

20TH JUNE, 1907.

PRESENT:—

HIS EXCELLENCY THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT, Hon. Mr. F. H. MAY, C.M.G.

MAJOR-GENERAL R. G. BROADWOOD, C.B.A.C.D.

Hon. Mr. A. M. THOMSON (Colonial Secretary).

Hon. Mr. H. H. J. GOMPERTZ (Attorney-General)

Hon. Mr. C. McI. MESSER, (Colonial Treasurer).

Hon. Mr. W. CHATHAM (Director of Public Works).

Hon. Mr. A. W. BREWIN (Registrar-General).

Hon. Mr. F. J. BADELEY (Captain-superintendent of Police).

Hon. Dr. HO KAI, M.B., C.M., C.M.G.

Hon. Mr. WEI YUK.

Hon. Mr. H. E. POLLOCK, K.C.

Hon. Mr. E. A. HEWETT.

Hon. Mr. E. OSBORNE.

Hon. Mr. H. KESWICK.

Mr. A. G. M. FLETCHER (Clerk of Councils).

MINUTES.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read, and confirmed.

QUESTIONS.

Hon. Mr. HEWETT gave notice that he would ask the following questions at the next meeting of the Council:—

(1) Will the Government state if it is proposed to recognise the special services rendered by certain Government officials in connection with a Commission appointed to enquire into the working of the Public Health and Buildings Ordinance?

(2) If so, what, if any, special remuneration is it proposed to grant for the extra work undertaken by the following members of the Hongkong Civil Service:—Mr. Bowen Rowlands, Mr. J. Dyer Ball, Mr. A. Chapman, V.D.?

(3) Will this remuneration, if granted, be dealt with by a special vote in the Legislative Council?

(4) If not, has the proposed amount been already included in some previous vote, if so, which vote, or will the sum granted to those officials be paid out of Miscellaneous Charges?

THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND BUILDINGS

ORDINANCE.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved the second reading of a Bill entitled "An Ordinance to amend the Public Health and Buildings Ordinance, 1903."

The COLONIAL TREASURER seconded.

Hon. Mr. POLLOCK—At the last meeting of this Council when this bill was read for a first time your

Excellency made some observations with reference to the housing question of this Colony, and more especially in connection with cubicles. Your Excellency stated amongst other things that you were satisfied that the existing law relating to cubicles has failed, and your Excellency also stated that you were in great hopes that the community as a whole would take the subject of cubicles into their most serious consideration, and try to arrive this time at some method of dealing with this question which will really settle it once for all.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY—I don't see what this has to do with the Bill.

Hon. Mr. POLLOCK—It has to do with it. I am perfectly in order.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY—It has no value whatever.

Hon. Mr. POLLOCK—It is a very great impertinence on the part of the Colonial Secretary to say it is of no value whatever. I think, Sir, the hon. member should be called to order. I am addressing your Excellency in Council with reference to the remarks made by your Excellency with reference to the proposal laid on the table at the last meeting, and I think if your Excellency had a right to address the Council on the question of cubicles on the first reading of the Bill, I have an equal right on the second.

HIS EXCELLENCY—I think the hon. member is rather under a misapprehension. I stated that I had a purpose for the few remarks I made. I said I should not be in order and asked the indulgence of the Council to allow me to make some remarks which were out of order. I certainly think it would be much more convenient if the hon. member would defer his remarks till such time as a Bill is submitted to the Council dealing with cubicles. We are now dealing with a Bill which deals with a different subject, and the only reason this Bill is being introduced before the general amending Ordinance is that there are various papers hung up owing to want of legal power to grant exemptions under section 175; hence the reason we put this forward before the general amendment Bill. I must rule the hon. member out of order in going into the general question. He must abide by the rules of the Council. The statement I made the other day was a very short one. I allowed another hon. member a good deal of licence to make a personal explanation, but now the hon. member wants to go into the whole question, which, I think, is very inconvenient.

Hon. Mr. POLLOCK—I propose to make observations on your Excellency's remarks at the last meeting of the Council. I claim my right to do so.

His EXCELLENCY—If the hon. member insists it just shows that one ought never to break any rule.

Hon. Mr. POLLOCK—I do not see why I should not be allowed to answer your Excellency's observations on the first reading. It is a monstrous thing for your Excellency, administering the Government, to claim a licence which is denied to me.

His EXCELLENCY—I did not claim it. I asked the leave of the Council.

Hon. Mr. POLLOCK—It is not likely any member would intervene.

His EXCELLENCY—The hon. member may go on.

Hon. Mr. HEWETT—Will you excuse me, Sir. There is one point to which I would like to refer.

His EXCELLENCY—You are certainly not in order now. I don't know what you are speaking to.

Hon. Mr. POLLOCK—In my remarks to this Council I cannot refrain from expressing extreme surprise at the attitude you have taken up upon the question of cubicles, and I have every right to express that surprise because your Excellency has made remarks which you say are not to be criticised until the proper time comes. Your Excellency stated truly that the question of cubicles is one of the most important with which this Council has to deal, and you laid a certain proposal before the Council and as far as I know it was submitted to the Council for the first time at the last meeting. I think Sir, as it is an important question, as you stated, and as it is a question with regard to which your Excellency admitted there has been failure—complete failure—that we cannot take too early an opportunity of addressing ourselves to this question with a view to putting an end to that failure—failure is by no means too strong a word to apply to the past sanitary policy on the question of cubicles. It seems to me, so far as cubicles are concerned, that your Excellency is quite correct in stating that an important point which will have to be borne in view in the future is the question of the provision of lateral windows. But, Sir, I do not agree with all the suggestions which I understand were put forward by the Government in connection with this matter. With regard to the best scheme in connection with cubicles, speaking for myself, I think there can be no doubt that the best scheme laid before the community so far, is the scheme mooted some four years ago, namely, that in Chinatown upper storeys of every third house should be pulled down with a view to the provision of lateral windows for the houses standing on either side. I understand, Sir, there was an objection raised against this being done in view of the fact that the walls of houses on either side of the house proposed to be pulled down might require strengthening, or in some instances rebuilding. I think, Sir, however, that this

scheme is such a good one, that such difficulties as I have mentioned ought not to stand in the way of its being adopted. No doubt means can be found for strengthening the walls, or if that is impracticable, for rebuilding them. It is simply and solely a question of money. There is nothing impossible in the operation.

His EXCELLENCY—Have you any idea how much money would be involved?

Hon. Mr. POLLOCK—No, but I would be glad if your Excellency would inform me.

His EXCELLENCY—At the lowest computation, \$8,000,000.

Hon. Mr. POLLOCK—For the whole thing?

His EXCELLENCY—That is correct.

Hon. Mr. POLLOCK—Your Excellency apparently thought I was going to be knocked down by those figures. I am not, as I was quite prepared to know that a considerable expenditure would be incurred. \$8,000,000 does not appear to me a very large sum to carry out a scheme which, unlike many schemes in the past, will be a thorough scheme. I think this scheme, Sir, is the only one I have ever heard of for settling the question once and for all. So far there has been a certain amount of tinkering. I quite agree with your Excellency that in sanitary matters there has been considerable improvement since the plague year of 1894, but your Excellency frankly admits that the settlement of the cubicle question has failed. I don't myself feel alarmed if this very necessary matter should involve a cost of \$8,000,000, and I am not at all surprised to hear it will involve something in the neighbourhood of that expenditure. Your Excellency and the Council have to consider what we shall get in return for such expenditure. I submit we shall have an enormous sanitary improvement in the Colony. It will be an enormous boon to the Colony from the point of view of public health to have every third house in Chinatown pulled down, and to have a free current of air and light going through where every third house was. I think, Sir, that it is a big scheme, but it is a scheme that should commend itself to the consideration of the community as deserving of the epithet thorough being applied to it and as opposed to some half hearted and dilatory measures which have been carried out.

His EXCELLENCY—Who is to bear the cost?

Hon. Mr. POLLOCK—I am coming to that, Sir. With reference to the question of at whose cost this reform is to be carried out, I certainly, Sir, don't agree with what I consider the stereotyped Government view, that the whole of this cost of pulling down third houses should be borne by the owners of the adjacent houses. I think

S i r , t h a t i n a

case like this the Government should certainly give a grant in regard to which, however, it is difficult to state the precise proportion. I simply throw out the matter tentatively for discussion. We will have to thresh out the exact the amount of compensation to be assessed. If you ask me to give my idea I would say this: It seems to me that it would be a fair compensation that the owners on each side of the house to be pulled down should contribute one third each towards the cost, and the Government the rest. This is rather a rough idea of my own. The owners of houses on either side, I suggest, should contribute in the proportion I mention, because no doubt they will benefit considerably by this, in that they will be able to have a considerable number of windows laterally put into their houses, a number of rooms opening into external air and legal according to the public Health Ordinance. Therefore it is only right, Sir, that they should contribute to this matter, and I see from a proposal laid before the Council at the last meeting that the Government intends apparently to allow in case of lateral windows certain concessions with reference to space and internal air space. With reference, Sir, to it being right and proper for the Government to grant some compensation, I would refer your Excellency to section 308 of the English Public Health Act of 1875. It is clearly laid down there, Sir, that if radical sanitary improvements are ordered by the local authorities, owners of property are to receive compensation. In the present instance I don't think, in view of the fact that owners of houses on either side gain considerable benefit, and in view of the fact that the Government are prepared to meet them, that all these alterations should be carried out at the public expense. I should like, Sir, before quitting this subject, to say again that this figure which your Excellency mentioned, which I suppose would include the whole of the cost of every third house pulled down, does not seem to me formidable in view of the immense gain to be accomplished. The Council of this Colony last year devoted a sum of a million or so of dollars to railways in the middle of China. If, Sir, we can do that, I don't see why, when a loan is proposed for a very necessary public matter here in our midst, the Government should pull a long face and tell us that this is a poor and bankrupt Colony, and cannot afford the loan for these urgent public works. I know, Sir, that is the usual attitude of the Government. Something must be done, and I think your Excellency will agree with me that the sooner it is done the better, and I don't think, Sir, with all due deference to the Government that any of the proposals laid on the table at the last meeting of council at all meet the case. Your Excellency truly pointed out at the last meeting of the Council that it is most desirable, with a view to the prevention of plague and other diseases which cause great losses to the Colony, that if we are going to attack the burning question we should attack it with spirit and settle it once for all. With the Government proposal to settle it once for all, it would

take 30 or 40 or 50 years to effect any considerable improvement. I think, Sir, we recognise that this is a very important question, and it is a question which cannot be attacked too soon. I ventured to bring forward these remarks Sir, because it seemed to me, reading as I did about this most urgent question, that it was desirable something should be laid before the Council for discussion. And I venture to bring before the Council a certain point in which, with all due respect, I differ from your Excellency's view; that is, that every improvement should be paid for by the owners of houses.

HIS EXCELLENCY—You cannot say that in face of the Statute of 1903, which shows that a very large proportion of cases, in fact in all cases, where improvements are made compensation is given by the Government.

Hon. Mr. POLLOCK—Some are, Sir; some are not.

HIS EXCELLENCY—You said just now all are.

Hon. Mr. POLLOCK—Perhaps your Excellency is right there. I do not want to deprive you of the credit of scoring a point.

HIS EXCELLENCY—I do not want to score points. I want accuracy.

Hon. Mr. POLLOCK—But with reference to 3B in the Government proposals, I fail to see there, Sir, reference to any compensation. I would draw special attention to that section. This is what the Government say: (reads). Well, Sir, apparently the Government proposes, when then contiguous houses are rebuilt, to insist on the provision of lateral windows.

HIS EXCELLENCY—And to grant—

Hon. Mr. POLLOCK—And to grant certain exemptions which will be beneficial to the tenants.

HIS EXCELLENCY—The landowner, I submit, will lose nothing.

Hon. Mr. POLLOCK—I should like to see that worked out; I have very great doubts with reference to the question.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—There is no Bill before you.

Hon. Mr. POLLOCK—I must ask that the Colonial Secretary be not allowed to make these remarks. I am much astonished that he is.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—There is no Bill before you, I said.

Hon. Mr. POLLOCK—It is a very serious thing the way in which these proposals were received by your Excellency, apparently to avert a discussion on the question. I was simply astounded at your Excellency

t e l l i n g u s t h a t

this was one of the most important things we had to deal with and that we should try to arrange the matter once for all, and then not desiring to hear me on the subject.

The Hon. Mr. HEWETT—Your Excellency. I understand that the official view of the case is that we are discussing the second reading of the Bill entitled "An Ordinance to amend the Public Health and Building Ordinance, 1903." That being so it appears to me that although the Bill at the moment before the Council is dealing only with a very small matter, it is an amending Bill for the main Ordinance of 1903.

His EXCELLENCY—Is the hon. member going to deal with the memorandum generally?

The Hon. Mr. HEWETT—I wish to make some remarks in connection with the proposed amendment and on the amendments generally of the Bill of 1903.

His EXCELLENCY—Then I must rule the hon. member out of order.

The Hon. Mr. HEWETT—Your Excellency—

His EXCELLENCY—Excuse me. I allowed the last speaker to proceed because he insisted upon criticising certain remarks on the one definite question of cubicles which I was foolish enough to think the Council would allow me to speak on at the last meeting. Apparently the Council was not in favour of that course, but did not like to intervene. It is quite intelligible that the hon. member should desire to revert to that question, but I cannot allow you now to try to cover the whole field or any part of it outside the cubicle question or the Bill before the Council.

The Hon. Mr. HEWETT—Your Excellency. I do not wish to say anything beyond that which was said by the hon. member opposite. I wish to make one reference to the main Ordinance of 1903, mainly because I do not wish to run the risk later on when the Bill becomes law of being told by members of the Government that we allowed an amending Ordinance to pass without any remarks on our part. I only wish to emphasise what the hon. member has said; if Your Excellency insists upon ruling me out of order I—

His EXCELLENCY—I do not know what the point is on which you wish to speak—on what section?

The Hon. Mr. HEWETT—I am going to speak on section 175, sub-section 4.

His EXCELLENCY—Then you are in order.

The Hon. Mr. HEWETT—I beg your Excellency's pardon. I am speaking on the whole section.

His EXCELLENCY—Very well.

The Hon. Mr. HEWETT—The remarks I have to make are, as I explained, to protect myself in the future from the possibility of misunderstanding. I do not want an amending Ordinance of this kind to pass without a few words being said on one of the most important sections of the Ordinance. My hon. and learned colleague has already referred to section 308 of the Public Health Act of 1875. I did not know he was going

to do so, and I brought a copy of the Act. I will read the section. (Reads the section referring to compensation.) The point I wish to make, Your Excellency, is carrying on the discussion which took place last week in this chamber, that a large section of the community is not satisfied with the compensation provided for in the existing Ordinance and which Your Excellency considers satisfactory. I merely wish to draw attention to the fact that the Public Health Act of 1875 which admits the principle that where a man suffers damage, that is to say, where his property is depreciated by sanitary reforms forced upon him, he is entitled to receive compensation.

His EXCELLENCY—If the property is insanitary?

The Hon. Mr. HEWETT—That is the question to be decided. I would remind Your Excellency that there are an enormous number of properties which were perfectly sanitary up to the 20th February, 1903, and which were immediately rendered insanitary by the passing of this very drastic Ordinance. The compensation which the property owners demanded as their right was set forth and fully dealt with in the petition to the Government in December of the previous year. Property suddenly, by the passing of this Act, was rendered insanitary. If the Government attempt to shelter themselves behind the fact that the houses are insanitary because they do not comply with the new ordinance, then all I can say is that the Government is acting with far less justice than the Home Government, which admitted this principle 30 or 40 years ago. I think it was necessary to make these few remarks in order to prevent possible misconception in the future.

The Hon. Mr. OSBORNE—Your Excellency. In the absence of any statement of objects and reasons for the Bill before this Council, I wondered why it had been brought forward. With Your Excellency's explanation to-day I see that it has been brought forward for a definite purpose—that is, to get over a temporary difficulty. I desire also to place on record that I reserve to myself the right on a future occasion to address the Council on the subject generally and not to-day.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY—Honourable members—unofficial hon. members do not seem to be aware of the right they have to forward notice of resolutions on any point whatever that they wish to raise, at the proper time preceding any meeting of the Council in which they can discuss any question in the public interest. There is, however, I maintain, no occasion now to discuss the question of cubicles, because that is not involved in the Bill under discussion. Before proceeding to take the  
d i v i s i o n o n t h e

second reading of the Bill I would like to make a few remarks in reply to those passed by the hon. member nominated by the Chamber of Commerce on the occasion of the first reading. If I am correct, he said, speaking on behalf of Mr. Hooper and other European owners—

The Hon. Mr. HEWETT—Your Excellency, I only spoke on behalf of Mr. Hooper.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Hewett is reported to have said "I do not think that it was quite right that the Government should take advantage and make capital out of a letter written in a moment of misconception by a gentleman who had some five years later been a member of the Commission." Now this charge practically amounts to one of unfairness against the Government. The words "should take advantage and make capital out of" are, I maintain, unwarrantable. The simple facts of the case are: When the Government decided that this letter should be laid on the table, it was not in the slightest degree aware that there was any contemplated repudiation by Mr. Hooper, or on behalf of other European landowners. There was no desire in the mind of the Government to convict Mr. Hooper of any inconsistency in regard to the matter. The paper would have been laid on the table even if it had been signed by any person other than Mr. Hooper and if he had not been a member of the Commission it would still have been laid on the table. This action was taken without any *arrière pensée* on the part of the Government in order to strengthen their position and to show that all possible concessions on the question of compensation had already been made. As regards the question of the value of Mr. Hooper's letter after its repudiation I have only to point out that the circumstances are somewhat as follows: On the 28th September, 1902, the European landowners petitioned the Government and asked for compensation. They quoted cases in regard to various matters. One was *Knight v. Moses*, July 1902. They were informed in reply to their petition that the Government had already considered most of the points concerned in the Bill. That was the answer given to the petitioners. Before that, Sir, we had a commission on the subject of the Public Health Ordinance. This was quoted by the Attorney-general on the occasion of the second reading of the Bill which subsequently became law. The Attorney-general in his speech quoted from the report of the Commissioners (reads from report). I may here say that these quotations are practically correct. The Bill was read a second time on that day. That was in November, 1902. No further discussion took place on Section 175. The community was apparently well satisfied that the compensation subject had been properly dealt with in a generous spirit by the Government. The letter laid on the table was dated 3rd December, 1902, and the Bill did not become law till February, 1903; it is therefore perfectly obvious that they had ample opportunity to

represent to the Government the fact that their representation on the subject of compensation had not been properly dealt with. The hon. member further said "when he wrote that letter he was under the impression that the Government had honestly and loyally adopted the recommendations put forward in the report which had been drawn up at the instance of the landowners. I submit that the inference from his statement was that the Government had not dealt with the matter honestly and loyally. I think I have given sufficient facts to show that the Government had dealt with the subject as honestly and loyally as they could, and the hon. member's remarks on the subject were entirely unjustified.

The Hon. Mr. HEWETT—Your Excellency, May I make a personal explanation?

His EXCELLENCY—You are not in order. You have already made your personal explanation on behalf of Mr. Hooper at the last meeting.

The Hon. Mr. HEWETT—I submit, Sir, when the Colonial Secretary quotes from *Hansard* or some other source with special regard to remarks made by me at the last meeting, I am absolutely within my rights.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY—I could not reply to your remarks at the last meeting.

The Hon. Mr. POLLOCK—Surely the hon. member is entitled to answer the Colonial Secretary who has criticised him.

Mr. POLLOCK and Mr. HEWETT were now speaking together.

His EXCELLENCY—Will you allow me to speak.

The Hon. Mr. POLLOCK—Yes.

His EXCELLENCY—If the explanation is purely personal—

The Hon. Mr. HEWETT—I have told your Excellency that it is purely a personal explanation, and only on that ground I demand it. I told your Excellency that I wished to make a personal explanation with reference to the quotations made by the Colonial Secretary from a report of the speech made by me at the last meeting of the Council. I do not know from what source the Hon. the Colonial Secretary obtained his version, if from *Hansard* the report is not a verbatim one, but it is substantially correct. I have nothing to withdraw, nothing to apologise for, and nothing to take back. I stand by that. (The Hon. Mr. Pollock: hear, hear.)

His EXCELLENCY—Gentlemen, I think I have already explained the reasons why I did not want the hon. member on my left to proceed. I have no desire to burke discussion and I wish to say that I am not afraid of criticism either of what I write or say. As a matter of fact I rather enjoy it, but it seemed to me that on a future occasion when the general amending Bill

came to be considered his remarks would come in more fittingly. The hon. member has suggested a scheme for dealing with cubicles. I do not want to take up the time of the Council by going into it now. He made rather light of the expenditure, and there is one word of warning I would like to utter on that point, because it may weigh with him and others in considering that scheme. At the present time this colony is in a very difficult position. We have a very large railway scheme on hand which is not going to prove a gold mine. We have our currency in a very deplorable condition not, I submit, through the fault of the Government, but through a combination of various circumstances. We have the opium question looming in the background and our insatiable Director of Public Works wants us to incur an expenditure of three million dollars in increasing our water supply. In these circumstances, gentlemen, I do not think that any matter which runs into millions of dollars is within the region of consideration. In the compensation of which the hon. member nominated by the Chamber of Commerce spoke, I do not think that his quotation from the Public Health Act will altogether help him. The origin, as the Colonial Secretary pointed out, of this sub-section of Section 175 which requires open spaces in the rear of houses is the report of the Insanitary Properties Commission, acknowledged to be one of the strongest commissions that ever sat in this Colony, composed of no less than Sir Paul Chater, Sir Thomas Jackson, Mr. Thomas Whitehead, Mr. Nathaniel Ede, and the former Colonial Secretary. This Commission reported, after personal investigation, that they regretted to have to report that there were many insanitary properties and dwellings which were unfit for human habitation under their present condition. (Quotes) "we regret to report that there are many insanitary properties in the colony and dwellings which in their present condition are unfit for human habitation. The back portions of a number of the houses visited by us are dark, ill ventilated, extremely dirty, and in some cases mere dens of filth." They made recommendations which the Colonial Secretary read — "the said properties should be improved in the manner suggested, and carried out by the owners at their own cost." Now it was given in evidence before that Commission that in compelling owners to make insanitary properties sanitary the Government were only doing what they could compel those owners to do in another way. (Quotes from section empowering magistrate to declare a house unfit for human habitation.) That is the same as in England. If the Sanitary Authority is of opinion that property is unfit for human habitation they have to apply to a Magistrate for an order before they can compel these premises to be closed or made fit for habitation. Gentlemen, in addition to the evidence given before the Commission, and in addition to the recommendation of these high authorities, I beg to add my evidence. I was on the

special Commission of the Sanitary Board in 1894 when we closed and sealed up scores and scores of these houses on the ground of being unfit for human habitation. And they were unfit for human habitation. I venture to say that the lower classes of this town are in many cases not as well housed as the dumb four footed animals in Mr. Kennedy's stables in Causeway Bay. There each horse has one window. The hon. member nominated by the Chamber of Commerce remarked that certain houses in 1902 were sanitary, and became insanitary by the operation of this law of 1903. Gentlemen, we took the power to grant modifications in hard cases where properties were not altogether insanitary, and we are now taking power to deal with certain conditions which affect a block of houses which, I venture to say, the hon. member had in his mind when he spoke. The property belongs to the Humphreys Estate Company and is situated at Kowloon.

The Hon. Mr. HEWETT—Really, I cannot allow that to pass. When I spoke I had no particular property in my mind. I was speaking on a general principle of the Act which was suddenly brought into force, making a large amount of property in the Colony insanitary. I take objection to your assertions, with all due respect to your high position, and object to your trying to twist my words to imply that I am working in the interest of some individual members of the Community, more particularly Mr. Humphreys, one of my late colleagues on the Sanitary Commission. I roll no man's log, I sharpen no man's axe. I object to your imputations which are as unworthy as they are untrue.

His EXCELLENCY—I did not twist your words.

The Hon. Mr. HEWETT—You imputed motives to me which I repudiate.

His EXCELLENCY—I said that I thought you had these buildings in your mind when you spoke.

The Hon. Mr. HEWETT—No Sir, I had not.

His EXCELLENCY—Very well; I accept your explanation. I thought that it might be so, because the property was so particularly referred to in the Report of the Commission. The Colonial Secretary has explained that the question of compensation under this particular section was put forward in 1903, and did not commend itself to this Council, and the Government are determined not to reopen the question. You will also find that in the debates on that Ordinance of 1903 mention was made of compensation for loss of cubicles. It was agreed by this Council that such compensation should not be granted. The Government do

not propose now to reopen the question of compensation for cubicles.

The motion was agreed to.

The Council went into committee to consider the Bill.

On resuming,

The ATTORNEY GENERAL, in the absence of objection, moved the third reading of the Bill.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded, and the motion was agreed to.

THE NEDERLANDSCH-INDISCHE

HANDELBANK.

The Attorney-general moved the second reading of the Bill entitled "An Ordinance for giving to a

Foreign Company called the Nederlandsch-indische Handelsbank certain facilities for carrying on its business in the Colony."

The COLONIAL TREASURER seconded, and the Bill was read a second time.

Council then went into committee and considered the Bill clause by clause.

On resuming, the ATTORNEY -GENERAL reported that the Bill had passed through committee without amendment.

The Bill was then read a third time, passed, and became law.

Council adjourned *sine die*.

---