

OFFICIAL REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS**Meeting of 20th January 1965****PRESENT**

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR (*PRESIDENT*)
SIR DAVID CLIVE CROSBIE TRENCH, KCMG, MC
BRIGADIER THE HONOURABLE THOMAS HADDON, CBE
SENIOR MILITARY OFFICER
THE HONOURABLE EDMUND BRINSLEY TEESDALE, CMG, MC
COLONIAL SECRETARY
THE HONOURABLE MAURICE HEENAN, QC
ATTORNEY GENERAL
THE HONOURABLE JOHN CRICHTON McDOUALL
SECRETARY FOR CHINESE AFFAIRS
THE HONOURABLE JOHN JAMES COWPERTHWAITHE, CMG, OBE
FINANCIAL SECRETARY
THE HONOURABLE KENNETH STRATHMORE KINGHORN
DIRECTOR OF URBAN SERVICES
THE HONOURABLE ALEC MICHAEL JOHN WRIGHT
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS
DR THE HONOURABLE TENG PIN-HUI, OBE
DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL AND HEALTH SERVICES
THE HONOURABLE WILLIAM DAVID GREGG
DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION
THE HONOURABLE PATRICK CARDINALL MASON SEDGWICK
COMMISSIONER OF LABOUR
THE HONOURABLE DAVID RONALD HOLMES, CBE, MC, ED
DIRECTOR OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY
THE HONOURABLE JOHN PHILIP ASERAPPA
DISTRICT COMMISSIONER, NEW TERRITORIES
THE HONOURABLE DHUN JEHANGIR RUTTONJEE, CBE
THE HONOURABLE FUNG PING-FAN, OBE
THE HONOURABLE KWAN CHO-YIU, CBE
THE HONOURABLE KAN YUET-KEUNG, OBE
THE HONOURABLE SIDNEY SAMUEL GORDON
THE HONOURABLE LI FOOK-SHU, OBE
THE HONOURABLE FUNG HON-CHU
THE HONOURABLE TANG RING-YUAN
THE HONOURABLE TSE YU-CHUEN, OBE
THE HONOURABLE KENNETH ALBERT WATSON, OBE
THE HONOURABLE WOO PAK-CHUEN, OBE
THE HONOURABLE GEORGE RONALD ROSS
MR ANDREW McDONALD CHAPMAN (*Deputy Clerk of Councils*)

ABSENT

THE HONOURABLE RICHARD CHARLES LEE, CBE

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 6th January 1965, were confirmed.

AFFIRMATION

MR. J. P. ASERAPPA made an Affirmation of Allegiance and assumed his seat as a Member of the Council.

ANNOUNCEMENT

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:—Sir, on the 4th November, when I laid on the table a paper on Aims and Policy for Social Welfare, I said in my introductory statement that the document was being published for information and study by the public in general and particularly by the voluntary social welfare agencies, and for subsequent debate in this Council.

A number of letters setting out the views of various organizations and agencies have since been sent to Government and to my unofficial colleagues, and many of these have only been received comparatively recently. In order that these comments and opinions may be given careful examination, it is, I understand, the general wish of the Unofficial Members that further time should be made available for their study. With Your Excellency's agreement, therefore, it has been decided that arrangements to debate the Paper on the Aims and Policy for Social Welfare will be postponed until after the Budget Sessions.

PAPERS

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

<i>Subject</i>	<i>LN No</i>
Sessional Paper, 1965:—	
No 1—Annual Report by the Postmaster General for the year 1963-64.	
Merchant Shipping Ordinance 1953.	
Report made in accordance with Section 115(1).	
Boilers and Pressure Receivers Ordinance 1962.	
Boilers and Pressure Receivers (Exemption) Order 1965	2
Registration of Persons Ordinance 1960.	
Registration of Persons (Re-registration) Order 1965	3

<i>Subject</i>	<i>LN</i>
<i>No</i>	
Registration of Persons Ordinance 1960.	
Registration of Persons (Cancellation of Registration and Identity Cards) Order 1965.	4
Foreign Judgments (Reciprocal Enforcement) Ordinance 1960.	
Foreign Judgments (Reciprocal Enforcement) (Application to the Commonwealth) Order 1965	8
Foreign Judgments (Reciprocal Enforcement) Ordinance 1960.	
Foreign Judgments (Reciprocal Enforcement) (Commonwealth) Order 1965	9
Registration of Persons Ordinance 1960.	
Registration of Persons (Re-registration) (No 2) Order 1965	10
Registration of Persons Ordinance 1960.	
Registration of Persons (Cancellation of Registration and Identity Cards) (No 2) Order 1965	11

QUESTIONS

MR KAN YUET-KEUNG, pursuant to notice, asked the following questions:—

Your Excellency, during the Budget Debate in March 1963, in answer to a point raised by me concerning the use of the cricket ground the Honourable Colonial Secretary made the following remark: —

“I have no doubt, therefore, that we must cast around for a less central site, and that it is not too early, while there is still some balance of the lease to run, to start thinking about where this ground should be reprovisioned.”

- (a) Has Government actually given consideration to this matter since that date?
- (b) In the event of a suitable alternative site being available is it Government's intention to effect the exchange immediately rather than to wait until the term of the present lease runs out?
- (c) Will Government give this Council the assurance that we will be kept closely informed of any negotiation and also that we will be consulted before any final decision is taken as to the alternative site?

- (d) Will Government further give an assurance that this Council and other interested bodies will be consulted as to the use to which this ground will be put?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied as follows:—

Sir, some very preliminary consideration has been given by the Public Works Department to possible ways of resiting the Cricket Club ground, should Government in due course decide that this would be in the public interest. But no conclusions have been reached, there has been no consultation or negotiation with the Club, and there is no present intention to negotiate an immediate exchange.

In reply to the third part of my honourable Friend's question, I shall be glad to keep this Council informed of any developments. As honourable Members are aware, the ground is held under a short recreational lease, and such grants are made by Your Excellency on the advice of the Executive Council in accordance with the policy recommended in the Morse Report.

Finally, the statutory Comprehensive Re-development Plan for the Central District zones the present Cricket Club ground for permanent open space. There is no proposal whatsoever that it should be built over. If it were proposed that the ground should in due course become, for instance, a public park, appropriate bodies would be consulted and this Council would of course be invited to consider any such proposal in relation to whatever public expenditure might be involved.

MR KAN YUET-KEUNG:—Sir, may I ask one supplementary question relating to the reply given to the third part of my question? The question is—

Is it correct that the lease provides for early termination of the lease upon three months' notice on the part of Government?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied as follows: —

Sir, I cannot answer that question precisely. I have not looked at the lease recently. My honourable Friend may well be right but I will let him know later on.

MR KAN YUET-KEUNG : —

Sir, is it possible for a copy of the present lease to be either shown to Members of this Council or tabled at this Council?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied as follows:—

Sir, I can see no objection to the lease being circulated.

MR KAN YUET-KEUNG :—Thank you, Sir.

MR KAN YUET-KEUNG, pursuant to notice, asked the following question:—

Sir, has Government inquired into the extraordinary circumstances in which a prisoner recently escaped from custody in the precincts of the Supreme Court whilst the hearing of his appeal was pending and, if so, is Government prepared to make a statement to this Council concerning this occurrence?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied as follows:—

Sir, an investigation by the Commissioner of Prisons into the circumstances of this escape has led to disciplinary action being taken and the imposition of penalties.

A separate investigation has been undertaken by the Police who of course are still seeking the recapture of the prisoner. These two operations are closely connected and I do not wish to prejudice Police action by saying any more at this stage.

MR KAN YUET-KEUNG, pursuant to notice, asked the following question:—

Sir, when will the Advisory Committee on Telephone Services issue its first report?

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY replied as follows:—

Sir, the terms of reference of the Advisory Committee on Telephone Services include an obligation to present periodical reports on the matters within their terms of reference to the Governor in Council. The Chairman of the Advisory Committee submitted the first of these periodic reports on

the 14th of January, 1965 and it was received by members of Council yesterday. The report covered the period from 18th September, 1964, that is the date of appointment of the Advisory Committee, to the 31st December, 1964.

MR KAN YUET-KEUNG:—Sir, may I ask one supplementary question?

Is it the intention of Government to publish this report in due course?

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY replied as follows:—

I have no doubt that the main points in the report at least will be published but the question of publication has still to be considered with the Committee and with the Company.

MR KAN YUET-KEUNG :—Thank you, Sir.

MERCHANT SHIPPING (AMENDMENT) BILL 1965

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the First reading of a Bill intituled “An Ordinance further to amend the Merchant Shipping Ordinance 1953.”

He said:—Your Excellency, at the outset. Sir, I wish to say that the provisions contained in this Bill have received the approval of the Secretary of State and that both the Port Committee and the Port Executive Committee have been consulted on such aspects of die measure as fall within their respective terms of reference and their views have been taken into account.

Sir, the Bill contains 68 clauses, 44 of which seek solely, or mainly, an increase in the general level of fines applicable for offences committed, against the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Ordinance 1953 which is the principal Ordinance. The existing penalties have remained unchanged for 65 years and owing to the change in the value of money over this long period are not now commensurate with the gravity of the offences which they were originally designed to deter. Accordingly it is now proposed that the maximum of all fines be, on average, quadrupled throughout the principal Ordinance. It is not proposed that sentences of imprisonment be increased. The heaviest financial penalty, namely, a \$20,000 fine, is proposed only in the case of the following three very serious offences—forging a certificate of competency, contrary to section 7; failure to display appropriate notices on cargo consisting of dangerous goods, contrary to section 87(1); and taking or

sending a ship to sea in defiance of an order of detention made under section 106(1). Only two new penalties are introduced, namely, a maximum fine of \$1,000 for failure or refusal to supply information required by a Port Health Officer in accordance with section 60 and a maximum fine of \$2,000 for obstructing or preventing the proper inspection of a vessel under Part XIV of the Ordinance, which relates to miscellaneous small craft. Clause 58 of this Bill renders such craft subject to inspection in a similar manner as are launches and ferry vessels under Part XIII.

Sir, I turn now to provisions in the Bill dealing with matters other than penalties.

Clauses 2(c), 4(a) and (b), 22 and 55 taken together seek to remove from the principal Ordinance, all reference to river steamers as a particular class of vessel, and to introduce a definition of river trade limits based upon a geographical area. Sir, the reason for this change is that the standard of life saving appliances and equipment and the structural particulars of a vessel required for safe navigation depend not upon the type of vessel but upon the geographical area in which she plies and whether or not she carries passengers. The expression "river steamer" is used only in the principal Ordinance, the relevant subsidiary legislation relating principally to licensing and surveys, avoids the expression altogether, being concerned not with the type of vessel but with the area in which she plies, and the manner of her employment.

Clauses 3, 13 and 49 deal with the size of vessels to which the definition "launch" in the Ordinance applies and seek to increase that size from 60 tons to 300 tons. There are now a number of vessels of over 60 tons plying exclusively within the Colony's waters and that number is increasing. As the law stands at present, vessels, other than junks, if in excess of 60 tons, generally are required to be officered as if they were foreign going steamships. It is considered that this requirement is unnecessarily stringent in the interests of safe navigation and unduly burdensome upon the owners of such craft. If these clauses are enacted it will enable vessels of under 300 tons to be operated by holders of local certificates of competency only.

Clause 15 is an important clause which seeks amendment of section 27 to permit passenger and safety certificates to be issued in Hong Kong upon the declarations of Board of Trade ship surveyors where the survey is conducted outside the Colony. This will be a great convenience to certain shipping interests because Marine Department surveyors may then be appointed surveyors under section 724 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1894, enabling them to survey ships outside the Colony, say in Japan as is sometimes required, and the certificate may then be issued in Hong Kong upon their declarations.

Clause 24 seeks to clarify the provisions relating to entries in ships log books of examinations of ships safety and life saving appliances and equipment.

Clause 25 seeks to make more flexible provision for the remuneration of assessors appointed to sit on marine courts as the existing limit of \$50 per day is considered inadequate.

Clause 32, the need for which was emphasized by the typhoons of last year, is designed to enable the Director of Marine to cause a ship to be moved where the master, owners or agents cannot readily be found or are themselves for some reason unable or unwilling to move her in accordance with the requirements of the Director.

Clause 36 introduces a power to make regulations to deal with a problem which is already acute and rapidly becoming more so, namely, the control of cargo working on public piers and prayas.

Clause 45 seeks the repeal of section 82 of the Ordinance which became redundant upon the enactment of the Dangerous Goods (Shipping) Regulations 1964.

Clauses 50 and 57 introduce powers to make regulations relating to the examination for, and the issue of, local certificates of competency to persons handling ferry vessels, launches and miscellaneous small craft.

Clauses 56 and 63 seek the amendment of sections 101 and 115 respectively to bring pleasure craft of a “junk” design under the same degree of control as is at present applicable to pleasure craft of European design only. The need for this measure is manifested by the rapidly increasing number of large and powerful motor pleasure craft of “junk” design now operating in the waters of the Colony.

Clauses 65 and 66 seek the deletion of the Third Schedule to the Ordinance. This Schedule specifies by title and limits the number of the regulations which may be made under the principal Ordinance. The list is inadequate and unduly restrictive and as a legislative measure serves no useful purpose. It is therefore proposed that it be deleted without replacement.

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 amendment of the Merchant Shipping Ordinance 1953 in a number of respects.

2. Clauses 2, 3, 4, 13, 22, 49 and 55 seek—
 - (a) to remove from the principal Ordinance all reference to river steamers as a class of vessel while retaining for the purposes of certain subsidiary legislation relating to licensing and surveys the expression “river trade limits” defined by reference to geographical area instead of by reference to a number of places;
 - (b) to increase the size of vessels to which the definition “launch” contained in the principal Ordinance applies from sixty tons to three hundred tons; and
 - (c) by clause 2, to delete the words “Civil Aviation” from the definition “Minister” consequent upon the recent change in the title of the Ministry of Transport.

3. As regards the modifications referred to above which relate to river steamers, vessels are surveyed for the issue of safety and passenger certificates in accordance with rules made by the Minister of Transport in the United Kingdom under section 427 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1894 (as amended by section 2 of the Merchant Shipping (Safety Convention Act 1949) subject to modification by local legislation permitted in the case of ships plying in certain areas and in certain trades by the provisions of the Simla Rules 1931 made under the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea 1929. The standard of life-saving appliances and equipment and structural particulars with which any vessel must comply depend not upon the type of vessel as such but upon the geographical area in which she is currently employed and whether or not she is engaged in the carriage of passengers. The relevant subsidiary legislation is all framed accordingly and the expression “river steamer” is not used. It is therefore anomalous and misleading that the principal Ordinance should use that expression and define it in a manner which has no application in practice.

4. The reason for seeking the increase referred to above in the size of vessels to which the definition “launch” applies, is that a considerable number of vessels to which that expression would normally apply but which exceed sixty tons are now plying in the waters of the Colony and it is considered sufficient in the interests of safe navigation if the law requires them to be commanded by masters and to carry engineers who hold local certificates of competency issued by the Director of Marine and not necessarily “foreign going” certificates.

5. By section 727 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1894, the Governor may only appoint surveyors of ships for the purpose of carrying out surveys within the Colony, and by section 27 of the principal Ordinance he may only issue to vessels passenger certificates upon the declaration of such surveyors. Consequently a ship which is registered

in Hong Kong, unless she is surveyed in the Colony, must be surveyed by Board of Trade surveyors appointed by the Minister of Transport and the passenger certificate issued in the United Kingdom. Clause 15 seeks to amend section 27 of the principal Ordinance to enable the Governor to issue such certificates in Hong Kong upon surveys conducted by Board of Trade surveyors outside the Colony, thus avoiding the inconvenience and delay involved in obtaining the issue of the certificates in the United Kingdom. In practice Hong Kong Government surveyors will also be appointed Board of Trade surveyors under section 724 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1894, thus enabling them to carry out ship surveys both inside and outside the Colony for the purpose of the issue of such certificates in Hong Kong.

6. Clause 24 seeks the amendment of section 40 of the principal Ordinance to include a reference to regulations made by the Governor in Council under section 37 relating to life-saving appliances to be carried in ships to which the Simla Rules 1931 apply as well as to rules made by the Minister of Transport under section 427 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1894. Such regulations may be additional to or in substitution for rules made by the Minister.

7. Clause 25 seeks the amendment of subsection (3) of section 50 of the principal Ordinance which limits the remuneration payable to assessors appointed to sit on marine courts to fifty dollars per day which is considered insufficient and inflexible.

8. Clause 26 seeks the amendment of subsection (4) of section 52 of the principal Ordinance to require marine courts appointed by the Governor under section 50 to investigate shipping casualties to submit their reports on cases to the Governor instead of direct to the Minister of Transport.

9. Clause 27 seeks the amendment of section 54 of the principal Ordinance to remove a redundancy which has arisen consequential upon the amendment of subsection (2) of section 50 of the principal Ordinance by the Merchant Shipping (Amendment) Ordinance 1959.

10. Section 63 of the principal Ordinance empowers the Director of Marine in the interests of the safety of shipping in the harbour to direct the master of a vessel to shift the vessel from one berth to another. Clause 32 of the Bill seeks to amend that section to include a power in the Director himself to move or cause a vessel to be moved where either the master fails to do so when directed or for some other reason the vessel cannot otherwise be moved.

11. Clause 36 seeks the amendment of section 67 of the principal Ordinance in order to widen the regulation making powers relative the general control of the waters of the Colony and the prevention obstruction and nuisances therein to include public prays, seawalls and water-frontages.

12. Clause 37 seeks the amendment of subsection (6) of section 68 of the principal Ordinance to remove the reference to the discharge of fireworks which is now redundant by reason of the Dangerous Goods (General) Regulations 1964, and secondly to make it an offence to endanger the safety of persons not only when they are in vessels but also when they are in the sea, for example swimming.

13. Clause 40 seeks the amendment of subsection (1) of section 75 in order to substitute a reference to the rank of police inspector for that of sub-inspector consequent upon the abolition of the latter rank.

14. Clause 41 seeks the amendment of section 78 of the principal Ordinance to enable the Governor in Council by regulation to prescribe dues payable by vessels entering the waters of the Colony instead of requiring that such dues be fixed by order of the Governor pursuant to a resolution of the Legislative Council. The reason for this amendment is in order to enable dues to be included in one comprehensive set of regulations to be made by the Governor in Council prescribing all fees, dues and other charges payable in relation to merchant shipping. Opportunity is taken to substitute the Director of Marine for the “collector” of fees as this is in practice the case.

15. Clause 44 seeks the insertion in Part XI of the principal Ordinance of a definition of the expression “dangerous goods anchorage”.

16. Causes 45 and 46 seek the repeal of section 82 of the principal Ordinance which deals with certain matters relating to dangerous goods which are now dealt with in the Dangerous Goods (Shipping) Regulations 1964, and the consequential amendment of section 85.

17. Clauses 50 and 57 are for avoidance of doubt. They seek the insertion in sections 94 and 102 respectively of the principal Ordinance of specific powers in the Governor in Council to make regulations for the conduct of examinations for local certificates of competency issued by the Director of Marine.

18. Clauses 56 and 63 seek amendment of sections 101 and 115 respectively of the principal Ordinance to enable the Governor in Council to make regulations for the control of pleasure craft which are not of European design. The reason for this measure is that there are now in the waters of the Colony a considerable number of mechanized pleasure craft of “junk” design which are of appreciable size and power and it is considered that such vessels should be brought under a similar degree of control to that already applicable to pleasure launches of European design.

19. Clause 58 seeks the addition of a new section 102A to the principal Ordinance in order to extend to the Director of Marine and to Government surveyors of ships and other suitable persons appointed by them similar powers to enter and to inspect miscellaneous small

craft to which the provisions of Part XIV of the Ordinance apply as are already extended by section 96 in the case of ferry vessels and launches to which the provisions of Part XIII apply.

20. Clause 61 seeks the amendment of section 111 of the principal Ordinance to make reference to the Asiatic Emigration Ordinance 1915, in order that the fees payable for surveys of vessels for that issue of licences under that Ordinance may be included in the regulations to be made by the Governor in Council under this Ordinance generally prescribing merchant shipping survey and other fees.

21. Clause 62 substitutes the Director of Marine for the “collector” of fees in line with the proposed amendment introduced by clause 41.

22. Clauses 65 and 66 seek the deletion of the Third Schedule to the principal Ordinance which specifies subsidiary legislation by reference and Tables. This feature of the Ordinance has been found inconvenient in practice.

23. Clause 67 and the Schedule to the Bill seek the consequential amendment of other legislation which will be required upon the enactment of the measures proposed in the Bill.

24. Clause 68 is the suspension clause required by the provisions of sections 735 and 736 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1894.

25. In addition to the proposed amendments specifically mentioned above, this Bill seeks the increase throughout the principal Ordinance of all penalties by way of fine. The reason for this measure is that the decrease in the value of money over the years has rendered the maximum fines to which an offender may become liable unrealistic and inadequate.

DANGEROUS DRUGS (AMENDMENT) BILL 1965

DR TENG PIN-HUI moved the First reading of a Bill intituled “An Ordinance to amend the Dangerous Drugs Ordinance. ”

He said:—Your Excellency, the purpose of this amending legislation is set out in the Objects and Reasons stated at the end of the Bill.

The need to amend the present Dangerous Drugs Ordinance became evident when, on 13th January 1964, a judicial decision of the High Court declared Regulation 15 of the Dangerous Drugs Regulations to be ultra vires the enabling powers contained in Section 11 of the Ordinance. This regulation has been on the statute book since 1936, and its effect was to enable the authority granted by Regulation 13 to registered medical practitioners, dental surgeons or approved veterinary surgeons and certain other persons to supply, administer and prescribe dangerous drugs, to be withdrawn where the Director after inquiry by the relevant Council had reason to believe that the privilege was being abused.

The purpose of this measure is to reinstate the effect in substance of Regulation 15 and to embody it as a substantive provision of the Ordinance.

I do not think, Sir, that the need for stringent powers to control the supply and administration of dangerous drugs in Hong Kong at the present moment can be questioned.

As I have said, Sir, the effect of the proposed new Section 17A is the same as the existing Regulation 15 prior to its having been discovered ultra vires, but the machinery will be different in that the proposed authority will be vested directly in the Director of Medical and Health Services who is the appropriate authority for the purposes of the Dangerous Drugs Ordinance with appeal from any decision of the Director to the Governor in Council by way of petition. At present, there is no appeal. Opportunity has also been taken to rectify the anomalous position of the Medical and Dental Councils in requiring them to advise the Director of Medical and Health Services in respect of a function under the Dangerous Drugs Ordinance which is not within the scope of their statutory roles.

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 amendment of the Dangerous Drugs Ordinance by inserting therein provision for the withdrawal in individual cases of authority to deal in dangerous drugs where such authority is granted generally to classes of persons by regulations made under the Ordinance.

2. The purpose of this provision is to tighten the control over the dispensing of dangerous drugs and to prevent abuses of authority in this respect by persons so authorized. It is considered that the Director of Medical and Health Services is the appropriate authority, subject to appeal to the Governor in Council by way of petition, to exercise the powers sought by this Bill.

SUMMER TIME (AMENDMENT) BILL 1965

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved the Second reading of A Bill intituled “An Ordinance to amend the Summer Time Ordinance 1953.”

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.

COLONIAL SECRETARY:—Sir, I rise to move that Clause 1 be amended by leaving out the figures “1964” and substituting the figures “1965”.

Clause 1, as amended, was agreed to.

Clause 2 was agreed to.

Council then resumed.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY reported that the Summer Time (Amendment) Bill 1965 had passed through Committee with one 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.

MEDICAL CLINICS (AMENDMENT) BILL 1965

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved the Second reading of a Bill intituled “An Ordinance further to amend the Medical Clinics Ordinance 1963.”

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 and 2 were agreed to.

Council then resumed.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY reported that the Medical Clinics (Amendment) Bill 1965 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.

**HONGKONG AND SHANGHAI BANKING CORPORATION
(AMENDMENT) BILL 1965**

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY moved the Second reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend The Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation Ordinance."

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.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY:—Sir, I rise to move that Clause 1 be amended as set out in the paper before Honourable Members.

Proposed Amendment

Clause

- 1 Leave out the figures "1964" and substitute therefor the following—
"1965".

Clause 1, as amended, was agreed to.

Clause 2 was agreed to.

Council then resumed.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY reported that the Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation (Amendment) Bill 1965 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.

URBAN COUNCIL (AMENDMENT) BILL 1965

MR K. S. KINGHORN moved the Second reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance further to amend the Urban Council Ordinance 1955. "

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 9 were agreed to.

Council then resumed.

MR K. S. KINGHORN reported that the Urban Council (Amendment) Bill 1965 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

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR:—That concludes the business for today, gentlemen. When is it your pleasure that we should meet again?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:—May I suggest this day three weeks, Sir.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR:—Council stands adjourned until this day three weeks.