

OFFICIAL REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS.**Meeting of 10th April, 1957.****PRESENT:**

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR (*PRESIDENT*)
SIR ALEXANDER WILLIAM GEORGE HERDER GRANTHAM, G.C.M.G.
THE HONOURABLE THE COLONIAL SECRETARY
MR. EDGEWORTH BERESFORD DAVID, C.M.G.
THE HONOURABLE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
MR. ARTHUR RIDEHALGH, Q.C.
THE HONOURABLE THE SECRETARY FOR CHINESE AFFAIRS
MR. BRIAN CHARLES KEITH HAWKINS, C.M.G., O.B.E.
THE HONOURABLE THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY
MR. JOHN JAMES COWPERTHWAITTE (*Acting*).
DR. THE HONOURABLE YEO KOK CHEANG, C.M.G.
(*Director of Medical and Health Services*).
THE HONOURABLE JOHN FORBES, O.B.E.
(*Acting Director of Public Works*).
THE HONOURABLE DAVID CLIVE CROSBIE TRENCH, M.C.
(*Commissioner of Labour*).
THE HONOURABLE EDMUND BRINSLEY TEESDALE, M.C.
(*Director of Urban Services*).
DR. THE HONOURABLE CHAU SIK NIN, C.B.E.
THE HONOURABLE CHARLES EDWARD MICHAEL TERRY, O.B.E.
THE HONOURABLE LO MAN WAI, C.B.E.
THE HONOURABLE NGAN SHING-KWAN, O.B.E.
THE HONOURABLE DHUN JEHANGIR RUTTONJEE.
THE HONOURABLE CEDRIC BLAKER, M.C., E.D.
THE HONOURABLE KWOK CHAN, O.B.E.
DR. THE HONOURABLE ALBERTO MARIA RODRIGUES, M.B.E., E.D.
MR. RONALD THOMPSON (*Deputy Clerk of Councils*).

ABSENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE COMMANDER BRITISH FORCES
LIEUTENANT-GENERAL SIR WILLIAM HENRY STRATTON, K.C.B., C.V.O., C.B.E., D.S.O.

MINUTES.

The Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 27th March, 1957, were confirmed.

PAPERS.

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

<i>Subject.</i>	<i>G.N. No.</i>
First Report of the Law Reform Committee.	
Trade Unions and Trade Disputes Ordinance.	
Trade Unions (Registration) (Amendment) Rules, 1957	A. 28.
Import Control Order, 1947.	
Amendment of General Licence No. 1	A. 32.
Emergency Regulations Ordinance.	
Emergency (Detention) (Rescission) Regulations, 1957	A. 33.
New Territories Ordinance.	
Markets and Market Areas (N.T.) (Amendment) Rules, 1957	A. 34.
New Territories Ordinance.	
Wo Hop Shek Cemetery (Establishment) Rules, 1957	A. 35.
Public Health (Sanitation) Ordinance, 1935.	
Wo Hop Shek (Public Health (Sanitation) Ordinance)	
Application Order, 1957	A. 36.
Stamp Ordinance.	
Stamp (Bank Authorization) (No. 1) Order, 1957	A. 37.

He said: With regard to the First Report of the Law Reform Committee which was appointed by Your Excellency in March last year I would inform honourable Members that Government has accepted the recommendation in that report that legislation similar to the United Kingdom Defamation Act, 1952, should be adopted in Hong Kong and a Bill will be introduced in due course.

LANDLORD AND TENANT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1957.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved the First reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the Landlord and Tenant Ordinance, Chapter 255."

He said: Although the main purport of this Bill is clearly set out in the Objects and Reasons, it is necessary for me to say a few words by way of amplification. The sections of the Ordinance which this Bill seeks to repeal enable a Crown lessee who is subject to a building covenant to obtain a certificate from the Director of Public Works which, subject to appeal by interested parties, permits him to recover vacant possession for the purpose of redeveloping his property in accordance with the terms of the covenant. Among other terms of the covenant is a time limit within which the redevelopment has to be completed. This time limit is imposed in order to serve the public interest that lease renewals should be subject to the more intensive development of the property in conformity with current needs and modern standards. Indeed, in order to encourage early redevelopment it is the practice to accept applications for lease renewals up to 20 years before the expiry of the original term and on approval of the application to impose the appropriate time limit on the building covenant to run from the date of approval. In order to comply with the building covenant in future it will be necessary for the lessee to obtain an exclusion order under section 31. Applications under this section are voluntary and when the applicant has been made aware of the conditions imposed on the exclusion order, including compensation to the tenants, it is still open to him to withdraw if he finds those conditions unacceptable. It would clearly be inequitable that a lessee whose only means of complying with a building covenant will now be by proceeding under section 31 should be compelled to accept conditions attaching to an exclusion order which are outside his control and of which he will have no prior knowledge at the time he accepts the building

covenant under his lease renewal. To meet this difficulty so long as the present legislative position obtains, future lease renewals will provide that the time limit under the building covenant will only begin to run from the time when either the lessee obtains vacant possession of the existing premises or the existing premises are no longer subject to the provisions of the Landlord and Tenant Ordinance. For those lessees who are already subject to a covenant and not having applied for a certificate from the Director of Public Works will now be deprived of the procedure under section 3, extensions of time will be granted without penalty on the basis I have just mentioned. I realize that there is a risk that these arrangements may retard desirable redevelopment but that is a risk the Government is prepared to take since it is not thought that lessees generally will be deterred by this change in the law from proceeding with redevelopment.

There is one further matter I have to mention, Sir. Lease renewals at present contain a provision that until the building covenant has been fulfilled the lease can only be assigned with the permission of the Director of Public Works. This provision is inserted to discourage speculation and a charge is usually made for such permission. In future, this provision will be omitted from the terms of lease renewal and in cases in which it has already been imposed permission to assign will be freely granted without monetary or other penalty.

Sir, that is all I think I need say by way of explanation to supplement the declared objects and reasons of the Bill.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL SECONDED.

The question was put and agreed to.

The Bill was read a First time.

Objects and Reasons.

The "Objects and Reasons" for the Bill were stated as follows: —

This Bill provides for the repeal of sections 3A, 3B, 3C, 3D and 3E of the Landlord and Tenant Ordinance, Cap. 255 (1953 Reprint), with effect as from 9 April, 1957. A lessee of the Crown who is liable under a building covenant to demolish his premises and rebuild is enabled by section 3A to obtain vacant possession of premises subject to the Landlord and Tenant

Ordinance, where the Director of Public Works, being of opinion that it is reasonable that such covenant should be complied with and that the lessee should be given vacant possession, issues a re-building certificate. Sections 3B, 3C and 3D provide for appeals to the Governor in Council from decisions of the Director of Public Works, and section 3E lays down the procedure where a re-building certificate has been granted.

2. Compensation may be awarded for disturbance suffered by tenants dispossessed by reason of "exclusion orders" under section 31, but none is payable to tenants evicted in consequence of the issue by the Director of Public Works of a re-building certificate under section 3A. It is considered that this distinction between two classes of evicted tenants is invidious and that the situation should be remedied.

3. As the Government has no evidence that landlords are not anxious to get rid of out-moded property and develop their sites to the greatest extent permissible, and as the Director of Public Works can deal with dangerous buildings under the new Buildings Ordinance, it is considered that the best remedy is to repeal the aforesaid sections, leaving landlords to take exemption proceedings under section 31 whereupon tenants will be entitled to claim compensation for disturbance.

PROBATE AND ADMINISTRATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1957.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the First reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the Probate and Administration Ordinance, Chapter 10".

He said: Sir, this Bill provides for the disposal of a deceased prisoner's property up to a total value of \$5,000 without production of probate or letters of administration, and I would just add to the statement of objects and reasons that the Commissioner of Prisons, who is charged with the administration of this matter, is of course required to make over the property to the person he considers to be entitled to it.

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 object of this Bill is to empower the Commissioner of Prisons to dispose of the property, up to a total value of five thousand dollars, of a prisoner who dies in a prison or in a training centre, without the necessity of production of grant of representation.

CROWN PROCEEDINGS BILL, 1957.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the First reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the law relating to the civil liabilities and rights of the Crown and to civil proceedings by and against the Crown, to amend the law relating to the civil liabilities of persons other than the Crown in certain cases involving the affairs or property of the Crown and for purposes connected with the matters aforesaid."

He said: Sir, this is a Bill of much technicality but the main purposes and provisions are explained in very general terms in the statement of objects and reasons. It is, however, an important measure and I think that on this occasion there is ample justification for adding something to that statement—something in very general terms, for it would be possible to talk for hours in explanation of the multifarious provisions of this Bill. And I would not like, Sir, to place any member of this Council in the position of a member of the House of Lords of whom it is said that on one occasion he dreamt he was addressing that august assembly and when he woke up he found that he was. (*Laughter*).

Sir, the first paragraph of the Objects and Reasons reads as follows: —

"The object of this Bill is, primarily, by modifying the exceptional position of the Crown, to make the law of Crown Proceedings accord in greater measure with the principle of equality before the law, and the Bill is modelled on the United Kingdom Crown Proceedings Act of 1947."

Honourable Members will observe that reference is made to the exceptional position of the Crown and to the purpose of assimilating as far as possible the Crown's position to that of the subject.

First of all, Sir, I would like to say something of a historical nature about the exceptional position of the Crown. In the Middle Ages, writs were issued, as they still are, in the name of the Sovereign; the Courts were, as they still are, the Sovereign's Courts; and justice was, and still is, administered in the name of the Sovereign. As a result of this, two rules were laid down by the common lawyers. First—a rule of law—that the Sovereign can do no wrong; secondly—as a matter of procedure—that the Sovereign cannot be impleaded in his own Courts. Therefore, at common law, the Sovereign enjoyed a wide immunity which extended not only to the Sovereign personally but to the Crown in its widest sense. I would, however, emphasize that this immunity did not extend, and has never extended, to Crown servants personally; they are and always were liable and it was no defence to them to plead that they were acting on the Crown's orders.

As time went on, a measure of redress was made available to the subject by way of what was called petition of right, and this was put on a statutory footing in England in 1860. The subject could not sue as of right but could present a petition setting forth the matter of his grievance, and the Crown would, in appropriate cases, grant what is called the fiat and endorse the petition with the words "Let right be done". Thereupon the matter was referred to the Courts for decision. But, Sir, the petition of right was only available in four cases: it was only available for the recovery of, first, a debt or liquidated sum due under contract or by statute; secondly, an unliquidated sum due by statute; thirdly, damages for breach of contract, and fourthly, property in the hands of the Crown. In relation to what we lawyers know as torts, that is to say, acts or omissions giving rise to a civil remedy which is not an action of contract, the subject had no redress at all, and that is in law the position in this Colony today. It is not, however, to be assumed that the Crown has been entirely deaf to claims for redress where a citizen has thought that he has been wronged by some action of a servant of the Crown and has brought his grievance to the notice of the authorities.

So far as the granting of the fiat is concerned, it has long been the practice of Attorneys-General who are charged with the responsibility of advising in such matters, to advise its grant even where they have thought that the claim was bad in law. So far as actions sounding in tort are concerned, the Crown, as I have said, could not be sued, but where proceedings have been brought against a Crown servant, it has been the practice in appropriate

cases for the Crown to stand behind that servant where liability has been established. But honourable Members will appreciate that this is not a very satisfactory position, and it was one which was remedied as far as possible in the United Kingdom by the Crown Proceedings Act of 1947 on which this Bill is modelled.

I will now turn, if I may, to the question of assimilating the Crown's position to that of the subject. Let me say right away that complete assimilation is not possible, and a few moments' reflection will show why. The private citizen does not, for example, have the same kind of responsibility for protecting the public; he does not have the care of the public safety; he does not have the defence of the realm to consider; he is not responsible for the organization of such public services as the Post Office; and in these matters the Crown is involved in duties and responsibilities which no subject is required to undertake. It is for this reason, Sir, that in the statement of Objects and Reasons the assimilation is expressed to be "in great measure" and "so far as possible", and in this connexion I would invite attention to clauses 7 and 8 of the Bill which limit the liability of the Crown in certain respects.

Clause 7 limits its liability in connexion with postal packages, and that is because there is no real analogy between the position of the Post Office and that of the private citizen. The Crown is under an obligation to carry mails and cannot protect itself by means of a special contract with each sender of a postal packet containing conditions exempting it from liability. To accept general liability would, I submit, open up alarming possibilities. For example, suppose it was alleged that delay in delivering a letter had caused a loss of large profits on some transaction; it would be well-nigh impossible for those defending the Crown in such proceedings to refute such a claim. So general liability has been excluded, but I would point out that under this clause the Crown for the first time takes on a statutory liability in respect of loss or damage to registered inland postal packages. Compensation under this clause will be on a scale dependent on the amount of the registration fee.

I now come to clause 8 which relates to the Armed Forces. Apart from this clause, it would be possible for members of the Armed Forces to sue each other, and also the Crown, in respect of accidents occurring while on duty or while on any land, premises, ship, aircraft or vehicle used for forces purposes. It

was thought by the Government of the day when the United Kingdom Crown Proceedings Bill was before Parliament that it would be undesirable to allow such a liability to run at large, and the liability was excluded in cases where the service member suffering the accident is qualified for pension. It appears from the debates in Parliament that this was something of a compromise, but it seems to me a reasonable one, having regard to all the circumstances, for again you cannot draw a true analogy between the position of a member of the Armed Forces and that of a civilian. At all events, I think we should follow the United Kingdom provision, and this we do in clause 8.

I should perhaps emphasize one other important matter, and it is, that this Bill only enables the Crown to be sued in respect of the Government of Hong Kong and in relation to acts or omissions for which that Government is responsible.

Sir, to sum up, the main purposes of the Bill are first, to make the Crown liable for torts committed by its servants in cases where a citizen would be liable for his servant; and secondly, to enable the citizen to sue the Crown without the necessity of obtaining the Governor's consent as is required by existing law. This Bill has been considered by the Judiciary, the Bar Association and the Law Society, and I trust that no serious flaws will be found. However, in a measure of this complexity and technicality, one cannot give a guarantee against error and I hope that lawyers and laymen alike will scrutinize it between now and the Committee stage. If any queries are brought to my notice they will be carefully considered, so that, if necessary, amendments may be made.

Sir, with this explanation I commend the Bill to the consideration of this Council as one designed to foster in the subject the feeling that he can get justice in the Courts in relation to grievances which he feels he has suffered at the hands of servants of this Government.

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 object of this Bill is, primarily, by modifying the exceptional position of the Crown, to make the law of Crown Proceedings accord in greater measure with the principle of equality before the law, and the Bill is modelled on the United Kingdom Crown Proceedings Act of 1947.

2. In general, and apart from special statutory provision (such as, for example, that relating to recovery of moneys due to the Government by way of rent, rates, etc.), proceedings by and against the Government are at present regulated by Order XIX of the Civil Code of Procedure, and claims against the Government can only be brought within a very limited compass. By derivation from the maxim that the Sovereign can do no wrong, the rule of law is that the Crown cannot be sued in tort—cannot be sued in the Courts by a person who has, for example, suffered personal injury as a result of being run down by a motor car driven by a servant of the Crown acting within the scope of his authority. This Bill seeks to remedy that situation, and if it becomes law, the private citizen will have a right of action against the Crown for wrongs committed by its servants if such wrongs would be actionable had they been committed by the servant of an ordinary citizen. But it should be stated that this piece of legislation is also restricted in scope for it does not enable the Crown to be sued save in respect of the Government of Hong Kong and only in respect of acts or omissions for which the local Government is responsible; it does not for example enable Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom to be sued nor the Government of any Dominion or Colonial territory. Moreover, there are other necessary limitations stemming from the peculiar position of the Crown, for example, the position in relation to privilege of documents must be preserved. But on the whole this Bill does assimilate, so far as possible, legal proceedings by and against the Crown to legal proceedings between private individuals and it does extend the liability of the Crown to torts committed by its servants.

3. A Comparative Table is attached showing the United Kingdom derivation of each section and also its Fiji equivalent.

4. The Bill is divided into five Parts of which the crossheadings are: Part I—Preliminary (clauses 1 and 2); Part II—Substantive Law (clauses 3 to 9 inclusive); Part III—Jurisdiction and Procedure (clauses 10 to 19 inclusive); Part IV—Judgments and Execution (clauses 20 to 23 inclusive); and Part V—Miscellaneous and Supplemental (clauses 24 to 34 inclusive).

5. Here follow comments on the more important clauses or provisions—

Clause 3. This section creates no new liability, but is procedural in effect. Its general effect is that where a person could have enforced a claim against the Crown in any way before, he may do so now by action as of right and without the necessity of obtaining the Governor's consent under Order XIX of the Civil Procedure Rules.

Clause 4. This makes, for the first time, the Crown generally liable in tort, *i.e.*, for civil injuries or wrongs independent of contract. It should be noted that subclause (6) is a stop-gap inserted to save the Crown from liability in respect of ships, docks, etc., until such time as the United Kingdom Parliament has passed legislation. It is considered that legislation applicable to Colonial territories in respect of the matters dealt with in sections 5 to 8 of the United Kingdom Act should be by a United Kingdom Act.

Clause 7. This clause imposes on the Crown for the first time a statutory liability in respect of loss of or damage to registered inland postal packages up to the amount covered by the registration.

Clause 8. (1) This clause exempts the Crown and any member of the armed forces causing the injury from claims in tort in respect of death or personal injury caused by one member of the armed forces while on duty to another while on duty or in the circumstances specified in paragraph (a) of sub-clause (1). Exemption also applies where death or personal injury results from the nature or condition of the matters specified in paragraph (a) of sub-clause (2).

(ii) The "Crown" in this clause includes Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom. Exemption will only be applicable if the appropriate certificate is forthcoming that a pension or gratuity has been earned, and it should be noted that exemption is limited to cases of death or personal injury.

Clause 34. This clause contains provisions limiting proceedings by and against the Crown to those by and against the Government of Hong Kong.

MEDICAL REGISTRATION BILL, 1957.

DR. YEO KOK CHEANG moved the First reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to repeal, and to re-enact with amendment, the Medical Registration Ordinance, Chapter 161."

He said: Sir, this Bill has for its object the replacement of the Medical Registration Ordinance, Chapter 161, with a comprehensive Ordinance re-enacting in amended form the substantive provisions of the existing Ordinance.

Explanations of the different parts of the Bill are set forth in the "Objects and Reasons" and I feel it unnecessary to add to what is contained there. I would, however, draw specific attention to section 27, which represents a major departure from the corresponding provision in the Medical Registration Ordinance, Chapter 161. Under this section, an unregistered medical practitioner, other than one exempted from registration under sections 28 and 29, will be completely prohibited from practising Western medicine, whether for gain or not.

In order that the clinics which have been operating with unregistered doctors may be given time to secure the services of registered ones, provision has been made to delay the coming into operation of section 27 until 1st January, 1958.

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 object of this Bill is to replace the Medical Registration Ordinance (Cap. 161) with a comprehensive Ordinance re-enacting in amended form the substantive provisions of the existing Ordinance. The Bill will come into operation on a date to be appointed by the Governor, with the exception of clause 27 which will not come into operation until 1st January, 1958.

2. The Bill consists of five parts as follows—

Part I—Citation, Commencement and Interpretation.

Part II—The Medical Council of Hong Kong.

Part III—Registration of Medical Practitioners.

Part IV—Disciplinary Proceedings, and Offences.

Part V—Examinations, Savings, Regulations and Repeal.

3. Part II—The Medical Council of Hong Kong—This Part establishes the Medical Council of Hong Kong in substitution for the Medical Board under the existing Ordinance, and provides for its meeting and procedure.

4. Part III—Registration of Medical Practitioners—This part establishes a Register of Medical Practitioners maintained by the Director of Medical and Health Services as Registrar, and makes detailed provision as to qualification for registration, publication of register and the privileges and duties of medical practitioners.

5. Part IV—Disciplinary Proceedings, and Offences—This part gives the Medical Council jurisdiction to inquire into allegations of misconduct on the part of medical practitioners and gives power to hear evidence on oath, summon witnesses, etc. Appeal from a decision of the Medical Council is to the Full Court. Clause 27 creates the offence of practising medicine, following on the corresponding Singapore legislation as compared to the present offence, which is practising medicine for gain which follows U. K. legislation.

6. Part V—Examinations, Savings, Regulations and Repeal—This Part makes amended provision as to exemption from registration and as to Chinese medicine contained in the existing Ordinance. By clause 33, section 14 of the existing Ordinance is continued in operation until section 27, which relates to unqualified persons practising medicine, comes into operation on 1st January, 1958.

7. A Table of Comparison annexed to these Objects and Reasons specifies the local and Singapore legislation on which this Bill is based, and also seeks to indicate briefly where and why these differ from such precedent legislation.

SHOPS (HOURS OF CLOSING) (REPEAL) BILL, 1957.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the Second reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to repeal the Shops (Hours of Closing) Ordinance, Chapter 62".

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

The Bill was read a Second time.

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were agreed to.

Council then resumed.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL reported that the Shops (Hours of Closing) (Repeal) Bill, 1957 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.

ENEMY PROPERTY LEGISLATION REPEAL BILL, 1957.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the Second reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to repeal the Ordinances relating to Trading with the Enemy and Enemy Property".

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

The Bill was read a Second time.

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were agreed to.

Council then resumed.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL reported that the Enemy Property Legislation Repeal Bill, 1957 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.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY BILL, 1957.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the Second reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to impose penalties for trading with the enemy, to make provision as respects the property of enemies and enemy subjects, and for purposes connected with the matters aforesaid."

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 13 were agreed to.

Council then resumed.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL reported that the Trading with the Enemy Bill, 1957 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.

KOWLOON CITY BAPTIST CHURCH BILL, 1957.

MR. KWOK CHAN moved the First reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to provide for the incorporation of the Trustees of the Kowloon City Baptist Church."

He said: This Bill follows the usual and customary form of an incorporation bill and its purpose is clearly set out in the Objects and Reasons.

MR. NGAN SHING-KWAN 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: —

1. The members of the Kowloon City Baptist Church have erected a church and desire to elect trustees and to incorporate the trustees as a corporation to ensure perpetual succession.

2. Clause 1 of the Bill comprises the short title of the Ordinance.
3. Clause 2 defines the Church.
4. Clause 3 incorporates the trustees.
5. Clause 4 defines the powers of the corporation.
6. Clause 5 provides for the restriction on sale of property.
7. Clause 6 provides for the succession to property.
8. Clause 7 provides for the number of trustees.
9. Clause 8 provides for the vacation of office by trustees.
10. Clause 9 provides for the appointment and tenure of office of trustees.
11. Clause 10 provides for notification of changes of trustees.
12. Clause 11 provides for the execution of deeds.
13. Clause 12 provides for the custody of deeds and document.
14. Clause 13 empowers a committee to draw up regulations.
15. Clause 14 requires such regulations to be approved before becoming binding.
16. Clause 15 contains provisions saving the rights of the Cown.

ADJOURNMENT.

H. E. THE GOVERNOR: —That concludes the business gentlemen. When is it your pleasure that we should meet again?

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

H. E. THE GOVERNOR: —Council will adjourn to this day fortnight.