

21ST JULY, 1910.

**PRESENT:—**

HIS EXCELLENCY THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT, HON. SIR F. H. MAY, K.C.M.G.

HON. MR. A. M. THOMSON (Colonial Secretary).

HON. MR. W. REES DAVIES, K.C. (Attorney-General).

HON. MR. C. McI. MESSER (Colonial Treasurer).

HON. MR. W. CHATHAM, C.M.G. (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.G.

HON. MR. WEI YUK, C.M.G.

HON. MR. M. STEWART.

HON. MR. E. OSBORNE.

HON. MR. H. KESWICK.

MR. C. CLEMENTI (Clerk of Councils).

**Minutes**

The minutes of the last meeting were read and confirmed.

**Financial Minutes**

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY, by command of His Excellency the Governor, laid on the table Financial Minutes (Nos. 58 to 59), and moved that they be referred to the Finance Committee.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER seconded, and the motion was agreed to.

**Financial**

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY, by command of His Excellency the Governor, laid on the table the report of the Finance Committee (No. 7), and moved its adoption.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER seconded, and the motion was agreed to.

**Papers**

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY, by command of His Excellency the Governor, laid on the table the following papers:— Report of the Director of Education; report of the Land Officer; report of the Director of Public Works, and copy of the Secretary of State's despatch No. 178 of June 17th.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS laid on the table the report of the Public Works Committee (No. 2.)

**Acknowledgment**

Sir,  
Downing Street,  
17th June, 1910.

Your despatch and its enclosures have been laid before the King, who has been greatly touched at hearing of the deep sorrow evinced by the British, Chinese and all sections of the inhabitants of Hongkong, and I have it in command from His Majesty to express on his own behalf and on that of Her Majesty the Queen Mother and the other Members of the Royal Family their heartfelt appreciation of the sympathy shown throughout the Colony, and of the dutiful and loyal attitude of all classes of the community.

I have the honour to be,  
Sir,  
Your most obedient,  
Humble servant,  
(Sd.) CREWE.

The Officer Administering  
The Government of  
Hongkong.

**Executive Council Relief of Duties Ordinance**

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved the second reading of a Bill entitled, "An Ordinance to relieve the Governor-in-Council of certain duties." In doing so he said—An Ordinance was passed last year, No. 29 of 1909, which effected in a greater measure what it is proposed to effect by the Bill now before the Council. That Ordinance was regarded by the Secretary of State as of somewhat too drastic a character, and was disallowed by His Majesty, and the Bill proposes to substitute an Ordinance of a more limited character than the Ordinance enacted by the Council last year.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

Council then resolved itself into a committee of the whole Council to consider the Bill clause by clause.

On resuming,

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL reported that the Bill had passed through committee without amendment, and moved that it be read a third time.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded, and the Bill was read a third time and passed.

### **Young Persons Amendment Ordinance**

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved the second reading of the Bill entitled, "An Ordinance to amend the Young Persons Ordinance, 1909." In doing so he said—There was an Ordinance passed last year which abolished the death sentence in the case of young persons, and the object of the present Bill is to invest discretion in the Courts in determining the age of a young person. As has been pointed out, difficulties have arisen in some cases in proving the age of an offender, and this amendment in the Ordinance of last year merely gives discretion to the Court so to determine.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

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

On resuming,

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL reported that the Bill had passed through committee without amendment, and moved the third reading of the Bill.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded, and the Bill was read a third time and passed.

### **The Copyright Ordinance**

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved the second reading of the Bill entitled, "An Ordinance to amend the Law of Copyright." In doing so he said—This Bill proposes to amend the law of copyright in the Colony.

It was drafted, I may say, by my learned friend, Mr. Slade, when he was acting Attorney-General. The Imperial Act of 1842 is in force here so far as it is applicable, and as the law is at present the owner of the copyright of any book first published in this Colony has to be registered at the Stationers' Hall in London. He cannot sue to defend his copyright unless he is registered at Stationers' Hall, because there is no copyright register in Hongkong. This Bill provides that a local register shall be established here, and makes the provisions of the Imperial Act applicable to the local register so that the owner of a copyright may register either locally or at Stationers' Hall. The Bill also extends the provisions of the Copyright Musical Compositions Acts, 1882 and 1888. These Acts give the Court discretion in awarding penalties, and restrict the scope of the damages for infringements which were given by the old statute 3 and 4 William IV. The object my learned friend had in making these two Acts applicable to this Colony was to make the general law affecting copyright uniform. The Bill is drafted largely on precedent. Section 2 is based on section 5 of the Fine Arts Copyright Ordinance of 1901 in so far as the phraseology is concerned on the Imperial Act of 1842. Section 3 is based, I may say verbatim, on section 6 of the Fine Arts Copyright Ordinance of 1901. Section 4 on section 56 of the Ceylon Ordinance dealing with copyright. Section 5 on section 58 of the Ceylon Ordinance, and section 6 is based in brief on section 24 of the Imperial Act. I may say for the information of the Council that these sections as a whole are based either upon precedents now in existence in the Colonies, or upon sections of the Imperial Act.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

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

On resuming,

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL reported that the Bill had passed through committee without amendment, and moved that it be read a third time.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded, and the Bill was read a third time and passed.

### **Crown Lands Resumption Amendment Ordinance**

THE ATTORNEY - GENERAL moved the second reading of the Bill entitled, "An Ordinance to amend the Crown Lands Resumption Ordinance, 1900, and to make special provision for the Resumption of Crown Lands of small value for public purposes." In doing so he said—It is desired, Sir, to simplify the machinery provided by the principal Ordinance, that is, No. 10 of 1900, in the case of land which is resumed by the Government for public purposes when it is under the value of \$500. The Bill is directed entirely to land of small value. The principal Ordinance, in the case of the resumption of land, requires a number of formalities to be gone through, such as publication in the *Gazette*, four months' notice to be given to the owner, and the Board of Arbitrators who sit to assess the compensation must consist of a judge of the Supreme Court and two other members, while notification of the constitution of the Board has to be gazetted, with other formalities. Now, Sir, the Bill proposes in the case of land, as I have said, of small value, to simplify these formalities. It substitutes one month's notice to the owner of the land, it does not require a *Gazette* notice, which is deemed to be unnecessary in the New Territories, and as to the constitution of the Board it provides that the Board shall consist of a magistrate or justice of the peace nominated by the Governor as Chairman, and two other members, one nominated by the owner of the land, and the other by the Governor. Then there are two clauses, Nos. 6 and 7, which contain amendments deemed desirable both in this Ordinance and in the principal Ordinance. Clause 6 gives a general power of entry in the case of land to be resumed of a small value, and also of land to be resumed under the principal Ordinance. As regards clause 7, it provides that when the owner of any land resumed is absent from the Colony, or cannot be found within six months of the date of the amount of compensation being determined, and makes no claim, the Government may direct payment of the compensation to such person as seems just. That, sir, I believe is based on a precedent of the Land Clauses Consolidation Acts at Home. Cases have occurred where land has been resumed, and owners have been resident out of the Colony, and where the people in present occupation of the land were unable to give a receipt in respect of the compensation.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

HON. MR. OSBORNE—With regard to the notice, Sir, just merely fixing a notice on the land, is that deemed to be sufficient? Take the case of Chinese owners living at Canton, for instance.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL—Notice has to be given to the owner of the land and also fixed up on each end of the land concerned.

HON. MR. OSBORNE—I think more trouble should be taken to find the owner than merely putting the notice on the ground.

HIS EXCELLENCY—This Ordinance is strictly designed for resumptions in the New Territory, and it is generally a case of notifying the person on the ground.

HON. MR. OSBORNE—The name of the owner must be registered in the Land Office or somewhere.

HIS EXCELLENCY—Yes.

HON. MR. OSBORNE — Then notice should be sent to him.

HON. MR. STEWART—It says, "notice to be given to the owner."

THE ATTORNEY - GENERAL—It is very much like substituted service for a writ of summons. Where the owner cannot be discovered in time, notice placed on the locality suffices.

HON. MR. OSBORNE—When this point arose in an Ordinance recently it was decided to send notice under registered cover to the owner. I think the same practice might be followed here.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS — I understand there is no postal service to many of the places.

HIS EXCELLENCY—There is no post in the New Territory.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS—I think it may be taken that in all cases every effort is made to get at the owner.

HON. MR. OSBORNE—I think it better, Sir, that something in black and white should go into the Ordinance.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS—It is only as a last resort that this proceeding is taken. Posting notices on the land is done in all cases, but in every case before the proceedings get so far, every effort has been made to get the owner and negotiate with him.

HON. MR. STEWART—As it stands here there is no obligation on the Government.

HON. MR. OSBORNE—I think some words should be inserted to the effect that "if the owner cannot be found, after reasonable effort has been made."

HIS EXCELLENCY—If you refer to the notice under the Sanitary Ordinance, that is a different thing. It is pretty rare to find a piece of land without getting hold of a claimant. This says you shall give notice, and also put notice on the land.

HON. MR. OSBORNE—It also says, you may merely put the notice on the land, and that is sufficient.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL—That is exactly based on the principal Ordinance. The principal Ordinance requires that the Governor shall enter into private negotiations with the owner of the land.

HON. MR. OSBORNE — The principal Ordinance, Sir, is at fault in not making better provision for giving notice. I think reasonable steps may not be taken to find the owner. If it is troublesome to find the owner, they will merely put the notice on the land.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL — I was only pointing out what the law is at present in respect of properties of very much larger value.

HON. MR. STEWART—Is it unnecessary to send in notice at all to the owner? You merely advertise it in the *Gazette*?

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL — It is necessary to communicate with the owner. Under the existing Ordinance notice must be given to him, or it must be

substituted in default.

HIS EXCELLENCY—Perhaps it would meet the case to put in the words, "Where the owner cannot be found."

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS—The principal Ordinance requires private negotiations to be carried on in the first instance. These clauses only come into operation, I think, when private negotiations have failed.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL—Will it meet the hon. member's views if we insert these words, after the word "provided" in the tenth line: "and if the owner cannot be found shall be affixed on a conspicuous part of the land."

HON. MR. OSBORNE—Yes, Sir, that will do.

The Bill was left in committee, and Council resumed.

#### **Protection of Women and Girls' Ordinance.**

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved the second reading of the Bill entitled, "An Ordinance to amend the Protection of Women and Girls' Ordinance, 1897." In doing so he said—Under section 32 of the Protection of Women and Girls' Ordinance of 1897 it is provided that no parent or person acting in the place of a parent who has voluntarily parted with a girl for the purpose of adoption into another family, or who has received money for the parting with the custody of such girl for another purpose, shall be deemed to be entitled as of right to the custody of such girl. As the law stands a girl may in such case find herself without legal protection, as there is no legal guardianship provided for by the Ordinance. It is therefore proposed that in these cases where a girl has been parted with for the purposes of adoption, or for the purpose of money, the law shall be amended by constituting the Registrar-General the legal guardian of the girl. It also enables him to take such action for her welfare as he may think fit. The second part of the clause also gives

salutary power to the Registrar-General for the proper protection of such girls. The Bill re-enacts section 32 of the principal Ordinance, and was strongly recommended by the Registrar-General in the interests of the Chinese community, and I commend it to the attention of the Council.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

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

On resuming,

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL reported that the Bill had passed through committee without amendment, and moved that it be read a third time.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded, and the Bill was read a third time and passed.

### **The Highways Ordinance.**

THE ATTORNEY - GENERAL moved the second reading of the Bill entitled, "An Ordinance to provide for the narrowing, stopping up, diversion, turning or alteration in levels of Highways." In doing so he said— This Bill, Sir, is based in part on the Highways Act of 1835. It is deemed necessary to give the power conferred owing to the formation of new streets and the diversion of portions of existing streets in different parts of the Colony. Section 2 gives the Governor-in-Council power to notify the proposed work in the *Gazette* and also to affix notices specifying the work at each end of the street concerned. Section 3 requires parties interested to send objections to the Colonial Secretary which will be considered by the Governor-in-Council, and the parties objecting may be heard by the Governor-in-Council personally or by representative. There is a precedent for that course in existence. If the objection is disallowed by the Governor-in-Council, the works cannot be undertaken except by resolution of the Legislative Council. Of course, if the objection is allowed by the Governor-in-Council there is an end to the matter. As regards the Home precedent to which I have alluded, the Highways Act of 1835, the highway authority now in England is the District Council, the rural or urban district council as the case may be, and there is a general right of appeal to Quarter Sessions. It has therefore been deemed desirable by His Excellency in Council that in the event of objections being taken to the decision of the Governor-in-Council the sanction of the Legislative Council as being the representative authority should be obtained.

HON. MR. STEWART—Sir, the Hon. Attorney-General has told us that this Bill is based on the Highways Act of 1835. I should like to know whether in that Act provision is made for compensation. It seems to me that circumstances can easily be conceived under which hardship might be created for private owners when, say, the Government have decided to elevate or depress a road opposite their property. An objection having been referred to the Governor-in-Council and disallowed, his decision could then be pushed through by the official majority of the Legislative Council. The property owner would then have no redress at all, no compensation. Without some provision for compensation, I shall not see my way to vote in favour of the second reading of this Bill.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL—Do I understand my hon. friend to say the Highways Act does provide compensation?

HON. MR. STEWART—I would be glad to know.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL—I was looking up the matter, but I was unable to find that the Act does provide compensation. It gives a right of appeal to Quarter Sessions and gives the Court power to award costs.

HON. MR. STEWART—It deals with the possibility of costs being allowed?

THE ATTORNEY - GENERAL—Yes, costs of the appeal.

HON. MR. STEWART—In any case, whether that Act provides compensation or not, I think this one should.

HON. MR. KESWICK—I have great pleasure in following my hon. friend opposite. If this Ordinance is allowed to go through without any clause providing for compensation, I think it may in many cases deal very seriously with conditions in the Colony. A great deal of land in this

Colony is subject to mortgage, and if the Government were allowed to alter the conditions under which the surrounding property is held without paying any compensation to the owners of the property immediately affected, it would make a great upset to many investments which are made throughout the Colony. That is only a small thing perhaps, but the whole principle appears to me to be wrong, namely, that the Government should be able to alter the condition of property without paying some compensation for it. It seems only reasonable that some compensation should be paid to owners for the advancement of the comfort or convenience of the public. Therefore, I have very much pleasure in supporting my hon. friend opposite. Also, there is another thing in this Bill. It proposes that after the matter has been brought before the Governor-in-Council it should be referred to the Legislative Council. That appears to me to be entirely unnecessary, because the Governor-in-Council can surely deal with these things perfectly well. If they are referred to the Legislative Council afterwards, it is a sort of specious situation, because in any case, as a matter of practice, the Governor having approved in Council, this Legislative Council would be certain to follow. Therefore, I don't see any object in referring the matter first to the Governor-in-Council and then to the Legislative Council. It would be far better if the Governor-in-Council did it themselves.

HIS EXCELLENCY — I don't think, gentlemen, that you are following the precedent of the Imperial Act. You are told that in that Act there is no provision for compensation. I don't myself see the necessity for inserting it here. Just reflect one moment upon the position. We are told there is a likelihood of the Governor-in-Council, after disallowing an objection on the part of an owner of property, forcing the resolution through this Council in the face of the opposition of the owner, and, if it was a question of refusing compensation, I should think, against the opinion of every unofficial member of this Council. The unofficials never give officials any credit for having a conscience at all, I know. So I do not include officials. We put in this clause about referring objections to the Legislative Council for the very purpose of providing that the matter should not be done in a hole and corner manner, and that full publicity should be given to the transaction. It is likely to be an action in the interests of

the public, but I don't know whether it will serve the public well if you commit yourselves to giving compensation for every little alteration in roadway, or narrowing, stopping or diverting. We quite realise that in certain cases such work may affect the value of a property, and there have been cases in the past where, without any compulsion at all, we have come to amicable arrangements on the subject. This particular legislation cropped up because, as a matter of fact, we found that we had no power to close any road in the Colony, although roads have been closed in the past. I think you have got every safeguard, gentlemen, in this Bill. The owner has got every opportunity to plead his objection, and of making it public in this Council, and I think the Government would get itself into bad odour if there was an equitable claim for compensation, and it insisted upon forcing a resolution through the Council without giving compensation where it was due.

HON. MR. OSBORNE—Sir, there is a considerable difference in the circumstances between this Colony and at Home. Your Excellency has intimated that the Government would not perhaps refuse compensation where compensation was justified, but I think we should all like to see something more tangible than a mere expression of opinion; we should like to see that principle embodied in the Ordinance. Here in Hongkong, if the Government have made up their minds to level a road, thereby destroying the frontage value of shops, they will carry it through, as far as my experience is concerned, despite any opposition or any objection on the part of owners. They will carry that measure through, and if they have made up their minds not to give compensation, they will not do so. At Home, if the District Authority were to act in that manner there would be an outcry, and I think the Board of Trade would step in and prevent any injustice being done. In any case the owner there would have an appeal to a District Council composed not of officials, but of unofficials. Here, if we make an appeal, we make an appeal from Caesar unto Caesar. There is no appeal here if the Government has made up its mind. I have

in my mind an instance, I think it was at Queen's Road West, where a hill near the Sailors' Home was proposed to be levelled. Now, Sir, if you level that hill you will put all those house fronts probably ten or twelve feet above the roadway. That would certainly destroy the value of the property, and the Government could force that public improvement and pay no compensation whatever to the owners. Seeing that the circumstances are so different between here and at Home, we should not be doing our duty if we did not object to the principle of injuring a man's property without paying compensation.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS—Sir, I think that the remarks which have fallen from the hon. member who spoke last are rather in support of the measure, because he tells us of a proposal that was once made, but which has never been carried into effect. Therefore, we may assume that the Government was satisfied that it was a proposal that would inflict hardship on the owners, and that it was not wise to attempt to carry it out. I am somewhat surprised that he should have spoken in opposition to the measure, because the most notable case which has occurred during my term in this Colony has been the closing of certain public roads at Kowloon which ... through property owned by the Company of which he is secretary. That, Sir, was undoubtedly a great public improvement, and it possibly inflicted some hardship upon owners of property in roads which had been formerly traversed by the public before the diversion of the traffic occurred owing to the alterations made. There was no trouble about it, and I think on every hand it is acknowledged to have been a great public improvement. I think, Sir, that the Government is not quite so callous as our friends would have us believe, and that in all cases any real hardship would be carefully studied, and that nothing would be done of so harsh a nature as has been hinted at.

HON. MR. OSBORNE—I should like to correct a statement, Sir, of the Hon. Director of Public Works. He has referred to the giving up of the Praya at Kowloon. That Praya, Sir, was reclaimed from the sea at the expense of the predecessors of the Wharf Co. It was never paid for in any way by the public. It was paid for by the persons from whom the Wharf Co. bought the property, and the Government in giving up the Praya were only doing a very tardy act of justice. They were giving back to the persons who had practically made that part of Kowloon a piece of property which should in the first place have belonged to them.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS—No.

HON. MR. OSBORNE—And furthermore, Sir, after the Praya at Kowloon had been withheld from the Wharf Company, the Government gave the Praya to other people who came afterwards. Therefore, the Government need take no credit to themselves for having performed an act of justice, and that very tardily.

HON. MR. KESWICK—May I speak again, Sir?

HIS EXCELLENCY—No, you are not in order, but the Director of Public Works wants to make an explanation.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS—I would like to remove any wrong impression that may be created by the hon. Mr. Osborne's words. The lines that he has described have been followed in numerous other cases by the Government, and in the case of the whole Praya Reclamation scheme roads were reclaimed at the expense of the owners of lots, so that his Company were not treated in any different way from the owners of other property similarly situated.

HON. MR. OSBORNE—At Kowloon, yes. I can prove it.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS—The reclamation was made subject to the condition that these areas were reserved to be used as roads, and I cannot see that any hardship resulted from the carrying out of a simple bargain.

HON. DR. HO KAI—Sir, I generally support the remarks of my unofficial colleagues, and I would suggest that a clause be introduced giving the Legislative Council discretion in awarding  
c o m p e n s a t i o n t o

owners in cases of the kind in which we think compensation is necessary. I think that will meet the difficulty. A resolution by the Legislative Council will be necessary when objections are disallowed, and I would suggest with that resolution that the Council will award compensation in cases in which they deem it to be necessary and just.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL—Sir, I think your Excellency desires that hon members shall be met as far as possible, and I think their wishes may be met by giving a discretionary power to the Governor-in-Council to award compensation under section 4 by adding to the end of that section, "And may in his discretion award such compensation as he may deem just in respect of the work proposed to be undertaken. "The Governor-in-Council would then consider entirely the equity of a case, and if established interests were seriously infringed it would, acting judicially, grant compensation. I think that is a fair way of meeting it.

Council then went into committee to consider the Bill clause by clause, and the Bill was left in committee for further consideration of clauses 4 and 5.

Council then resumed.

### **Liquors Amendment (No. 2) Ordinance**

THE ATTORNEY - GENERAL moved the second reading of the Bill entitled, "An Ordinance to further amend the Liquors Ordinance, 1909." In doing so he said—This is a very simple Bill, the object being to put naval officers and men on the same footing as the military. It proposes to give them exemption under section 3 of the Ordinance of last year.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

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

On resuming,

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL reported that it had passed through committee without amendment, and moved that it be read a third time.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded, and the Bill was read a third time and passed.

### **Public Performances Ordinance**

THE ATTORNEY - GENERAL moved the second reading of the Bill entitled, "An Ordinance to amend the Theatres and Public Performances Regulation Ordinance, 1908." In doing so he said—It has been deemed desirable, Sir, to put cinematograph exhibitions under the censorship of the Registrar-General. There are reasons which at once occur to the mind why some kind of discretion should be exercised in the control of cinematographs, although, speaking generally, the exhibitions in this Colony are of quite a high order. The Chinese Regulation Ordinance, 3 of 1888, section 26, gives the Registrar-General power over Chinese theatrical performances, and inasmuch as the great majority of this community are Chinese, it seems fitting that the Registrar-General, who possesses power under the Chinese Regulation Ordinance, should possess a similar power over cinematographs.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

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

On resuming,

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL reported that the Bill had passed through committee without amendment, and moved that it be read a third time.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded, and the Bill was read a third time and passed.

His EXCELLENCY—Council stands adjourned until this day fortnight.

### **FINANCE COMMITTEE**

A meeting of the Finance Committee was held afterwards—the Colonial Secretary presiding. The following votes were passed:—

### **Secret Service**

The Officer Administering the Government recommended the Council to vote a sum of One thousand Dollars (\$1,000) in aid of the vote, Police and Prison Depart -



ments, A.—Police, Other Charges, Secret Service.

**Sanitary Department**

The Officer Administering the Government recommended the Council to vote a sum of five hundred dollars (\$500) in aid of the vote, Sanitary Department, Other Charges, Sanitary Staff, Nightsoil Receptacles.

**Supplementary Appropriation Bill**

The Committee then considered the Bill entitled, "An Ordinance to authorize the Appropriation of a Supplementary Sum of Three hundred and fourteen thousand five hundred and thirty-three Dollars and thirty-two Cents, to defray the Charge of the Year 1909."

After going through it clause by clause, it was passed without comment.

---