

OFFICIAL REPORT TO PROCEEDINGS.**Meeting of 20th January, 1960.**

PRESENT:HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR (*PRESIDENT*)

SIR ROBERT BROWN BLACK, K.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 KWOK CHAN, O.B.E.

THE HONOURABLE HUGH DAVID MAC EWEN BARTON, M.B.E.

THE HONOURABLE DHUN JE HANGIR RUTTONJEE, O.B.E.

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

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

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

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

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

MINUTES.

The Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 6th January, 1960 were confirmed.

PAPERS.

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

Subject.

Sessional Papers, 1960: —

No. 2—Annual Report by the Registrar of Co-Operatives and Director of Marketing for the year 1958-59.

No. 3—Annual Report by the Director of Public Works for the year 1958-59.

Report of the Electricity Supply Companies Commission.

Third Report of the Law Reform Committee.

Merchant Shipping Ordinance, 1953.

Special Report in accordance with proviso to section 115(1).

He said: Among these papers, Sir, is the Report of the Electricity Supply Companies Commission. The recommendations contained in the Report are far-reaching and I should make it clear that no decision has yet been taken as to whether the recommendations will be accepted or rejected. It appears, however, that it is necessary now to take measures to ensure that if Government ultimately decides to impose control on the operations or acquire the assets of the two electricity Companies no action has been taken in the meanwhile by either of the Companies by way of dissipation of assets. Accordingly a letter which will be made public has been sent to the Companies today giving a warning that the legislation necessary to give effect to that decision, if taken, will provide that if, during the period from the date of publication of the Report to the date of imposition of control or acquisition of assets, as the case may be, either Company without the authority of the Governor, has increased the rate of dividend above the latest rate adopted or publicity forecast prior to the 10th April, 1959, the excess payments will be recoverable from the directors. The letter also conveys a warning against distribution of capital moneys and assets and against the payment of dividends on new shares issued without similar authority.

Finally, Sir, with regard to the Third Report of the Law Reform Committee, which is also laid on the table today I would inform honourable Members that Government has accepted the recommendation in that report that legislation similar to the United Kingdom

Cheques Act, 1957, should be adopted in Hong Kong, and that the necessary Bill will be introduced in due course. As to the amendment of the law relating to intestacy, both as regards Chinese and non-Chinese persons domiciled in Hong Kong, it is proposed to give further consideration in due course to the Committee's recommendation in the light of such comments as may be received after publication of this Report.

As to the amendment of the law relating to intestacy, both as regards Chinese and non-Chinese persons domiciled in Hong Kong, it is proposed to give further consideration in due course to the committee's recommendation in the light of such comments as may be received after publication of this Report.

VAGRANCY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1960.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved the First reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance further to amend the Vagrancy Ordinance, Chapter 229."

He said: Sir, from time to time complaints are received and letters appear in the press from people who have been pestered by beggars. Begging for alms has long been unlawful and in fact the position has now been reached where it can be said that no one need beg. The Social Welfare Department and a number of voluntary agencies stand ready to assist all those who are genuinely destitute by providing them with accommodation and food or helping them to find some other way of making a living.

Honourable Members will no doubt have heard of the Investigation Card Scheme operated by the Council of Social Service. Under this scheme people are asked to contribute \$1 for Investigation Cards which they can then hand to beggars or to any other person apparently in need of assistance. These Cards advise the recipient where he can go to for help; and quite a number have taken this advice and been given the help they needed. The money contributed for the Cards is passed on to the voluntary agencies which participate in the scheme: that is to say, the agencies to which the beggars are directed and which stand ready to help them. I need hardly say that the voluntary agencies and, indeed, the Department of Social Welfare agencies which also participate, although the latter naturally do not receive the money contributed, do not limit their help to the value of the \$1 donations. They give all the help they can, and the donations merely assist them in their work.

Investigation Cards are also made available to such persons as magistrates, police officers and social workers: in return for which Government has undertaken to bear the cost of printing the Cards.

This scheme, which has Government's fullest support, has two advantages: it enables the alms-giver to ensure that practical and skilled help is given to those who really need it, will profit by it, and may not know where to find it. At the same time it ensures that good use is made of the donor's money, while discouraging those professionals who prefer begging to working.

There are a number of these professional beggars who, despite numerous convictions and attempts to help them, always return to begging: and they will continue to do so unless their attitude of mind can be changed by inculcating regular habits and giving them some training over an extended period. The present maximum sentence under the Vagrancy Ordinance is however only one month. In order to give a better opportunity to rehabilitate offenders by sending them to Chi Ma Wan Prison, or, if they are drug addicts, to Tai Lam Prison where they can, if fit, do constructive work, this Bill has been drafted to provide for a maximum sentence of 12 months imprisonment for a third or subsequent offence of begging. At the same time, it is proposed to increase the maximum sentence to 18 months for a person convicted of asking alms in a threatening or insolent manner or continuing to ask after he has been required to desist.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 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 maximum prison sentence which may be imposed on a person convicted of mendicancy is one month and the maximum which may be imposed on a person convicted of asking for alms in a threatening or insolent manner is three months.

2. In the case of persistent professional beggars it is considered that these penalties are insufficient either to act as a deterrent or to give the offenders an opportunity of rehabilitation, particularly in those cases where they are also drug addicts. This Bill therefore proposes to increase the maximum in the event of a third or subsequent conviction.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT SERVICES (HONG KONG ISLAND)

BILL, 1960.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY moved the First reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to grant to the China Motor Bus Company Limited the exclusive right to maintain and operate certain public transport services."

He said: If Sir, I may borrow a phrase from the world of entertainment, I would say that the introduction of this Bill, and of the one which follows it on the agenda, on the same day as presentation of the Report of the Electricity Supply Companies Commission, is purely coincidental.

The Commission in its terms of reference was, before coming to any conclusion, enjoined to consider the control hitherto exercised over other public utilities in Hong Kong, of which the bus services are an important part. In paragraph 82 of their Report they touch on the existing system of control of public utilities in the Colony. They state in that paragraph that they examined the principles of such control, but that they have not attempted to judge its efficacy in practice. Then they say, and here I quote, "we feel we must also say that we find it difficult to support the impost of a royalty on a public utility". But they did add that in certain cases, such as transport services, where factors connected with the units of small change can lead to the position where it is not possible to reduce fares any further, such an impost may have some justification. They thus did not condemn absolutely the principle of bus royalties.

There is a further factor which the Commission did not mention, and of which it may have been unaware. The number of direct taxpayers in this Colony is comparatively small. A vast proportion of our population is new, and consists of people who have apparently decided that Hong Kong is a much better place in which to live than their own homeland. It does not seem to Government unreasonable that these people, who have come here in such numbers and whose presence creates so many of our problems, should contribute something to revenue, and for the great majority of them, the only way to obtain any contribution is by indirect taxation. One form of indirect taxation is the tax on transport which is represented by the bus royalty. I agree, Sir, that it would be difficult to justify such a tax if transport were expensive, but this is not the case; bus transport is in fact very cheap and is going to be cheaper. A tax on transportation is not unknown in other countries where travel is anything but cheap. In this place it may fairly be regarded as a form of payment for the privilege of living here and enjoying the peace and security we provide.

The recommendations in the Report of the Commission, in effect, are that the two Companies shall be placed under public control or shall be, to use the popular term, nationalized. Government has not yet made any decision on the Report, but I can say that Government is not at present prepared to agree that the arguments for nationalization of the electricity companies are applicable to the other utilities. The decision to continue in modified form the present system of operating bus services was made by Government in January, 1958—just two years

ago — and it was only recently that the negotiations were finalized and incorporated into these two Bills. Part of the delay in bringing these Bills forward has been due to the fact that the Commission sat in the interval, and that the recommendations in its Report naturally had to be considered in relation to the earlier decision to continue the present system of franchises for bus services. The result of that consideration, Sir, was the decision to proceed with these Bills.

As I have said, negotiations with the Bus Companies have been in progress for some considerable time, and the results are embodied in the two Bills now presented. The old franchises were in the form of licences granted under the Vehicles and Road Traffic Ordinance, and under them all dealings were theoretically between the Bus Companies and the Governor-in-Council. These licences expire on the 14th February next, and it is proposed that the new franchises shall operate from the 15th February for a period of 15 years, renewable for three further periods of five years. I might, Sir, touch on the main points of difference between the new franchises and the old ones.

Under the new franchises neither Bus Company will have exclusive rights to the operation of certain services. These include the hiring of buses or cars where payment is made otherwise than for the seat; the running of sightseeing tours; and school bus services; together with others of lesser importance. In the case of Hong Kong Island, the tramway remains in competition with the China Motor Bus Company.

The control of the franchises will primarily be the responsibility of the Commissioner of Police, with a right of appeal to the Governor-in-Council in case of dispute. Additional services, increases in frequency of service, and reductions of fares may all be arranged between the Commissioner and the Company, but only the Governor-in-Council may authorize increased fares. The Governor-in-Council may direct the Company to institute new services and the Company shall be obliged to comply, but if the Company is reluctant to comply, then the Governor-in-Council, without prejudice to his right to compel the Companies to proceed, may offer the service to some other operator.

Provisions are incorporated in the Bills for arbitration in any case of disagreement on financial matters.

It is a condition of the franchises that the Companies must have their shares listed on the Stock Exchange and must keep them so listed during the period of the franchise. It does not seem appropriate that public utilities of this sort should not have their shares quoted on the Stock Exchange list.

Generally the new franchises give greater powers to the Commissioner of Police and to the Governor-in-Council to maintain and improve the efficiency of the bus transport services, and these powers

will be used where necessary. On the other hand, the Companies concerned have assured us that they are doing, and will continue to do, their utmost to meet all reasonable demands for service.

In the case of the China Motor Bus Company dealt with in this Bill the basis of royalty has been changed from a percentage of gross receipts, which under the old licence was 17%, to a percentage of net profits as assessed under the Inland Revenue Ordinance. This percentage has been agreed at 46% as approximating very closely to 17% of gross receipts during the couple of years immediately prior to the negotiations. But, although in the past this 46% of net profits equalled 17% of gross receipts, this is unlikely to be the case in the future. The reason for this lies in the fact that Government has requested, and the Company has agreed to, reductions in charges. Under the old licence, buses were in theory divided into first and second class sections with first and second class fares, but this division has never been enforced since the war: the Company has been providing first class accommodation and charging first class fares with a minimum of 20 cents. Under the new franchise this obsolete distinction between first and second class disappears, and 10 cent stages will be introduced on all routes operating on the level, that is, on routes 1, 2, 5, 5A, 8 and 10. The length of the proposed 10 cent stage is approximately a mile, but in some cases is just under and in some cases almost a mile and a half, due to the physical limitations imposed by the locations of bus stops. There will similarly be reductions on the service to Repulse Bay, from 60 cents to 50 cents; on the service to Stanley, from 90 cents to 80 cents; and on the service from Shau Kei Wan to Shek-O, from 70 cents to 60 cents. There will be no changes on the routes which climb the hills, such as the routes proceeding up Garden Road. The justification for this is the severity of operating conditions on the hill routes. For these routes special heavy duty chassis with a short wheelbase have to be used to climb the gradients and to negotiate the corners, and these buses are licensed to seat only 30 passengers as compared with 43 on the less difficult and less tortuous routes. It does not seem unreasonable that, where smaller buses carrying fewer passengers have to be operated at a far greater running cost in fuel, tyres and depreciation, then there should be a difference in the fare.

It may be of interest, Sir, if I mention in conclusion that the China Motor Bus Company carried over 87 million passengers in 1959. It has 250 buses in service, and a further 50 buses which have been on order since last June will begin to arrive at the end of next month. In the financial year 1958/59, the royalty paid to us by this Company was \$2,652,000.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

MR. NGAN SHING KWAN: —Sir, I abstain from voting as I have a direct personal interest in this matter.

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 exclusive right to provide a service of public omnibuses and public cars in the island of Hong Kong and Aplichau, for the transport of passengers, on payment for the seat occupied as distinct from the hiring of the vehicle, is at present granted to the China Motor Bus Company Limited by licence issued by the Governor in Council under the regulations headed "Public Motor Vehicle Services" (Regulations of Hong Kong, 1937 Edition, Volume II). The last renewal of this licence will expire on 14th February, 1960 and no further renewal can be made under these regulations.

2. It is proposed by this Bill to grant a further similar exclusive right to the Company for a period of fifteen years from 15th February, 1960, with an option of renewal for further periods of five years each up to 14th February, 1990.

3. The Bill provides (clause 3) for the grant of the right and (clause 4) the duration of the grant. Certain services are excluded from the grant (clause 5) and provision is made (clause 6) for the restriction on assignment of the rights of the Company, (clause 7) for the composition of the Company and, (clause 12) for the listing and quotation of the shares of the Company on the Hong Kong Stock Exchange. The Company is restricted from forming subsidiary companies without the approval of the Financial Secretary (clause 11).

4. In return for the grant, the Company is under an obligation (clauses 8, 9 and 10) to pay to Government a royalty of forty six per cent of the net profit of the Company, ascertained in accordance with Part IV of the Inland Revenue Ordinance, Chapter 112, and to provide and maintain the services set forth in a Schedule of Services (clause 13), which has been agreed (clause 14) between the Company and the Authority (at present the Commissioner of Police) and which may be amended by the Authority (clause 15) or by the Governor in Council (clauses 16 and 18). The Company is under an obligation to ensure that copies of the Schedule of Services and of relevant extracts therefrom are adequately displayed (clause 20).

5. Provision is made for the adjustment of fares and royalty to meet changing circumstances in the Colony (clause 19) either by agreement or by arbitration.

6. Detailed provision is made for the running of the services (clauses 21 to 26), for the revocation of the grant in the event of failure on the part of the Company to fulfil its obligations under the Bill (clause 27), for the taking over of the assets of the Company in the event of an emergency (clause 28) and for the compulsory purchase of the assets of the Company (clause 30). If the Company has failed or is likely to fail to fulfil its obligations under the Bill, the Governor in Council may make arrangements with any other person to carry out such obligations (clause 29). Provision is made for service of notices on the Government and on the Company (clause 31) and for appeal by the Company against decisions of the Authority or of public officers (clause 17).

PUBLIC TRANSPORT SERVICES (KOWLOON AND NEW TERRITORIES) BILL, 1960.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY moved the First reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to grant to the Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited the exclusive right to maintain and operate certain public transport services."

He said: This Bill proposes to grant to the Kowloon Motor Bus Company the franchise to operate and maintain bus services in Kowloon and the New Territories, excluding the islands, for 15 years, renewable, from the 15th February next.

The terms of the proposed franchise are in most respects the same as those proposed for the China Motor Bus Co., Ltd., on which I have already spoken at some length. The principal difference is that this Company has elected to continue to pay royalty on the basis of gross receipts. Under the old licence royalty was payable at the rate of 10% on the first \$3 millions of gross receipts and 20% on anything in excess of this amount. The Company is now agreeable to pay 20% of gross receipts, including receipts from advertising.

As with the China Motor Bus Company, the obsolete distinction between first and second class is to be formally abolished, but, as the Kowloon Motor Bus Company already operates 10 cent stages, there is little scope for reduction in fares within the urban area. The Company nevertheless has, at the instance of Government, agreed to adjust its stages in some cases to give a longer journey for 10 cents, and has also agreed to reductions of fares on a number of the New Territories routes. I shall not Sir attempt to give them all, but the fare from Jordan Road to Man Kan To, for example, is to be reduced from \$1.40 to \$1.30; from Jordan Road to Yuen Long from \$1.10 to \$1; and from Kowloon City ferry to Sai Kung from 70 cents to 60 cents. I do not think that there is much scope for further reductions; indeed I

would think that the journey from Jordan Road to Yuen Long, a distance of 25 miles, at a cost of \$1, or 1/3d., 18 American cents, must be one of the cheapest bus journeys in the world, and is provided by a concern which is not only not subsidized by the taxpayer, but contributes substantially to the revenue.

The royalty paid by this Company to Government in the financial year 1958/59 amounted to just over \$9 millions. During the year 1959 the number of passengers carried was 295 millions, there being no competition from trams as there is on the island. The Company has 510 buses in service with another 20 about to go into service in the next week or so. Another 20 buses are on their way to Hong Kong, and an order for yet 40 more buses has just been placed.

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 exclusive right to provide a service of public omnibuses and public cars in Kowloon and the mainland part of the New Territories, for the transport of passengers, on payment for the seat occupied as distinct from the hiring of the vehicle, is at present granted to the Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited by licence issued by the Governor in Council under the regulations headed "Public Motor Vehicle Services" (Regulations of Hong Kong, 1937 Edition, Volume II). The last renewal of this licence will expire on 14th February, 1960 and no further renewal can be made under these regulations.

2. It is proposed by this Bill to grant a further similar exclusive right to the Company for a period of fifteen years from 15th February, 1960, with an option of renewal for further periods of five years each up to 15th February, 1990.

3. The Bill provides (clause 3) for the grant of the right and (clause 4) the duration of the grant. Certain services are excluded from the grant (clause 5) and provision is made (clause 6) for the restriction on assignment of the rights of the Company, (clause 7) for the composition of the Company and, (clause 10) for the listing and quotation of the shares of the Company on the Hong Kong Stock Exchange.

4. In return for the grant, the Company is under an obligation to pay to Government a royalty of twenty per cent of its gross receipts (clauses 8 and 9) and to provide and maintain the services set forth in a Schedule of Services (clause 11) which has been agreed (clause 12) between the Company and the Authority (at present the Commissioner

of Police) and which may be amended by the Authority (clause 13) or by the Governor in Council (clauses 14 and 16). The Company is under an obligation to ensure that copies of the Schedule of Services and of relevant extracts therefrom are adequately displayed (clause 18).

5. Provision is made for the adjustment of fares and royalty to meet changing circumstances in the Colony (clause 17) either by agreement or by arbitration.

6. Detailed provision is made for the running of the services (clauses 19 to 24), for the revocation of the grant in the event of failure on the part of the Company to fulfil its obligations under the Bill (clause 25), for the taking over of the assets of the Company in the event of an emergency (clause 26) and for the compulsory purchase of the assets of the Company (clause 28). If the Company has failed or is likely to fail to fulfil its obligations under the Bill, the Governor in Council may make arrangements with any other person to carry out such obligations (clause 27). Provision is made for service of notices on the Government and on the Company (clause 29) and for appeal by the Company against decisions of the Authority or of public officers (clause 15).

CENSUS BILL, 1960.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved the First reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to provide for the taking of a census."

He said: Honourable Members will be aware Sir of the decision to hold a general population census in 1961 consisting of an enumeration of all persons who are found in the Colony on the census date. The Bill before Council provides the necessary legal framework for the conduct of this census. In the first place it is proposed to repeal the Census Ordinance, 1931 and to replace it with a new Ordinance. Under the 1931 Ordinance, separate regulations had to be made for each census on a number of subjects which are in fact common to all censuses. The present Bill incorporates the principal standard provisions which were included in the *ad hoc* regulations made under the 1931 Ordinance, and opportunity has been taken to bring the Hong Kong legislation more in line with census legislation in the United Kingdom and in other British territories. The provisions of the Bill are summarized in the Statement of Objects and Reasons attached to the Bill. I would in particular draw attention to sections 19(d) and 22 of the Bill, which provide for the strict secrecy of all personal particulars recorded by the census enumerators.

It has been decided that the main census should be held on the 7th March, 1961. An exception to this will be in respect of the population dwelling on boats. It is only at Chinese New Year that

one can be reasonably sure that these people will be in port, and accordingly it has been decided to hold a census for these persons just before Chinese New Year, 1961. It is also the intention to hold pilot censuses in order to obtain by sample a preliminary estimate of the population of Hong Kong and also to test the various administrative processes to be employed. The main pilot census will be held on 25th October, 1960, and the pilot census for the population dwelling on boats will be held just before Chinese New Year 1960, the actual date being 23rd January.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 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 repeal and replace, subject to modification, the Census Ordinance, 1931.

2. The principal modifications concern provision for the making of permanent census regulations, instead of *ad hoc* regulations only, and the proper identification of census officers. In other respects the Bill differs from the Census Ordinance, 1931, by incorporating the substance of a number of provisions which appeared in the *ad hoc* Census Regulations of 1931 but which by their nature are applicable to any census to be taken.

3. Clauses 1 and 2 deal with the short title of the Ordinance and interpretations. Clause 3 provides for the procedure to initiate the taking of a census. Clauses 4 to 6 deal with the appointments of the Commissioner of Census and other officers. It is expected that the temporary employment of a large number of persons will be necessary during the taking of a census. Clause 7 provides for the proper identification of census officers. Clauses 8 to 13 inclusive provide the machinery necessary to enable the information required for the census to be obtained. Clauses 14 and 15 provide for the ultimate destruction of all forms or returns containing personal particulars and for their proper custody until destroyed. These provisions are considered necessary in order to maintain the confidential nature of census. Clauses 16 to 18 inclusive create certain offences, namely, the making of false returns, obstructing census officers and impersonation of census officers, while clause 19 deals with certain offences by census officers as opposed to members of the public. Clause 20 is a penalty clause. The penalties proposed are less severe than those contained in the Census Ordinance, 1931. Clause 21 provides that no prosecution may be commenced

without the consent of the Attorney General. This provision is inserted to ensure against the possible commencement of vexatious prosecutions arising out of minor infringements during the taking of a census. Clause 22 protects the individual against the disclosure in evidence of personal information obtained about him by means of the taking of a census. Clause 23 provides for the making of regulations and clause 24 repeals the existing Census Ordinance, 1931.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: —Your Excellency, I referred just now to the intention to hold the pilot census for the population dwelling on boats on 23rd January, this year. Your Excellency will note that this date is very close at hand and it will be necessary for the Bill before Council to become law and for an order under section 3 of the Bill to be made before that date. In view of this Sir I submit that it is most desirable that Standing Orders be suspended in order to enable the Bill to pass through its remaining stages today. If, Sir, you are of that opinion I beg leave under Standing Order 37, to move the suspension of Standing Orders.

H. E. THE GOVERNOR: —I am of that opinion.

COLONIAL SECRETARY: —Accordingly, Sir, I rise to move suspension of Standing Orders to enable this Bill being read a Second and Third time today.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved the Second reading.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 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 24 were agreed to.

Council then resumed.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY reported that the Census Bill, 1960 had passed through Committee without amendment and moved the Third reading.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

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

MARRIAGE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1960.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the Second reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the Marriage Ordinance, Chapter 181."

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 20 were agreed to.

ATTORNEY GENERAL: —Sir, I rise to move that this Bill before Council be amended by the addition of the new clause set forth in the paper before honourable Members.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

Proposed Amendment.

21. The following new clause is added to the Bill—

"Provision for a reprint of the principal Ordinance as amended and of this Ordinance. **21.** (1) The Government Printer shall, if directed by the Governor, cause to be prepared and published a reprint of the principal Ordinance and all the Schedules thereto incorporating therein all additions, omissions, substitutions and amendments effected by this Ordinance and by any other enactment amending the principal Ordinance or the Schedules thereto, and shall, if so directed, print as part of such reprint and as an appendix thereto section 1 of this Ordinance together with this section.

(2) The publication of such reprint and appendix shall be notified by the Colonial Secretary in the *Gazette* and, with effect from the date of such notification, such reprint and appendix shall be deemed authentic copies of the principal Ordinance and the Schedules thereto as amended and of this Ordinance and shall be judicially noticed as such, and further shall be deemed to be official copies for the purposes of subsection (3) of section 7 of the Interpretation Ordinance.

(Cap. 1).

(3) If any inconsistency is shown to exist between a provision of any enactment authorized to be published in such reprint and appendix and that provision as published in such reprint and appendix, the provision as enacted shall prevail. ”.

Clause 21 was agreed to.

Council then resumed.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL reported that the Marriage (Amendment) Bill, 1960 had passed through Committee with one 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 GOVERNOR: —Gentlemen, that concludes the business for today. When is it your pleasure that we should meet again.

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

H. E. THE GOVERNOR: —Council stands adjourned until this day fortnight.