

**OFFICIAL REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS.****Meeting of 8th January, 1958.****PRESENT:**

HIS EXCELLENCY THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT (*PRESIDENT*)

MR. EDGEWORTH BERESFORD DAVID, C.M.G.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE COMMANDER BRITISH FORCES

LIEUTENANT-GENERAL SIR EDRIC MONTAGUE BASTYAN, K.B.E., C.B.

THE HONOURABLE THE COLONIAL SECRETARY

MR. CLAUDE BRAMALL BURGESS, C.M.G., O.B.E. (*Acting*).

THE HONOURABLE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

MR. ARTHUR RIDEHALGH, Q.C.

THE HONOURABLE THE SECRETARY FOR CHINESE AFFAIRS

MR. JOHN CRICHTON MCDOUALL.

THE HONOURABLE THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY

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

THE HONOURABLE PATRICK CARDINALL MASON SEDGWICK  
(*Commissioner of Labour*).

THE HONOURABLE DAVID RONALD HOLMES, M.B.E., M.C., E.D.  
(*Director of Urban Services*).

THE HONOURABLE ALLAN INGLIS  
(*Director of Public Works*).

DR. THE HONOURABLE GEORGE GRAHAM-CUMMING  
(*Acting Director of Medical and Health 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, O.B.E.

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. MAURICE DEREK SARGANT (*Deputy Clerk of Councils*).

**MINUTES.**

The Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 18th December, 1957 were confirmed.

**ANNOUNCEMENT.**

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: —By Your Excellency's direction I rise to announce the appointment of the Standing Law Committee for 1958. The following members have been appointed and have agreed to serve: —

The Honourable the Attorney General (Chairman)

The Honourable Lo Man Wai

The Honourable Dhun Ruttonjee

The Honourable C. Blaker

Dr. the Honourable A. M. Rodrigues.

**PAPERS.**

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

*Subject.*

*G.N. No.*

Sessional Papers, 1958: —

No. 1 — Annual Report by the Director of Agriculture,  
Fisheries and Forestry for the year 1956/57.

No. 2 — Annual Report by the Commissioner for Resettlement  
for the year 1956/57.

No. 3 — Annual Report by the Director of Audit for the  
year 1956/57.

Report of the Administrator of German Enemy Property, 1957.

Land Registration Ordinance.

Land Registration Fees Regulations, 1957 ..... A. 104.

**HONG KONG TOURIST ASSOCIATION  
(AMENDMENT) BILL, 1958.**

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved the First reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the Hong Kong Tourist Association Ordinance, 1957."

He said: Section 15 of the principal Ordinance, which became law in June last year, requires the Tourist Association Board to make recommendations, within two years of its establishment, for broadening the basis of membership of the Association.

The Board has now proposed that there should be two classes of Members, Ordinary Members and Associate Members, and that Ordinary Membership should be open to Air and Surface Carriers, individual firms engaged in the selling of travel facilities (provided that such firms are recognized travel or tourist agencies) and hotels which provide accommodation for travellers and tourists, while Associate Membership would be open to organizations, firms or individuals who, while interested in travel and tourist development, either commercially or culturally, are not eligible for full Membership.

These recommendations have been accepted by the Government and this Bill is designed to give effect to them and at the same time to make it clear that the Board has the power to terminate any ordinary or associate membership. The opportunity has also been taken to provide that the members of the Board shall become *ex-officio* Members of the Association.

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: —

Pursuant to section 15 of the Hong Kong Tourist Association Ordinance, No. 29 of 1957 (which requires the Board of Management to make, within two years of its establishment, recommendations as to the desirability of increasing the classes of persons

eligible for membership of the Tourist Association), the Board has recommended to the Governor a broadening of the basis of membership of the Association. The amendments proposed by this Bill will make the members of the Board of Management *ex-officio* members of the Association and provide for the admission to the Association of ordinary and associate members. An application for associate membership will have to be sponsored by two ordinary members, and an associate member, although entitled to attend meetings of the Association, will not be entitled to take part in the proceedings or to vote.

### **MERCHANDISE MARKS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1958.**

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the First reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the provisions of the Merchandise Marks Ordinance, Chapter 41."

He said: Sir, the Merchandise Marks Ordinance, which is based on the English Act of 1887, is designed to protect the public against false trade descriptions, and the purpose of this Bill is to amend that Ordinance, in the respects explained in some detail in the statement of Objects and Reasons. I would, however, add a word or two of general explanation.

The English Act of 1887 was amended in 1953 to bring it into line with merchanting practice which had undergone considerable change over the last half century, and we are following suit. Briefly, the position is that under the principal Ordinance subject to certain exceptions and defences it is an offence to sell goods to which any false trade description is applied. The Ordinance defines the term "false trade description" as any description, statement or other indication direct or indirect as to a number of things set forth in the definition, as for example, the number, quantity, measure, gauge or weight of any goods.

It may be said that the main purpose of this Bill is twofold, first it widens the definition of "trade description" to include representations as to the standard of quality or the fitness for the purpose of any goods and as to the strength, performance or behaviour of any goods. Secondly, the definition of "false trade description" is widened to include misleading descriptions, that is of course to say, descriptions which are misleading in a material respect. Ingenious persons have found it possible to devise

means whereby they keep themselves within the law as it stands and yet convey an utterly misleading impression, for example, a vacuum flask marked "British Made" in bold type designed to catch the eye but bearing an insignificant imprint tucked away somewhere else to the effect that it has "Foreign Inners". To take another example, ladies' stockings might be marked "Full of Fashion" which is not a trade description but is liable to be mistaken for "Fully Fashioned" which is. Such cases will be brought within the Ordinance if the proposed amendments are passed into law.

Sir, this Bill will not affect what is called the ordinary trade puff such as "Beer is Best". These trade puffs are harmless in themselves and sometimes almost meaningless, and it is not the intention to interfere with their use.

Sir, this Bill has been drafted in consultation with the Hong Kong General Chamber of Commerce, the Incorporated Law Society and the Bar Association, and I think it is one which should commend itself both to the consumer and also to the trader who describes his goods in honest, temperate and moderate terms.

Sir, with these few remarks, for I think that the other provisions of the Bill are sufficiently explained in the statement of objects and reasons, I beg to move the first reading.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

The Bill was read a First time.

#### *Objects and Reasons.*

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

The purpose of the Bill is to bring local legislation relating to merchandise marks more closely into line with United Kingdom legislation on the subject.

2. Clause 2 of the Bill extends (subject to savings provided by clause 5) the scope of the definitions "false trade description" and "trade description" in subsection (1) of section 2 of the principal Ordinance and also amends, and brings up to date, the definition "trade mark" in that subsection. This clause is based upon section 1 of the Merchandise Marks Act, 1953.

3. The effect of clause 3 is—
- (a) to delete, and with slight modifications, re-enact subsection (2) of section 3 of the principal Ordinance, so as to clarify the possible defences under that subsection, which prescribes it an offence to sell, expose for, or possess for, sale or any purpose of trade or manufacture, goods or things to which a forged trade mark or false trade description is applied, or to which a trade mark or mark so nearly resembling a trade mark as to be calculated to deceive is falsely applied, and
  - (b) to increase the penalties provided in subsection (3) of section 3 of the principal Ordinance from imprisonment for two years and a fine of ten thousand dollars upon conviction on indictment to imprisonment for five years and a fine of one hundred thousand dollars; and in the case of summary conviction from imprisonment for six months or a fine of five thousand dollars to imprisonment for two years and a fine of fifty thousand dollars; and
  - (c) to render goods by means of or in relation to which an offence against the Ordinance has been committed, liable to forfeiture irrespective of whether any person has been convicted in respect of the offence; and
  - (d) to abolish the right of a defendant to elect trial on indictment before the Supreme Court.

The provisions relating to the clarification of defences follows those of section 4 of the Merchandise Marks Act, 1953. The increased penalties proposed in this Bill are considered necessary for the protection of the trade name of the Colony. It is to be noted that the corresponding penalties in the United Kingdom amount to an unlimited fine and two years imprisonment upon conviction on indictment and that section 5 of the Merchandise Marks Act, 1953, increased the corresponding penalties upon summary conviction from a fine of twenty pounds and four months imprisonment on a first conviction and a fine of fifty pounds and six months imprisonment on a second or subsequent conviction, to a fine of one hundred pounds and four months imprisonment on a first conviction and a fine of two hundred and fifty pounds and six months imprisonment on a second or subsequent conviction. In other words the fine on summary

conviction was increased in the United Kingdom five fold as recently as 1953. The more stringent provisions relating to the forfeiture of goods in respect of which an offence has been committed go further than the corresponding provisions of the United Kingdom legislation but are considered necessary to ensure that such goods do not remain a risk to the public merely because a defendant may succeed in one of the special defences provided, namely, that he acted innocently or had taken all reasonable precautions against the commission of an offence. Finally the abolition of the defendant's right to elect trial on indictment is in line with the pattern of Hong Kong legislation, where, except in the case of the principal Ordinance, a right to elect does not appear.

4. Clause 4 amends section 5 of the principal Ordinance to include goods delivered in pursuance of a request made by reference to a trade mark or mark or trade description by providing that such goods shall be deemed to be goods in connexion with which a trade mark or mark or trade description is used. This provision follows subsection (2A) of section 5 of the Merchandise Marks Act, 1887, and was inserted in that Act by section 10 of the Patents Etc. (International Conventions) Act, 1938.

5. Clause 5 amends section 11 of the principal Ordinance by enabling a search warrant to be issued in the case of goods in respect of which it is suspected that an offence against the provisions of the Ordinance has been or is being committed without the need for the issue of a summons against some specified person either before or concurrently with the issue of the warrant. Experience has shown that the present position whereby the issue of the search warrant is linked in time to the issue of the summons can be fatal to the seizure of the offending goods.

6. Clause 6 amends section 14 of the principal Ordinance, firstly, and upon the advice of the Secretary of State, to extend the protection given to United Kingdom industry to Hong Kong manufacturers and, secondly, to extend to certification trade marks the provisions relating to the use of United Kingdom or Hong Kong trade marks on imported goods. This amendment is based on section 3 of the Merchandise Marks Act, 1953.

7. Clause 7 amends section 16 of the principal Ordinance to provide the savings referred to in paragraph 2 above.

8. Clause 8 amends section 19 of the principal Ordinance to enable the Governor in Council by regulation to provide for the payment and protection of informers in the case of prosecutions undertaken by the Crown or a public officer in the general interests of the Colony.

9. Clause 9 adds a new section 20 to the principal Ordinance applying section 48 of the Magistrates Ordinance to articles which come into the possession of the Crown or a public officer in the course of proceedings under regulations made under the principal Ordinance and in respect of the disposal of which no other provision has been made.

### **MAN MO TEMPLE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1958.**

THE SECRETARY FOR CHINESE AFFAIRS moved the First reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the Man Mo Temple Ordinance, Chapter 154."

He said: Sir, as stated in the Objects and Reasons, the intention is to extend in certain directions the purposes to which the Man Mo Temple Fund may be applied. There is, however, no divergence from the principles which governed the original setting up of the Man Mo Temple Fund.

Both the existing Man Mo Temple Ordinance and the Tung Wah Hospital Ordinance provide that surplus funds shall be used *inter alia* for the assistance of charitable or philanthropic work amongst the Chinese of Hong Kong. Moreover, the administration both of Man Mo Temple and of Tung Wah Hospital Funds is vested in the Board of Directors.

The Bill now before Council, together with another Bill which seeks to amend the relevant section of the Tung Wah Hospital Ordinance, would if enacted, and within certain limits, facilitate the Board of Directors' use of a surplus in either Fund to assist approved projects initiated or financed by the other. The enactment of this Bill would also remove an obstacle at present blocking the development of property belonging to the Man Mo Temple—a development rightly urged by the present



Board of Directors in continuation of the Tung Wah Hospital's traditionally vigorous interest in sustaining and increasing its activities for the welfare of the Chinese community.

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 extend the purposes to which the Man Mo Temple Fund may be applied to enable proper development of property belonging to the said Fund and greater financial assistance to be given to the Tung Wah Hospital out of the income. Amendment of the Tung Wah Hospital Ordinance, Chapter 317, is proposed to enable the Tung Wah Hospital to finance the scheme of development.

2. For the avoidance of doubt opportunity is taken to define the expression "Tung Wah Hospital".

**TUNG WAH HOSPITAL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1958.**

THE SECRETARY FOR CHINESE AFFAIRS moved the First reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the Tung Wah Hospital Ordinance, Chapter 317."

He said: Sir, the intention behind this Bill has, I hope, been sufficiently explained in its Objects and Reasons and in the course of the first reading of the Bill to amend the Man Mo Temple Ordinance, Chapter 154.

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 extend the power of the corporation to enable financial assistance to be given for the proper development of property belonging to the Man Mo Temple Fund. Such development is for the mutual benefit of the corporation and the said Fund.

2. Amendment of the Man Mo Temple Fund Ordinance, Chapter 154, is also proposed for the purpose.

**TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS OF THE SECRETARY FOR  
CHINESE AFFAIRS BILL, 1958.**

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved the Second reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend certain laws of the Colony on the transfer to the Director of Social Welfare of certain functions now discharged by the Secretary for Chinese Affairs."

THE SECRETARY FOR CHINESE AFFAIRS seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

The Bill was read a Second time.

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

Clauses 1 and 2, and the Schedule were agreed to.

Council then resumed.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY reported that the Transfer of Functions of the Secretary for Chinese Affairs Bill, 1958 had passed through Committee without amendment and moved the Third reading.

THE SECRETARY FOR CHINESE AFFAIRS seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

The Bill was read a Third time and passed.

**EDUCATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1958.**

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the Second reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the Education Ordinance, 1952."

He said: Sir, this Bill was read a first time three weeks ago today, and since then there has been some comment in the Press—much of it perhaps due to misunderstanding. When I moved the first reading I did not go into any great detail because the statement of objects and reasons was very full and I certainly do not now propose to catalogue all that has been said and to answer seriatim. I would, however, say a word or two with the object of clearing up what may be genuine misunderstanding.

Sir, the policy of the Government is just the same as it was in 1952 when the principal Ordinance was passed. We wish to encourage the provision of educational facilities, but we would be failing—and failing sadly—in our duty were we to give everyone a free hand to use whatever premises he liked for whatever course of instruction he liked; we must, so far as we are able, protect pupils at schools, from physical hazards and also from educational hazards, that is to say, bad methods and political propaganda.

The effect of this Bill, it has been said in some quarters, will be to close down a great number of schools and thereby deprive a great number of children of a chance of schooling. Far from effecting the closure of registered private schools and making it more difficult for unregistered schools to obtain registration, this Bill prescribes practical measures which will enable many such schools in tenement premises to avoid closure under the provisions of the Buildings Ordinance, 1955.

That Ordinance, Sir, stipulates that the Building Authority must be notified of any intended change of use in a building and gives him power to prohibit such intended use, or to require the discontinuance of the present use, if it is his opinion that by reason of its construction the building is not suitable for the intended or present use. The majority of registered schools in Hong Kong are operated in premises, such as tenement buildings, which are not entirely suitable by reason of their construction for the purposes of a school, in particular the floor strength of such premises is not designed to take the weight of a large class of pupils. If the number of pupils allowed in such schools were

reduced to a figure consistent with the loading for which the premises were designed and constructed, it was estimated that there would be a loss of some 37,000 places, and the majority of such schools would be obliged to close down owing to the decrease in fee receipts. A technical committee was therefore appointed early in 1957 to advise on the risk involved in permitting such premises to be used for school purposes. This committee recommended that, in schools which are being, and which may in future be, operated in such premises, the minimum floor area for each pupil in a primary classroom should be 10 square feet, that is to say, the area required in all schools by regulation 41 of the Education Regulations, 1952, and that the minimum floor area for each pupil in a secondary classroom should be 12 square feet. That Committee also recommended that schools should not in future be registered in premises having floors supported by wooden joists, and that schools should not be registered in premises built under the Buildings Ordinance, 1955, unless, in each case, the premises are designed and constructed for the purposes of a school; they also recommended that certain restrictions should be imposed on the use of the premises, including restrictions on gymnastics and the assembly of large numbers of pupils, and they also recommended that a certificate from an authorized architect that the premises are in sound structural condition should be submitted annually to the Education Department.

These proposals which are incorporated in this Bill and in the draft Regulations, have been formulated with a view to allowing schools to operate in premises which might otherwise have been considered unsuitable, thus providing the greatest possible number of school places, and at the same time minimizing any risk to the safety of the pupils.

Here, Sir, I would emphasize that under the Education Ordinance, 1952, all schools are required to register; but in the registration of schools where there is no undue risk to the pupils because of fire or structural danger, the Director of Education proposes, for the time being and for so long as there is a shortage of school places, to exercise his discretion regarding other requirements for registration, and to be as lenient as possible in so far as the well-being of the pupils permits. It is, in fact, probable that many of the existing unregistered schools can be accepted for registration if they make proper application. I must,

however, stress the point that, while there is of course, no intention of wholesale closure of schools, where a school is operated in premises which, by reason of either structural or fire danger, constitute an undue risk to children and teachers in that school, the Government could not refrain from taking remedial action without laying itself open to justifiable criticism from every right-thinking person in the Colony. I need hardly say that, where a school has to be closed, the desirability of interrupting the education of the children concerned as little as possible and I repeat that, as little as possible, will be foremost in the mind of the Government. Sir, the public, in the particular parents, may rest assured that the main purpose of this legislation is to effect further safeguards for the well-being of the children. Registration of schools according to the requirements of the Education Ordinance not only ensures reasonable standards of safety regarding the premises, but, through periodic inspection and advice by officers of the Education Department, also ensures that schools are conducted along satisfactory lines.

There is one final point which I should mention, and it concerns subsection (4) of the new section 34A proposed by clause 33 of the Bill: that subsection will be found on page 18 and it reads as follows: —

"(4) Any person who behaves in an insulting manner or uses any threatening or insulting expression to or concerning or in the presence of the Appeals Board shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable to a fine of five hundred dollars and to imprisonment for three months."

It has been represented to me that this provision is drawn too wide, and although it follows precedent, I think it should be amended to make it plain that it is applicable only to threats and insults to or in the presence of the Board. I shall therefore at the Committee stage move to leave out the words "or concerning" in the third line of that subsection.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

MR. C. E. M. TERRY: —I rise to speak on this Bill not because I dissent from its provisions, but because I feel that it is necessary publicly to rebut some of what has appeared in the Press both by way of reported expressions of opinion and in the correspondence columns.

An examination of these recent articles and letters in the Press shows clearly that the majority of the critics have either misunderstood the Bill, and have not read it in conjunction with the principal Ordinance which it amends, or, which is more deplorable, have in some cases deliberately misrepresented and exaggerated its effects by what Labouchere once described as "organized, audacious and malicious mendacity".

I agree with my honourable Friend the Attorney General that far from discouraging private schools, this Bill aids them by providing measures which will enable them to use tenement premises which otherwise they would have been debarred from using by the provisions of the Buildings Ordinance, 1955. Nor are there any new requirements which make it more difficult for unregistered schools to register. As my honourable Friend said when he introduced this Bill at the first reading, detailed explanations are given in the "Objects and Reasons" set forth at the end of the Bill, and I believe that a study of these explanations would have answered almost all the legitimate queries which have been raised about the Bill. It is also worthy of particular notice, Sir, that established educational bodies of repute in Hong Kong such as the Hong Kong Teachers' Association, the Private Vernacular Schools' Association, and the Private English Schools' Association have made no representations against the Bill; they are the ones more concerned with the matters at issue than anyone, and the ones who may be expected to have a real insight into the present position.

It is a sad thing, but it is quite apparent, that there are various individuals and groups in Hong Kong who are particularly concerned that education and schools should be as free from all controls as possible so that they may, for the one part, be at liberty to exploit the present shortage of school places for their own financial gain, and, for the other part, be able to bring particular political and other influences to bear on the schools through the introduction of indoctrinated teachers and pupils, and through other underhand methods of infiltration of political propaganda.

We who live in Hong Kong want our schools to be free from political propaganda and underhand influence, and we want all our pupils to be safe-guarded as far as possible from any danger to their lives, health or general well-being. I should

imagine that the Director of Education would be the last person to wish to impose any unnecessary controls, for they must necessarily add to his already large administrative duties, but I am certain that the clarifications of present safeguards and the new safe-guards proposed in this Bill are, under existing circumstances, absolutely necessary. They have been carefully examined by honourable Members of the Executive Council as well as by this Council, and have received the close scrutiny and approval of the Board of Education. The composition of that Board, which includes three of my honourable colleagues of this Council, is in itself sufficient to ensure that Government stands no chance of getting away with undesirable restrictions. The very fact that many who have attacked the Bill have resorted to methods of exaggeration and misrepresentation to my mind only underlines the existence of undesirable elements which are anxious to have power and free-play in our schools, and shows more clearly than ever the necessity for the Bill.

Honest criticisms and doubts are another matter, and if any such remain I would point out that the Education Ordinance provides for an Appeals Board composed entirely of unofficial members, to which, under the terms of the Ordinance, appeal may be made against decisions of the Director of Education. This, Sir, provides an immediate and distinct check on any possibility of powers being used in a dictatorial fashion.

I see little of any substance that has been raised against this Bill and nothing that cannot be met in the normal way by the exercise of discretion in administration; on the other hand I see much in its favour. I therefore give the Bill my full support, not, Sir, because it is a Government Bill, but because it is a measure introduced by Government which, in my opinion, manifestly serves the public interest.

The question was put and agreed to.

The Bill was read a Second time.

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

H. E. THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT: —As this Bill contains a large number of clauses, gentlemen, we will with your permission take them in blocks of five.

Clauses 1 to 32 were agreed to.

Clause 33.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: —Clause 33, Sir, I beg to move the amendment standing in my name.

*Proposed Amendment.*

In the third line of subsection (4) of the new section 34A, leave out the words—

“or concerning”.

Clause 33, as amended, was agreed to.

Clauses 34 to 49 were agreed to.

Council then resumed.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL reported that the Education (Amendment) Bill, 1958 had passed through Committee with one amendment and moved the Third reading.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

The Bill was read a Third time and passed.

#### **TOWN PLANNING (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1958.**

MR. A. INGLIS moved the Second reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance further to amend the Town Planning Ordinance, Chapter 131."

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 3 were agreed to.

Council then resumed.

MR. A. INGLIS reported that the Town Planning (Amendment) Bill, 1958 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.

**HONG KONG AIRPORT (CONTROL OF OBSTRUCTIONS)  
(AMENDMENT) BILL, 1958.**

MR. A. INGLIS moved the Second reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the Hong Kong Airport (Control of Obstructions) Ordinance, 1957."

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

The Bill was read a Second time.

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

Clauses 1 to 8 were agreed to.

Council then resumed.

MR. A. INGLIS reported that the Hong Kong Airport (Control of Obstructions) (Amendment) Bill, 1958 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.

**ADJOURNMENT.**

H. E. THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT: —That concludes our business for today, gentlemen. When is it your pleasure that we should meet again?

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

H. E. THE OFFICER ADMINISTERING THE GOVERNMENT: —Council will adjourn to this day fortnight.