

OFFICIAL REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS.**Meeting of 7th October, 1959.**

PRESENT:HIS EXCELLENCY THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT (*PRESIDENT*)

MR. CLAUDE BRAMALL BURGESS, C.M.G., O.B.E.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE COMMANDER BRITISH FORCES

LIEUTENANT-GENERAL SIR EDRIC MONTAGUE BASTYAN, K.B.E., C.B.

THE HONOURABLE THE COLONIAL SECRETARY

MR. EDMUND BRINSLEY TEESDALE, M.C. (*Acting*).

THE HONOURABLE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

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

THE HONOURABLE THE SECRETARY FOR CHINESE AFFAIRS

MR. PATRICK CARDINALL MASON SEDGWICK (*Acting*).

THE HONOURABLE THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY

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

THE HONOURABLE ALLAN INGLIS

(Director of Public Works).

DR. THE HONOURABLE DAVID JAMES MASTERTON MACKENZIE, C.M.G., O.B.E.

(Director of Medical and Health Services).

THE HONOURABLE COLIN GEORGE MERVYN MORRISON

(Director of Urban Services).

THE HONOURABLE KENNETH STRATHMORE KINGHORN

(Commissioner of Labour).

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

THE HONOURABLE HUGH DAVID MACEWEN BARTON, M.B.E.

THE HONOURABLE KWOK CHAN, O.B.E.

THE HONOURABLE JOHN DOUGLAS CLAGUE, C.B.E., M.C., T.D.

THE HONOURABLE DHUN JEHANGIR RUTTONJEE, O.B.E.

THE HONOURABLE FUNG PING FAN, O.B.E.

THE HONOURABLE RICHARD CHARLES LEE, O.B.E.

THE HONOURABLE KWAN CHO YIU, O.B.E.

MR. ANDREW McDONALD CHAPMAN (*Deputy Clerk of Councils*).

MINUTES.

The Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 23rd September, 1959 were confirmed.

PAPERS.

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

Subject. *G.N. No.*

Sessional Paper, 1959: —

No. 16—Annual Report by the Commissioner of Registration
of Persons for the year 1958/59.

Merchant Shipping Ordinance, 1953.

Merchant Shipping (Engineers Certificates) (Amendment) Rules,
1959 A. 61.

Colonial Air Navigation Order, 1955.

Hong Kong Air Navigation (General) (Amendment) Regulations,
1959 A. 62.

Stamp Ordinance.

Stamp (Bank Authorization) (No. 4) Order, 1959 A. 63.

**TERMS OF AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN
THE GOVERNMENT OF HONG KONG AND THE ADMIRALTY.**

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY moved the following resolution: —

Resolved that the Terms of an Agreement between the Government of
Hong Kong and the Admiralty as shown in the Schedule be
approved.

SCHEDULE.

1. The Admiralty will surrender to and hand over to the Government of Hong Kong on or before the 1st day of October, 1959 all that area known as Kowloon Naval Dockyard together with all piers, wharves, anchorage and appurtenances thereon to belong.

2. The Admiralty will hand over to the Government of Hong Kong by stages after the 30th November, 1959 that part of the Hong Kong Naval Dockyard coloured yellow on the annexed plan, such handover to be completed on or before the 1st January, 1962.

3. The Government of Hong Kong will pay to the Admiralty the sum of £ 7,000,000 sterling by the following instalments: —

- (a) a first instalment of £ 1,000,000 on the 1st day of July, 1960; and
- (b) twenty-four quarterly instalments of £ 250,000 each, the first of such instalments to be paid on the 1st day of July, 1961.

4. The Government of Hong Kong will reimburse to the Admiralty one half of the cost of walling up the entrance to the dry dock known as No. 1 Dock.


5. The Government of Hong Kong will provide at its own expense a boundary wall enclosing that part of the Hong Kong Naval Dockyard which is to be retained by the Admiralty as coloured blue on the annexed plan.

He said: Sir, the schedule which is recommended for approval by this Council sets forth the main points of an agreement concluded between this Government and the Admiralty, under which this Colony will get back considerable areas of the lands now occupied by the Navy, and with your permission, Sir, I shall give a brief explanation of the background.

The problem of military and naval lands in Hong Kong has been a thorny one ever since the foundation of the Colony. I do not propose to waste time by going into past history, but those interested may find it set forth in Endacott's "History of Hong Kong". Suffice it to say that the naval and military lands in the centre of the city were recognized as a serious problem as far back as 1875, when the Surveyor General, the Director of Public Works of those days, Mr. J. M. Price, wrote that the settlement—it was not then a city at that time—was "strangled at its waist" by these lands; a curious example of the mixed metaphor. Since then the problem has become progressively worse, and anybody who now has to travel between the central district and Wanchai during the rush hours does not need to be told of its gravity.

The possibility of solving this problem presented itself with the Admiralty decision to run down the Naval Dockyard, and I have the Governor's authority to quote him as saying that he was satisfied we must make every effort to solve it, because this opportunity to eliminate the bottleneck between the central and eastern parts of the city might never recur.

At the beginning of the discussions, the Admiralty indicated that they proposed to retain a part of the island area as a naval base, but that the remainder of the island area, and the whole of the Kowloon dockyard, could be given up. We showed them our plans with the roadline as indicated on the plan which is before honourable Members.



This roadline, giving direct through access from Connaught Road to Gloucester Road, was recommended by the Public Works Department as providing the best solution to our traffic problem, and was agreed by Dr. Charlesworth. The Admiralty agreed to concentrate all their remaining activities to the north of this roadline, within the area coloured blue, and to release the area coloured yellow.

The negotiations then entered a more difficult stage. The Admiralty declined to entertain our proposition that they should hand back to us without any consideration lands for which they had no further use. On the contrary, they expected payment of the full market value. The question of what might be the full market value was not made any easier by considerations of title. Although the Admiralty title to certain areas was open to argument, it is very possible that they were entitled to assign or sell other areas as they wished. One such area of over 180,000 square feet, for example, has a long frontage on Queen's Road, and splits the whole naval area in two.

Agreement on title, and agreement on valuations, proved unattainable, and negotiations then proceeded on the basis of a package deal. I will not weary honourable Members by going into detail; the final result is summarized in the paper now before them. The consideration is £ 7,000,000, but payment is spread over seven years, without interest. We therefore have to pay a million pounds a year for seven years; the burden, although heavy, is one that the Colony's finances can, I feel, stand without undue strain. In addition, we meet the cost of a new wall round the much reduced area which the Admiralty will retain, and we meet half the cost of walling up the entrance to the drydock, which will be filled in. The cost of the wall is estimated at \$210,000, and half the cost of walling up the drydock is estimated at \$112,000. We agreed to this latter for the sake of getting on with the job quickly, because, as can be seen from the plan, the drydock must be filled in as a first step. Otherwise the new naval base will be split in two, and in any event the new road will go across it.

The whole of the Kowloon Naval Yard was in fact handed over to us on the 1st October, and part of it is now being used by the Stores Department. The whole of the Hong Kong area will be handed over before the end of 1961, although before then we expect to gain possession of parts of the area as they are vacated.

So much for the naval lands negotiations. They were difficult because there is no established and recognized procedure for dealing with naval land as there is with military land. We were anxious to get back these lands; the Admiralty for its part naturally wished to get the best possible terms. At one stage, indeed, the differences between us were so wide that negotiations were suspended. But finally we compromised; we made, as I have said, this package deal, which ignores

questions of title, and provides for payment to the Admiralty of a sum substantially less than originally asked. It does not in any way constitute a precedent for any future negotiations that may take place on naval lands.

Now the whole purpose of these negotiations was to eliminate this "stranglehold round our waist". We had reached agreement with the Admiralty for the surrender of their land, but this agreement was useless for our purpose unless we could also obtain the land to the east of the naval area which is coloured green on the plan before honourable Members. This area is War Department land and is known as War Department Lot No. 5. What is known as Wellington Barracks on this lot is occupied by the Navy as H.M.S. Tamar, but, as I have said, the area is still War Department land. We therefore had to make the agreement with the Admiralty conditional on agreement being reached with the War Department for surrender of this land. The War Department, prompted by His Excellency the Commander British Forces, whose personal help and support throughout I should like to acknowledge, agreed to negotiation, and I am glad to say that agreement has been reached for the surrender of this lot also in accordance with the usual Military Lands procedure. The agreement is in terms somewhat similar to that reached on Murray Barracks and Murray Parade Ground. It provides that this Government shall credit the War Department with the sum of \$24 millions to be made available for Army works services in the Colony, and it further provides that this credit may not be drawn upon at a rate greater than \$4,800,000 a year commencing in the financial year 1961/62. This area need not be handed over before the end of 1962 for reasons which I will give in a moment, but the Army has agreed to surrender the roadline on six months' notice being given, provided such notice is not given before the 1st January, 1960. I may add to that, that His Excellency the Commander British Forces has given us his assurance that, if we are ready to proceed with the road at a date before the 1st July, 1960, he will use his utmost endeavours to clear the line for us and allow us to go ahead.

The delays in handing over to us the various areas are necessitated by reprovisioning. Although the Dockyard is being run down, quite a considerable naval establishment will remain here, and it must all be reprovisioned within the restricted area which the Admiralty will retain. Accordingly time must be allowed for this reprovisioning. Particularly is this the case with War Department Lot No. 5 or H.M.S. Tamar. The Admiralty programme leaves H.M.S. Tamar to the last, and it is because of this that the agreement provides that the surrender of the green area need not be before the end of 1962. This perhaps is of no great moment, in view of the undertaking that the roadline will be surrendered at six months' notice.

I think Sir, that honourable Members, and the public generally, will agree that the time has come when it is essential that the bottleneck between the central and eastern parts of the city must be eliminated, and I should expect therefore that the greatest interest will be shown in the proposals for the road. The road will, as I have said, run through from Connaught Road Central to Gloucester Road and it will be necessary for the boat pool shown in the Army lot to be reclaimed, and for a further small reclamation to be made in front of Police Headquarters. I am sure that my Honourable friend the Director of Public Works will be happy to answer any questions of detail about this new thoroughfare, but I understand that, provided the necessary funds are voted by this Council, he is ready to start on the job just as soon as the land is available.

It may be of interest if I mention that the area of that part of the Hong Kong naval yard which we shall acquire is 962,000 square feet. It is roughly equal in size to the central city area bounded by Pedder Street, Queen's Road Central, Jackson Road and Connaught Road Central. The area of the Kowloon Naval Yard is 680,000 square feet—that is, the formed areas only, excluding the basins. The area of War Department Lot No. 5 is 461,460 square feet, of which the boat pool to which I have referred measures 56,182 square feet.

It is still for decision what we shall do with these lands when we obtain possession of them, and Your Excellency has directed as a first step that development of both the Kowloon Naval Dockyard area, and the land on the Hong Kong side, should be referred to the Town Planning Board, which will take into consideration, not only the lands now being surrendered, but also Murray Barracks, and also the new reclamations which are to be made on the waterfront. This will doubtless take time. There is one proposal for the Kowloon area which is likely to be pressed. This is that a part of the area, with the basin, shall be taken over by the Marine Department for the maintenance and servicing of the government fleet. The Marine Department at present has an area known as the Yau Ma Tei slipway, which is far too small for present-day needs. If this proposal be approved, the area at Yau Ma Tei can be vacated and will be available for disposal.

I have, Sir, tried to the best of my ability to set forth as briefly as possible the terms of these agreements. The cost of getting back these lands is perhaps heavy in relation to the present-day value of the land that we are obtaining, even though payment is to be spread over seven years. But I suggest to honourable Members that it would be short-sighted to look at this payment as a payment for land alone. If we do not get these lands, then I think that without question we shall have to incur very heavy expenditure on road widening, or on fly-overs, to try to improve the traffic congestion at the foot of Garden Road and round the Cricket Ground. And the result would never be satisfactory. A

glance at the plan will show honourable Members that a large proportion of the traffic now passing the junction of Queen's Road, Murray Road and Garden Road is likely in the future to go along the new road. I think indeed it is fair to expect that all the traffic between the existing and future central reclamations, and the eastern district, will go along the new and, I trust, wide road through what is now the Naval Yard rather than round the corner of Queen's Road and Murray Road. The price we have to pay, considered as a price for land, may be high, but the deal should not, I think, be regarded as a purchase of land for development by a speculator. It is very much more than that. It breaks that "stranglehold round our waist" which has persisted for so long; it enables us to breathe.

I commend it to this Council for approval,

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

MR. NGAN SHING KWAN: —I rise to speak on behalf of myself and all my unofficial colleagues.

The resolution before Council, if adopted, will mark the beginning of the end of a problem that has plagued Hong Kong for the greater part of a Century. For decades our predecessors on Council have advocated the removal of the Royal Naval Dockyard, and have roundly condemned the restriction it imposes on road communication between the heart of Victoria and the eastern part of the Island. At the same time the naval and military lands have impeded the natural expansion of the city towards the east.

Last year agreement was reached whereby the Murray Barracks area is to revert to Government. Since then the Dockyard has also become available for disposal, and the Unofficial Members of Council are unanimous in their agreement that Government should not let slip this opportunity of acquiring land which has been a source of frustration for so many years. Unfortunately, as is apparent from the remarks of the Honourable Financial Secretary, the decision to close the Dockyard did not in itself provide an answer to the problem, as might reasonably have been expected. On the contrary it led to complicated and protracted negotiations with the Admiralty which at one stage threatened to deprive the public of the use of these lands indefinitely. However, an agreement on the Admiralty's final minimum demands was eventually reached, to which the Unofficial Members reluctantly gave their approval, after satisfying themselves that the Government had made the best of a hard bargain.

With these remarks, Sir, and on behalf of the Unofficial Members, I support the resolution before Council.

The question was put and agreed to.

OCCUPIERS LIABILITY BILL, 1959.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the First reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the law as to the liability of occupiers and others for injury or damage resulting to persons or goods lawfully on any land or other property from dangers due to the state of the property or to things done or omitted to be done there, and for purposes connected therewith".

He said: Sir, this Bill has been prepared on the recommendation of the Law Reform Committee and its terms agreed with the Hong Kong Bar Association and the Incorporated Law Society of Hong Kong. It is modelled on the Occupiers Liability Act, 1957.

The main proposal contained in it is the standardization of the liability of occupiers of premises to visitors injured as a result of defects in the condition of those premises. The present law of the Colony draws an artificial distinction between two different categories of visitors to premises, known respectively as invitees and licensees, a higher duty of care being owed by occupiers to the former than they owe to the latter. Invitees are persons who are on the premises by virtue of a common interest with the occupier, whilst licensees are those who come on to the premises by permission of the occupier in a matter in which the occupier has no interest. In many cases coming before the courts there is considerable room for argument whether a visitor is an invitee or a licensee and as to the consequent standard of care owed to him. This Bill proposes the abolition of the distinction between the duty owed towards an invitee and that owed towards a licensee, and substitutes a common duty of care to both, described in the Bill as "a duty to take such care as in all the circumstances of the case is reasonable to see that the visitor will be reasonably safe in using the premises for which he is invited or permitted by the occupier to be there".

Thus, if this Bill is accepted, the law will be stated in clearer terms than at present and our law will be kept in line with the present law of England.

When the corresponding Act was enacted in England, some six months were allowed to elapse before it was brought into operation: this Bill contains a similar provision.

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 object of the Bill is to amend the law as to the liability of occupiers and others for injury or damage resulting to persons or

goods lawfully on any land or other property from dangers due to the state of the property or to things done or omitted to be done there as it is considered desirable that the law of the Colony on the subject should approximate to such law presently existing in England and Wales. The Occupiers' Liability Act, 1957 (5 & 6 Eliz. 2 c. 31), which came into operation in the United Kingdom on the 1st January, 1958, is based on the majority recommendations contained in the Third Report (Occupiers' Liability to Invitees, Licensees and Trespassers) of the Law Reform Committee of the United Kingdom.

2. Clauses 3 and 4 enact rules which are to have effect, in place of the rules of the common law, to regulate the duty owed by an occupier of premises to his visitors in respect of dangers due to the state of the premises or to things done or omitted to be done on them, but the rules of the common law will continue to determine who is an occupier and to whom the duty is owed (see clause 2).

3. By clause 3 an occupier will owe the same "common duty of care", as defined in the Bill, to all his visitors except where he is free to and does extend, restrict, modify or exclude it by agreement or otherwise.

4. Clause 4 provides that where an occupier is bound by contract or the terms of a tenancy to permit third parties to enter his premises, he may not in that contract restrict or exclude the common duty of care as respects them, and (subject to any provision to the contrary) he will be bound by any higher obligations under the contract or tenancy itself which are undertaken or renewed after the commencement of the Ordinance.

5. As provided by clause 5, the common duty of care will also be owed by a landlord towards all persons lawfully on the premises in respect of dangers arising from default by the landlord in carrying out his obligations for the maintenance or repair of the premises, but such persons will have no right of action unless the landlord's default is actionable at the suit of the occupier.

6. The Bill, by clause 6, also provides that, as respects contracts entered into after its commencement, the duty owed by an occupier to persons entering premises under a contractual right to do so will be the common duty of care, unless some express provision is made in the contract.

7. Clause 7 applies the Bill to the Crown in so far as the Crown is made liable in tort by the Crown Proceedings Ordinance, 1957 (No. 18 of 1957), and that Ordinance, in particular section 4, will apply in relation to duties under clauses 3 to 5 as statutory duties.

8. A Comparative Table showing the source of the clauses is appended.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1959.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the First reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the Merchant Shipping Ordinance, 1953".

He said: This Bill proposes a number of miscellaneous amendments to the Merchant Shipping Ordinance. These are explained clause by clause in the statement of Objects and Reasons appended to the Bill and I do not think there is anything I can usefully add at this stage to what is set out there.

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 purpose of this Bill is to amend the principal Ordinance in a number of respects.

2. Clause 2 of the Bill is to amend section 2 of the principal Ordinance by correcting the title of Minister of Transport and by the insertion of two new definitions, namely "accepted Safety Convention certificate" and "non-Convention country". These new definitions are required for the purposes of section 41 if amended in the manner proposed in clause 8.

3. Clause 3 is to amend section 5 in order to enable ships belonging to the Government of Hong Kong to carry masters and engineers possessing local certificates of competency issued by the Director of Marine. The effect of this will be to place such vessels in the same position as that of small river steamers, namely those which exceed sixty tons but do not exceed three hundred tons and which do not carry more than twelve passengers. This provision has become necessary to facilitate the manning of certain recently acquired Government vessels which exceed sixty tons and which cannot, therefore, be manned as motor launches under Part XIII of the Ordinance.

4. Clause 4 introduces a new section 17A, the effect of which will be to enable the Governor in Council to make regulations controlling the accommodation of seamen in Hong Kong registered ships. The power to make similar regulations in respect of ships registered in the United Kingdom was taken there by section 1 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1948, but the provisions of that Act have not been extended to the Colony by Order of Her Majesty in Council. Subsection (3) of the

proposed section 17A is adapted from subsection (2A) of section 1 of the 1948 Act which was introduced by the Merchant Shipping Act, 1952, in order to provide some measure of administrative latitude in the application of the regulations.

5. Clause 5 is to bring the spelling of the words "safety convention" in section 23(2)(a) of the principal Ordinance into line with the spelling of those words as used in the Merchant Shipping (Safety Convention) Act, 1949.

6. Clause 6 is to amend section 27 of the principal Ordinance to enable certain forms required to be used for the purposes of the Ordinance to be in a form approved by the Governor instead of in a form prescribed by the Governor in Council by regulation. The purpose of this is to avoid too great a rigidity in the matter of these forms which may need to be altered from time to time as experience dictates.

7. Clause 7 is to amend section 37 of the principal Ordinance. In 1931 the Government of Hong Kong became party to the formulation of special rules, known as the Simla Rules, providing for suitable safety requirements in ships engaged in certain special trades in the Far East which involve the carriage of large numbers of unberthed passengers. However the effect of section 37, as at present framed, is to restrict the extension to Hong Kong of those rules to ships to which the United Kingdom Life Saving Appliances Rules made by the Minister of Transport and Civil Aviation under the Merchant Shipping Acts, do not apply. There are in Hong Kong certain ships engaged in these special trades to which the United Kingdom Life Saving Appliances Rules do apply but to which they are not well suited and the purpose of this amendment is to enable regulations to be made by the Governor in Council to give effect to the Simla Rules in the case of those ships.

8. Clause 8 is to amend section 41 of the principal Ordinance in order—

(a) in paragraph (a), to correct the reference to "accepted Safety Convention certificate"; and

(b) by the addition of a new paragraph (c) extending the same exemptions to foreign ships which seek protection in the Colony from stress of weather or other unavoidable cause as is extended in the United Kingdom in similar circumstances by subsection (3) of section 29 of the Merchant Shipping (Safety Convention) Act, 1949.

9. Clauses 9 to 12 inclusive are to amend sections 50, 53, 55 and 57 of the principal Ordinance respectively. The effect of these various amendments will be to approximate the constitution of local marine courts to that of courts of formal investigation under the Merchant

Shipping Acts and will also enable regulations to be made to approximate the procedure of such courts to that prescribed under the Shipping Casualties Appeals and Rehearing Rules of the United Kingdom.

10. Clause 13 amends section 61 of the principal Ordinance in order to place the obligation for the proper mooring and moving of ships in the Colony's harbours upon the owners, agents or charterers in the absence of a master.

11. Clause 14 is to amend section 66 of the principal Ordinance to bring subsection (2) of that section into line with the requirements of rule 11 of the United Kingdom Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea. The effect of the words which it is proposed to amend in that subsection is to require ships of under 150 feet in length, while lying at anchor, to carry a stern light as well as a riding light, which is incorrect.

12. Clause 15 of the Bill is to amend section 68 of the principal Ordinance in the following three respects—

- (a) The penalty prescribed in respect of a contravention of subsection (1) is a fine or imprisonment. The effect of the proposed amendment will be to enable these penalties to be imposed jointly thereby bringing subsection (1) into line in this respect with other similar provisions in the Ordinance.
- (b) The effect of the proposed new subsection (1A) will be to render the master, owner, agent or charterers of a vessel from which refuse or oil is dumped into the waters of the Colony, contrary to the provisions of paragraph (c) of subsection (1), liable to prosecution as well as the person who actually cast the offending material overboard. The amendment is introduced for the better prevention of this offence because it is not always possible to detect the actual offender in such cases.
- (c) The proposed new subsection (8) is also introduced to facilitate the prosecution of offences under this section. The effect will be to shift the onus of proving permission to board or to lie alongside vessels onto the defendant in any case in which unlawful boarding of or unlawful tying up to vessels is charged. This amendment is necessitated by the fact that in many of these cases the ship concerned will have sailed between the time when the offender is handed over to the police for prosecution and the time when the case can be heard, thereby making it difficult for the prosecution to prove that the defendant did not have lawful authority for his act.

13. Clause 16 is to amend section 71 of the principal Ordinance to enable the Director to grant permission for shipbreaking subject to conditions and to provide for the enforcement of those conditions.

This provision is rendered necessary by the increasing number of ships being broken up in the waters of the Colony.

14. Clauses 17 and 18 are to amend respectively in sections 86 and 87 of the principal Ordinance the references to the Dangerous Goods Ordinance, 1873, which was repealed and replaced by the Dangerous Goods Ordinance, 1956.

15. Clause 19 is to amend section 111(1) in order to widen the power to prescribe fees.

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1959.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the Second reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance further to amend the Corporal Punishment Ordinance, 1954".

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

The Bill was read a Second time.

Council then went into Committee to consider the Bill clause by clause.

Clauses 1 to 3 and the Schedule were agreed to.

Council then resumed.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL reported that the Corporal Punishment (Amendment) Bill, 1959, had passed through Committee without amendment and moved the Third reading.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

The Bill was read a Third time and passed into law.

ADJOURNMENT.

H. E. THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT: —That concludes the business for today, gentlemen. When is it your pleasure that we should meet again?

ATTORNEY GENERAL: —Sir, I suggest this day fortnight.

H. E. THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT: —Council will adjourn to this day fortnight.