of such trades are now fully covered by the new and up-to-date legislation which the Commissioner of Labour now administers.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

**MEALS AND INTOXICATING LIQUORS TAX
(REPEAL) BILL, 1956.**

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY moved the First reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to repeal the Meals and Intoxicating Liquors Tax Ordinance, Chapter 113."

He said: —Sir: The purpose of this Bill is set forth in the "Objects and Reasons", to which I have nothing to add.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

The Bill was read a First time.

Objects and Reasons.

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

The taxes imposed by sections 3 and 4 of the Meals and Intoxicating Liquors Tax Ordinance, Chapter 113, were suspended with effect from 8 o'clock a.m. on Wednesday the 30th November, 1955. This Bill seeks to make the suspension permanent by repealing the Ordinance.

**THE SOCIETY FOR THE RELIEF OF DISABLED
CHILDREN INCORPORATION BILL, 1956.**

MR. C. BLAKER moved the First reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to provide for the incorporation of the members of The Society for the Relief of Disabled Children."

He said: —Your Excellency: The purpose of the Bill is fully set out in the "Objects and Reasons" and there is nothing that I can usefully add.

DR. A. M. RODRIGUES seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

The Bill was read a First time.

Objects and Reasons.

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

1. The object of this Bill is to incorporate the members of The Society for the Relief of Disabled Children.

2. The Society for the Relief of Disabled Children has been in existence since September 4th, 1953. The objects of The Society for the Relief of Disabled Children are, *inter alia*, to work for the relief of disabled children, to provide clinic, convalescent homes or other services for the treatment, curing or rehabilitating of disabled children and to promote and foster the general welfare of disabled children by co-operating with other social organizations and institutions.

3. The present The Society for the Relief of Disabled Children is not a corporate body and cannot, therefore, hold any property in its own name. Not being a corporate body it is handicapped in other ways in the carrying out of its functions.

ADJOURNMENT.

H. E. THE GOVERNOR: —Council will adjourn to this day week.