

OFFICIAL REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS.**Meeting of 9th November, 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 RODERICK WILLIAM MCLEOD, K.C.B., C.B.E.

THE HONOURABLE THE COLONIAL SECRETARY

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

THE HONOURABLE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

MR. ARTHUR RIDEHALGH, Q.C.

THE HONOURABLE THE SECRETARY FOR CHINESE AFFAIRS

MR. JOHN CRICHTON MCDOUALL.

THE HONOURABLE THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY

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

THE HONOURABLE PATRICK CARDINALL MASON SEDGWICK

(Commissioner of Labour).

THE HONOURABLE HECTOR WILLIAM FORSYTH

(Acting Director of Public Works).

DR. THE HONOURABLE TENG PIN-HUI

(Acting Director of Medical and Health Services).

THE HONOURABLE DAVID RICHARD WATSON ALEXANDER, M.B.E.

(Director of Urban Services).

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

THE HONOURABLE KWOK CHAN, 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.

THE HONOURABLE GEORGE MACDONALD GOLDSACK.

THE HONOURABLE DONALD BLACK.

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

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

MINUTES.

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 26th October, 1960, were confirmed.

PAPERS.

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

Sessional Paper, 1960: —

No. 29—Annual Report by the Director of Social Welfare for the year 1959/60.

Report on Training for Social Work in Hong Kong by Dr. Eileen YOUNGHUSBAND, C.B.E., LL.D., J.P.

He said: In laying these papers I think Your Excellency would wish me to make some reference to Dr. YOUNGHUSBAND'S Report on Training for Social Work in Hong Kong. Honourable Members will need no reminding that the social needs of Hong Kong's swollen population are immense. One of the main obstacles to the rapid development of social welfare work at the moment, and I refer to social work undertaken both by the voluntary agencies and by Government, is a shortage of trained staff. This has become even more acute in recent months because financial and other aid on the most generous scale has been received for the social services, as a result of the World Refugee Year Appeal. Over \$12 million has been allocated to this Government from other Governments and National Committees, for expenditure on World Refugee Year projects; other large sums have been donated direct to the voluntary agencies in Hong Kong, and some \$870,000 has been received locally in response to the appeal made by the Hong Kong Council of Social Service. Most of this money is being devoted to major capital projects, including buildings. In most cases public funds will have to meet the recurrent expenses and provide the staff who must, generally speaking, be well trained and skilled, if the best value is to be obtained over the years from these magnificent contributions.

One of these contributions, a sum of over \$2 millions received from the United Kingdom, was—most opportunely—designated as the nucleus of a Fund which will provide about \$100,000 every year for the training of social workers. At this juncture Government, with the assistance of the Colonial Office, had the good fortune to secure the services of Dr. Eileen YOUNGHUSBAND to advise on the establishment of a comprehensive training programme. Dr. YOUNGHUSBAND is an internationally recognized expert in this field; she was Chairman of a Working Party

on social workers in the United Kingdom, appointed by the Minister of Health, which reported last year; and she has also recently compiled a survey on Social Work Training for the United Nations.

The Report which is now before honourable Members bears, therefore, the stamp of authority and it will, I think, be generally agreed that it is a most impressive document. Very briefly, Dr. YOUNGHUSBAND'S recommendations include in the first place the provision of revised fulltime two-year courses in social studies, both by the University and by the Post-Secondary Colleges as a group, leading to a recognized qualification; secondly, one-year part-time courses for social workers already in the Service either of Government or of the voluntary agencies, or new entrants, who have not qualified in the full-time courses. To enable the most promising of these to go on to the full-time courses and thus qualify professionally, a part-time "bridge" course is proposed. It is considered that experienced workers need to be brought in from overseas for a period as consultants to help develop this training programme. Among other important recommendations are the establishment of an Advisory Committee on Social Work Training to promote and co-ordinate training; and the improvement of library facilities and teaching materials generally. Dr. YOUNGHUSBAND also emphasizes the need for social research.

The general effect of Dr. YOUNGHUSBAND'S recommendations, if they are accepted, would be to raise the standard of training in Hong Kong, widen the field for recruitment of professional social workers and afford greater opportunities for young people in Hong Kong to qualify in this field of work.

This Report is now published for the information and comment of those interested in or concerned with the question of Social Work Training, and after this decisions will be taken in the light of the views expressed.

QUESTIONS.

MR. NGAN SHING-KWAN asked the following question: —

Sir, in view of the fact that varying interpretations appear to have been placed on the words "radical or major change in the present constitutional position in Hong Kong" used by Lord Perth in his statement at the airport on Saturday, 29th October, can the government say whether the inclusion of elected members in this Council would be regarded as a "radical or major change" in the context of Lord Perth's statement?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied as follows: —

Yes, Sir, it would. The Governor has been authorized by the Secretary of State to make it clear that the inclusion of elected members in this Council is not contemplated.

MR. R. C. LEE asked the following question: —

Sir, according to a cable report which appeared in the China Mail on October 27th, 1960, Hong Kong is excluded from the Aid Plan of the Colonial Civil Service Scheme. Would the Honourable Colonial Secretary enlighten this Council what that Scheme is and what are the reasons for our exclusion?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied as follows: —

The scheme is described in a Parliamentary White Paper and was published on the 26th October. It is a complex scheme, and, rather than try to summarize it, I propose to send to honourable Members copies of the White Paper as soon as sufficient supplies are received. In the meantime, I am arranging for one of our three copies to be sent to the honourable Member who put this question.

On the question of the exclusion of Hong Kong, Members will see that it is stated in paragraph 10 of the White Paper that "for a number of reasons this form of help is not regarded as appropriate" for Hong Kong, the Bahamas, Bermuda and Brunei. I understand, in expansion of this phrase, that the scheme relates primarily to territories whose administration needs underpinning because of rapid constitutional advance, and where there is exceptional difficulty in maintaining an effective service. These considerations do not apply to Hong Kong.

His Excellency has however received the Secretary of State's fullest assurance that this restriction of the scheme does not mean that there has been any lessening of the interest on the part of Her Majesty's Government in the welfare of Hong Kong and of its public service.

CRIMINAL APPEAL (AMENDMENT) RULES, 1960.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the following resolution: —

Resolved that the Criminal Appeal (Amendment) Rules, 1960, made by the Acting Chief Justice on the 25th day of October, 1960, under section 9 of the Criminal Procedure Ordinance, Chapter 221, be approved.

He said: Sir, the purpose of this resolution is to secure the approval of this Council to rules made by the Chief Justice under the Criminal Procedure Ordinance. Sir, that Ordinance was amended earlier this year to conform with certain provisions of two Geneva Conventions relating to prisoners of war and civilians interned during time of war—those provisions relate to the time within which prisoners of war and internees who are protected by the conventions may appeal in criminal cases; and the amendment proposed by these rules brings the procedure under the principal rules into conformity with the provisions of the Ordinance, a purely consequential amendment.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

RESETTLEMENT (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) BILL, 1960.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved the First reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance further to amend the Resettlement Ordinance, 1958."

He said: Sir, for some years it has been necessary for Government to have powers to prevent the erection of squatter huts and other unlawful structures on leased land—in particular on tenement and factory rooftops. I think that the need for such powers is generally accepted. If the powers are to be exercised efficiently and effectively it is essential that they should apply at the earliest possible stage in the process whereby the squatter gradually moves in and eventually takes possession of land which is not his. Clearly if the powers could not be exercised until the unlawful structures were actually occupied, quite unnecessary difficulties would be raised not only for the departmental authorities, but also for the unfortunate squatters themselves. The latter would say, very reasonably: "If you are going to prevent me from squatting on this particular place, for heaven's sake do it as soon as I move towards it, and don't wait until I've built my shack and moved in my bits and pieces before ordering me away". And if domestic occupation is to be the test of unlawfulness the difficulties confronting the authorities themselves are immeasurably increased. Structures such as these can be, and in fact are, left unoccupied and locked during daylight hours, so that, if the "occupation test" is to apply, only night patrols can obtain the evidence necessary to declare them illegal; and in general it is virtually impossible to determine with any degree of accuracy whether a newly erected unlawful structure is intended for domestic occupation until it has actually been occupied.

There is nothing new in these considerations, but what is new is a legal opinion that the Resettlement Ordinance as it stands contains a certain inconsistency in relation to these particular matters. Section 13

of the Ordinance empowers the competent authority to serve notice on the owner of "any building which he has reason to believe may be an unlawful structure, (and which) is in course of erection or has been erected . . .". This is satisfactory and clearly conforms with the requirements which I have just mentioned.

The long title of the Ordinance, however, reads as follows "An Ordinance to provide for the clearance and resettlement of squatters". My learned friend the Attorney General advises that, in terms of the long title, the action we are discussing can be taken by the Competent Authority only where it is necessary for squatter clearance, that is to say, only after actual occupation by squatters; and further that section 13 cannot be read in isolation, but must be read in conjunction with the long title. I have already explained that section 13 in isolation provides the precise powers that are required. It is therefore necessary that the existing inconsistency should be removed by amending the long title; and that, Sir, is the main purpose that this Bill sets out to achieve. While the power conferred by section 13 could be used against any unlawful structure, it is not proposed, if the Bill is enacted, to use such power for purely lease-enforcement purposes but only against such unlawful structures as the Competent Authority believes to be capable of being occupied by squatters.

At the same time, and in accordance with advice tendered by the Resettlement (Policy) Select Committee of the Urban Council, certain other amendments to the Ordinance are proposed. It is thought that certain sections of the Ordinance give the impression that any person may apply for resettlement and that his application will be decided "by the length of his association with the Colony or otherwise". This is not, of course, the case. In fact, as honourable Members are well aware, resettlement is at present almost entirely confined to squatters living on land which is required for development. The amendments effected by clauses 4 and 5 of the present Bill are intended to correct this erroneous impression.

Furthermore clauses 6 and 7 of the present Bill amend sections 33 and 35 of the Ordinance so as to permit trespassers to be evicted from staircases and other communal parts of the resettlement estates. At the moment they can be evicted only from the dwellings themselves. I do not feel that this extension of the present powers of eviction requires any particular explanation or justification. It is obviously necessary if adequate control is to be exercised over these buildings.

Section 34 of the Ordinance makes it an offence to obstruct an authorized officer carrying out his duties of entry and inspection under that Section. It has been found, I am afraid, in practice that this does not go far enough, and it is proposed to add a new Section, section 53, to make it an offence generally to obstruct an authorized officer in the

exercise of any of his powers. There is nothing unusual, Sir, in this provision, and there are ample precedents in comparable provisions of other laws in the Colony.

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 main object of this Bill is to extend the scope and clarify the intentions of the Resettlement Ordinance, 1958, in two respects. The long title and the heading to Part II of the Ordinance are to be changed so as to authorize the clearance of unlawful structures, whether or not these are being used by squatters: the changes are to be effected by clauses 2 and 3. It is thought that sections 20, 24 and 37 give the impression that any person may apply for resettlement and that his application will be decided by "the length of his association with the Colony or otherwise", whereas in fact resettlement is almost entirely confined to squatters living on land required for development. The amendments to these sections, to be effected by clauses 4, and 5, are intended to correct this impression.

2. The opportunity has been taken to amend sections 33 and 35, by clauses 6 and 7, to permit trespassers to be evicted from staircases and other communal parts of resettlement estates instead of from dwellings only. And while section 34 makes it an offence to obstruct an authorized officer carrying out his duties of entry and inspection under that section, it is proposed to add a new section 53 to make it an offence generally to obstruct an authorized officer in the exercise of any of his powers.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1960.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the First reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the Bills of Exchange Ordinance, Chapter 19."

He said: Sir, the provisions of this Bill, which are of considerable technicality, are modelled on those of the English Cheques Act of 1957. The provisions of the Bill are explained in the statement of objects and reasons, but I think that this is a case where I might perhaps say a word or two more about the history of the matter and the main effect of the Bill.

As a result of the introduction into the House of Commons of a Private Member's Bill, the principal object of which was to reduce the

need for the endorsement of cheques in certain circumstances, a Committee was appointed in 1955 by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to examine the matter, and it was upon the recommendations of that Committee that the Cheques Act was founded. Honourable Members will know that those engaged in commerce and industry may receive many cheques during the course of the day—in the case of large businesses perhaps many hundreds of cheques—requiring endorsement by responsible people in business offices. All that the payee of a cheque is doing by endorsing it in blank is to convert it into a bearer cheque which can be handled without risk by the banks making and receiving payment. The payee himself does nothing for the protection of his interests by endorsing the cheque; he is merely turning it into something which anyone who holds it can cash, but thereby provides bank clerks in probably two banks—the collecting and the paying banks—with the task of examining the endorsement to see whether his signature on the back of the cheque appears to be—Sir, I emphasize, appears to be—that of the payee of the cheque. The chief recommendation of the Committee I have mentioned was to this effect: —

"We consider that a substantial saving of unproductive work would be achieved, and the present system would be appropriately adapted to modern conditions and needs, if it were arranged that endorsement was no longer necessary on a cheque being collected by a bank on behalf of a customer who was the payee. We recommend a change of law to this effect, making it clear that collecting banks, should not suffer any loss of protection thereby".

Now, Sir, the solution to this problem has centred chiefly on the need for preserving banks from liability for damages for conversion in dealing with cheques for people who have no title to them, of ensuring that the paying banker obtains a good discharge for the drawer of the cheque and that the collecting banker could not be sued by the true owner of a cheque which has been stolen. This Bill, following the provisions of the Cheques Act, 1957, does so provide. Its main effect will be to do away with unnecessary work in offices and in banks.

Sir, the Exchange Banks' Association have been consulted and are in agreement with the terms of the Bill, and I am sure it will be welcomed by all those engaged in commerce and industry who have large numbers of cheques passing through their hands.

Finally, Sir, there is one provision I should draw attention to, because its equivalent in the United Kingdom was subject to some misunderstanding. I refer to the new section 84C which provides that an unindorsed cheque which appears to have been paid by the banker on whom it is drawn is evidence of the receipt by the payee of the sum payable by that cheque. Some people in England seem to have thought that, because the law gave to the debtor this additional facility of

proving payment, there had been a fundamental legal change relieving the creditor of the obligation to give a receipt. Sir, that was not so in England, and it will not be so in Hong Kong if this Bill is enacted.

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: —

Though there has never been any statutory requirement that a cheque should be endorsed, paying bankers have felt bound to insist upon the endorsement of order cheques to ensure the protection to themselves of sections 60 and 80 of the Bills of Exchange Ordinance, Chapter 19, (herein referred to as the principal Ordinance) for it was considered that a banker would have no defence where he passed an order cheque which is unendorsed or irregularly endorsed to a person who has no title thereto.

2. In consequence a great deal of frustrating time and effort is expended on inspecting for endorsements and returning cheques where the endorsements fail to correspond with the name of the payee on the front of the cheque.

3. This Bill seeks to obviate the need for endorsements whilst retaining the aforementioned protection to the banks.

4. The proposed section 84A (1) provides that the banker shall not incur liability by reason only of the absence or irregularity of endorsements. The proposed section 84A (2) provides the same protection to bankers meeting certain instruments which are not technically bills of exchange and accordingly require separate treatment. The proposed section 84B treats the cheque as though it were endorsed for the purpose of making the banker, who gives value for the cheque, a holder for value.

5. Formerly endorsed cheques were considered to be *prima facie* evidence of the payees' receipt of the money. The proposed section 84C provides that an unendorsed cheque, which appears to have been paid, shall be evidence of receipt.

6. Section 82(1) of the principal Ordinance, which protects the collecting bank on receiving payment from the paying bank for its customer from any action which might be brought by the true owner of the cheque, if it transpires that its customer is not entitled to receive the money, will be repealed by clause 2 of the Bill and re-enacted by the proposed section 84D (1)(a) in extended form so as to apply not only to

cheques but also to the banking instruments mentioned in the proposed section 84D (2).

7. Again the provisions enabling a collecting bank to credit its customer's account before receiving payment from the paying bank contained in subsection (2) of section 82 of the principal Ordinance will be repealed by clause 2 and re-enacted by paragraph (b) of the proposed section 84D (1).

8. Section 84 of the principal Ordinance will be repealed by clause 2 and its provisions replaced by those in the proposed section 84E of the Bill which extends, in effect, the provisions of sections 76 to 81 (inclusive) of the principal Ordinance not only to cheques but also to most other banking instruments.

9. The Bill seeks only to do away with unnecessary endorsements so that, amongst other things, the endorsement of a cheque will continue to be necessary where it is being negotiated.

**BUILDINGS ORDINANCE, 1955, (APPLICATION TO THE
NEW TERRITORIES) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1960.**

Mr. H. W. FORSYTH moved the First reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the Buildings Ordinance, 1955, (Application to the New Territories) Ordinance, 1960."

He said: Sir, honourable Members will recall that the Bill extending the provisions of the Buildings Ordinance, 1955 to the New Territories was passed in June of this year as No. 27 of 1960.

Section 4 of that Ordinance dealt at some length with the power of the Building Authority to exempt certain types of houses from the provisions of the Principal Ordinance. The method of seeking exemption was perhaps unduly laborious and it suffered further from the difficulty of defining the types of buildings and the circumstances under which exemption might be granted.

This amending Bill, Sir, seeks to render the important question of exemption more flexible by dealing with it through regulations made under the Principal Ordinance. It does so by repealing section 4 and the Schedule and by deleting two expressions defined in section 2 all of the 1960 Ordinance and substituting a new section 4 empowering the Governor-in-Council to make such regulations as may be found necessary, and set out in the Paper before Members.

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 Buildings Ordinance, 1955, (Application to the New Territories) Ordinance, 1960 (the principal Ordinance) will, when it is brought into operation, apply the Buildings Ordinance, 1955, to the New Territories. Section 4 of the principal Ordinance empowers the Building Authority to exempt from certain sections of the Buildings Ordinance, 1955, and from the regulations made under that Ordinance building works for the erection, alteration or demolition of village-type houses and certain other buildings. The village-type houses and other buildings which were to be exempted under that section were not specified in the principal Ordinance since it was not considered possible to lay down within sufficiently precise limits what a village-type house is or what village-type houses or other buildings should be exempted. It was therefore, considered that the only suitable course was to leave each case to be decided by the Building Authority. However, further examination of the matter has shown that it is unnecessary for the purpose in question to define a village-type house as such, and that it is possible to specify the type of domestic buildings which it is desired to exempt by reference to their size and to specify the other buildings which it is desired to exempt by reference to their height and user.

2. In order to allow a measure of flexibility, it is proposed that the building works which are to be exempted and the provisions of the Buildings Ordinance, 1955 and the regulations made thereunder from which they will be exempted should be specified in regulations made under the principal Ordinance. Accordingly, this Bill seeks to amend the principal Ordinance by the repeal of section 4 and its replacement by a new section empowering the Governor in Council to make the necessary regulations. Consequent upon the repeal of section 4 of the principal Ordinance, the Bill also seeks to delete the Schedule to that Ordinance.

MIDWIVES REGISTRATION BILL, 1960.

MR. TENG PIN-HUI moved the First reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to repeal and re-enact, subject to modification, the Midwives Ordinance, Chapter 162."

He said: Sir, as explained in the "Objects and Reasons" the Bill is to seek a repeal of the Midwives Ordinance, Chapter 162 and the replacement thereof by an Ordinance incorporating more adequate provisions for the proper registration of midwives and the better control of the practice of midwifery in the Colony.

For the year 1959 there were 104,597 registered births. It is believed that in Hong Kong approximately 99% of the registered births

are delivered by doctors, nurses and midwives in the persons' homes, hospitals and maternity homes. It is gratifying to note that the figures of maternal, infant and neo-natal deaths have steadily dropped in Hong Kong, but in order to maintain a high standard of midwifery practice, proper control of midwives is necessary. The Bill contains adequate provisions for the proper registration of midwives, includes an indication of the manner in which a woman is entitled to registration as a midwife and, most important of all, ensures better control of the practice of midwifery.

The Bill not only provides for the establishment of a Midwives Board but for the first time empowers such a Board to conduct disciplinary proceedings against a registered midwife who has been convicted in the Colony or elsewhere of any offence punishable by imprisonment or has been guilty of unprofessional conduct. This will bring it into line with other professional bodies such as the Medical and Dental professions which are charged with the maintenance of professional ethics. In order to safeguard the health of the women in childbirth the Board has powers to prohibit registered midwives who are suffering from certain infectious diseases being in attendance. A new Clause, adapted from section 10(1) of the Midwives Act, 1951, of the United Kingdom confers on the Board powers to prohibit disqualified or suspended midwives from attending women in childbirth in other capacities. There is one very important clause in the Bill which provides that the Midwives Board may prohibit any registered midwife who has ceased practice as a midwife for any period exceeding five years from re-commencing to practice until she has undergone such courses of instruction or training in the nature of refresher courses or successfully proved that she is still competent in midwifery by such examination conducted by examiners appointed by the Board as the Board, in its discretion, may consider appropriate. A refresher course for those out of touch with the practice of midwifery for long periods is considered necessary by the United Kingdom professional body, that is the Central Midwives Board, and in view of the fact that out of the 1,686 midwives on the existing Roll in Hong Kong only 850 of them are in active practice either in Government service or as private midwives, points to the need to include this requirement.

Sir, I have endeavoured to point out the important provisions of the Bill which not only contains provisions from the Midwives Ordinance, Chapter 162 but also includes some very necessary additions to ensure that the standard of midwifery practice in the Colony is maintained at a high level. The existing Ordinance was enacted in 1910 and was modelled on the lines of the first Midwives Act, 1902, of the United Kingdom. I need hardly say that with the growth of the profession over the years the existing Ordinance has become obsolete.

Before I move the first reading of the Bill, I would like to assure you, Sir, and honourable Members, that the Bill had been carefully studied by, and had received the unanimous approval of the existing Midwives Board.

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 seek the repeal of the Midwives Ordinance, Chapter 162, and the replacement thereof by an Ordinance incorporating more adequate provisions for the proper registration of midwives and the better control of the practice of midwifery in the Colony. With the growth of the profession over the years, the existing Ordinance has become obsolete.

UNIVERSITY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1960.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the Second reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the University Ordinance, 1958."

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 and 2 were agreed to.

Council then resumed.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL reported that the University (Amendment) Bill, 1960, 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.

ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1960.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the Second reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the Road Traffic Ordinance, 1957."

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 and 2 were agreed to.

Council then resumed.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL reported that the Road Traffic (Amendment) Bill, 1960, 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.

FORESHORES AND SEA BED (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1960.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the Second reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the Foreshores and Sea Bed Ordinance, Chapter 127."

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 and 2 were agreed to.

Council then resumed.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL reported that the Foreshores and Sea Bed (Amendment) Bill, 1960, 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.

PRISONS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1960.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the Second reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the Prisons 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 and 6 were agreed to.

Council then resumed.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL reported that the Prisons (Amendment) Bill, 1960, 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 GOVERNOR: —Well, gentlemen, that concludes the business for to-day. When is it your pleasure that we should meet again?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: —May I suggest, Sir, this day two weeks?

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