

OFFICIAL REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS**Meeting of 23rd December 1964****PRESENT:**

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR (*PRESIDENT*)
SIR DAVID CLIVE CROSBIE TRENCH, KCMG, MC
HIS EXCELLENCY LIEUTENANT-GENERAL SIR DENIS STUART SCOTT O'CONNOR,
KBE, CB
COMMANDER BRITISH FORCES
THE HONOURABLE EDMUND BRINSLEY TEESDALE, CMG, MC
COLONIAL SECRETARY
THE HONOURABLE MAURICE HEENAN, QC
ATTORNEY GENERAL
THE HONOURABLE JOHN CRICHTON McDOUALL
SECRETARY FOR CHINESE AFFAIRS
THE HONOURABLE JOHN JAMES COWPERTHWAITTE, CMG, OBE
FINANCIAL SECRETARY
THE HONOURABLE KENNETH STRATHMORE KINGHORN
DIRECTOR OF URBAN SERVICES
THE HONOURABLE ALEC MICHAEL JOHN WRIGHT
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS
DR THE HONOURABLE TENG PIN-HUI, OBE
DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL AND HEALTH SERVICES
THE HONOURABLE WILLIAM DAVID GREGG
DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION
THE HONOURABLE PATRICK CARDINALL MASON SEDGWICK
COMMISSIONER OF LABOUR
THE HONOURABLE DAVID RONALD HOLMES, CBE, MC, ED
DIRECTOR OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY
THE HONOURABLE JAMES TINKER WAKEFIELD
DISTRICT COMMISSIONER, NEW TERRITORIES
THE HONOURABLE DHUN JEHANGIR RUTTONJEE, CBE
THE HONOURABLE FUNG PING-FAN, OBE
THE HONOURABLE RICHARD CHARLES LEE, CBE
THE HONOURABLE KWAN CHO-YIU, OBE
THE HONOURABLE KAN YUET-KEUNG, OBE
THE HONOURABLE SIDNEY SAMUEL GORDON
THE HONOURABLE LI FOOK-SHU, OBE
THE HONOURABLE FUNG HON-CHU
THE HONOURABLE TANG PING-YIJAN
THE HONOURABLE TSE YU-CHUEN, OBE
THE HONOURABLE KENNETH ALBERT WATSON, OBE
THE HONOURABLE WOO PAK-CHUEN, OBE
THE HONOURABLE GEORGE RONALD ROSS
MR ANDREW McDONALD, CHAPMAN (*Deputy Clerk of Councils*)

MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 2nd December 1964, were confirmed.

PAPERS

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

<i>Subject</i>	<i>LN No</i>
Sessional Paper, 1964: —	
No 48—Annual Report by the Manager and Chief Engineer, Railway for the year 1963-64.	
No 49—Annual Report by the Commissioner of Rating and Valuation for the year 1963-64.	
Registration of Persons Ordinance, 1960.	
Registration of Persons (Re-registration) (No 43) Order, 1964	176
Registration of Persons Ordinance, 1960.	
Registration of Persons (Cancellation of Registration and Identity Cards) (No 20) Order, 1964	177
Registration of Persons Ordinance, 1960.	
Registration of Persons (Re-registration) (No 44) Order, 1964	178
Registration of Persons Ordinance, 1960.	
Registration of Persons (Cancellation of Registration and Identity Cards) (No 21) Order, 1964	179
Stamp Ordinance.	
Stamp (Bank Authorization) (No 3) Order, 1964	180
Registration of Persons Ordinance, 1960.	
Registration of Persons (Re-registration) (No 45) Order, 1964	181
Registration of Persons Ordinance, 1960.	
Registration of Persons (Cancellation of Registration and Identity Cards) (No 22) Order, 1964	182

QUESTIONS

MR S. S. GORDON, pursuant to notice, asked the following questions: —

- Sir, (i) In view of the widespread increases in rateable values to take effect from 1st April next year, will Government explain the policy whereby the rateable value can be set at a figure higher than a rental which has been agreed by free negotiation between landlord and tenant on an arms length basis?
- (ii) As the Rent Increases (Domestic Premises) Control Ordinance is intended to control rather than stimulate rent increases, does Government consider it desirable that rateable values of owner occupied premises should be increased at this time?
- (iii) As an increase in rateable values is, in effect, an increase in taxation, would it not be more appropriate, if such increased taxation is in fact required, for it to be introduced openly through this Council?

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY replied as follows: —

Sir, as to my honourable Friend's first question, this is not a question of day-to-day policy but of existing law and of fact. The Commissioner of Rating and Valuation has a statutory duty to assess the rateable value of tenements and rateable value is defined in the Rating Ordinance as the rent at which any tenement might reasonably be expected to let, at the time of valuation, from year to year.

The first point then which should be stressed is that it is not the Commissioner who increases rateable values. He merely assesses from time to time any changes that have actually taken place in rateable value, that is, in the rent at which premises may be reasonably expected to let; and his judgement of this is subject to challenge in the courts.

The second point is that the law, deliberately, does not equate rateable value with the actual rent of a tenement. Quite apart from the dangers of collusion between landlord and tenant (I realize that my honourable Friend is not referring to such cases), there is never a perfect market for the leasing of property, even "at arm's length" to use my honourable Friend's expression. Two identical tenements may be let at quite different rents. A landlord may, for example, be happy to accommodate a particularly good

tenant at less than market rent in order to retain him. It may be reasonable that this tenant enjoy a lower rent than others by reason of his virtues as a tenant; but does he also have a reasonable claim, by reason of that virtue, to shoulder a smaller share of the burden of rates, a burden which it is the whole purpose of rating to distribute equitably between occupiers of property?

Again, the phrase in the definition of rateable value which reads "at the time of valuation, from year to year" is important. Is there any good reason why a tenant who has entered into a long lease at a fixed rent should thereby be deemed also to have fixed his share of the burden of rates for the same period, irrespective of the general movement of rents? He would be the first to argue the contrary if there were a fall in rents. I may add that re-valuation should properly be made every year, but because of pressure of work in rating new buildings it is now three years and four years respectively since Hong Kong and Kowloon were re-valued, so that many valuations are very much out of date and in need of revision.

Furthermore, where a premium or construction fee has been paid or the tenant himself has affected structural improvements to the property, the rent charged will normally be lower than the rateable value which is to be assessed.

These are, then, not so much aspects of present policy but rather the reasons which underlie the nature of the statutory duty imposed on the Commissioner, and in particular, the reasons why actual rent is not to be taken as conclusive of rateable value. I should add that in practice the Commissioner has not based, and does not base, his valuations on the highest level of rents, particularly at times when, as now, they may be inflated by shortage of accommodation, but on a reasonable expectation of rent, taking into account, among other things, the existence of statutory rent controls. It is my opinion that in present circumstances he and his staff are carrying out an unusually difficult task with fairness and moderation.

I must confess to having been puzzled a little as to the purport of my honourable Friend's second question and hope I will be excused if, before I answer it, I attempt to interpret it. The argument runs, I believe, as follows: —If the Commissioner re-assesses the rateable value of owner-occupied premises at increased figures, this is an indication that he considers that rateable values, and thus the rents

at which such premises may reasonably be expected to let, have increased. This indication will have the effect, my honourable Friend believes, of stimulating landlords, who would not otherwise have thought of doing so, into applying for increases in permitted rent within the provisions of the Rent Increases (Domestic Premises) Control Ordinance, and this effect, he maintains, is inconsistent with the objects of the Ordinance in that, when it was passed, it was hoped (a hope, by the large fulfilled) that, while controlling the extent of increases in rents when landlords were minded to increase them, it would not put it into their minds to increase them when they would not otherwise have thought of doing so. I think this is the correct interpretation and I apologize to my honourable Friend if I have misrepresented him. Now to answer the question.

It is true, I agree, that it was hoped that the Ordinance would not stimulate applications for rent increases although this was a risk that had to be run to achieve the purposes of the Ordinance. But its object was not to prevent rent increases altogether but rather, recognizing that there was a case, in some circumstances and within certain limits, for increases in rent, to try to reach a fair compromise between the legitimate interests of landlord and tenant, both giving security of tenure to the tenant and allowing landlords increases in rent where they were justified and to the extent that they were justified. From this it follows, equally and logically, that it is entirely proper to recognize that for rating purposes, and in the same sort of circumstances and to the same general extent, there have in recent years been increases in rateable values, as defined in the Rating Ordinance. This is, in fact, the basis on which the Commissioner has proceeded; he has, I understand, speaking generally, not related his current long overdue re-valuation, of both owner-occupied and of leased premises, to greater increases than have been allowable and allowed under the Rent Increases (Domestic Premises) Control Ordinance.

By honourable Friend appears, on the other hand, to advocate that, even if, as is the case, increased rents have been permitted on a wide range of tenancies and re-valuation has taken this into account, as it properly must, there should be a special moratorium on all re-valuations of owner-occupied premises, in case landlords of leased premises who have not yet applied for such increases as

would be approved under the Ordinance are thereby reminded of their rights. I am, I must confess, not entirely convinced that the effect alleged is likely to arise to any really significant extent today, not, at least, compared with the effect in this direction of the Ordinance itself. And surely such a moratorium would represent a wholly unjustifiable privilege for owner-occupiers as a separate class (a class which was recently granted special exemption, I would remind honourable Members, from property tax); and the more particularly so in view of the time which has elapsed since the last re-valuation and the large number of new tenements which have been rated for the first time since then. It would be just as wrong to refrain from re-valuation, when justified by the facts, because of this alleged effect as it would have been two years ago to refrain from passing the Rent Increases (Domestic Premises) Control Ordinance for this same reason. It would be, I must insist, wholly against the basic principles of rating, which is designed, as its name indeed implies, to distribute, and to re-distribute from time to time, the burden of rates in proportion to the value of occupation of premises.

The answer to my honourable Friend's second question, therefore, is that Government does consider it desirable that, if the rateable value, as defined in the Rating Ordinance, of an owner-occupied tenement has, in the opinion of the Commissioner, increased since the last valuation, then the Commissioner should increase his assessment of its rateable value, just as he should in the case of a leased tenement in the same circumstances. This is the intention of the Ordinance and the duty of the Commissioner.

I do not think that I can accept the premise to my honourable Friend's third question, at least as stated by him, and to answer it fully would require a lengthy dissertation on the nature of rates and their history in Hong Kong which would be inappropriate at today's meeting; I have already spoken at excessive length. The mere fact that increased rateable values (I speak of actual values, not of the act of assessing these values), the mere fact that rateable values produce more revenue does not imply the imposition of increased taxation any more than it does in the case of any ad valorem tax or duty when values are rising. Take stamp duty on assignments of property, for example, or on transfers of shares. I should add that this present review does not involve a universal increase in assessed values; very many assessments are remaining unchanged and some are even being reduced.

It is true that in British municipalities the rate per pound is normally varied annually so as to produce, when applied to the total of rateable values, the amount of revenue required to meet expenditure. In Hong Kong with a centralized Government, we do not any longer attempt to relate rates so closely to the cost of the public services they were originally designed to pay for, street-lighting, police, fire services, water, etc. Except for a short period in the exceptional years immediately post-war, we have left the percentage rate at 17% where it was set in 1931 when the system of separate rates for specific purposes was abandoned, and have been content to allow a growing valuation roll to contribute a growing revenue towards the growing cost of these services. This has, I believe, worked out reasonably fairly in practice. Rates were about 16% to 20% of total revenue in the 1930's, fell to 8% or so in the early post-war years and since the early 1950's have been constantly around 9% to 11%. Further, on a rough calculation, I would say that the yield from rates, which pre-war covered the cost of the services theoretically met by them now falls considerably short of doing so. It might be argued indeed that there is to-day a theoretical case for an increase in the percentage rate, although I do not propose one. Any such change would of course require the consent of this Council.

MR S. S. GORDON said: —Sir, may I ask two supplementary questions: —

The first one relates to the definition of rateable value, the rent at which any tenement might reasonably be expected to let. The rent charged by a public company to a normal tenant is a question of fact. I should have thought that that fell within the definition. Does Government consider that the rents charged in such cases where they are below the rateable values are too low?

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY replied as follows: —

Sir, I think I have already answered that question. I have nothing to add to what I have said already.

MR S. S. GORDON said: —Sir, my second is relating to the second question which I asked—to the answer to my second question, I am sorry. Is it not a fact that new premises which have first been rated

within the past three years have had the rateable value reassessed recently at a higher figure?

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY replied as follows: —

Sir, I am sorry I cannot answer that question very definitely but I believe the answer is yes.

MR S. S. GORDON: —Thank you.

MR K. A. WATSON, pursuant to notice, asked the following questions: —

Your Excellency, is Government aware that the demand for parking spaces for vehicles in the Central District of Hong Kong Island is likely to exceed the supply by about 3,000 spaces in 1968, and by about 5,000 spaces by the end of 1970?

These do not include the extra demand for about 6,000 places likely to arise if and when a cross-harbour tunnel is built.

What action does Government intend to take to meet this deficit in the Central District, and similar difficulties in other areas?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied as follows: —

Sir, my honourable Friend has been good enough to let me know the basis on which he has calculated the figures referred to in his question. Even so, I am afraid I am not able to agree with his assessment of future deficiencies in parking spaces in the Central District, not at any rate without a more careful examination of the figures than has been possible in the interval since his question was set down.

On the other hand, I can assure my honourable Friend that his calculations will be closely looked into in the proper quarters, and, if this appears to be necessary, taken into account in framing certain proposals which are now being drawn up and on which it is hoped to make a statement before very long.

MR K. A. WATSON said: —Sir, may I ask two supplementary questions: —

The first is that I am sorry that my friend the Honourable Colonial Secretary does not accept my figures, but even if

we go by Government's present estimates of parking deficiencies, do these not show a deficit of 2,322 places in mid-1969 and that only 78 extra parking spaces will be made available in the Central District during the next five years unless Government changes its policy—an increase of about sixteen places a year to meet an increase in demand estimated by Government of at least 360 a year?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied as follows: —

Sir, I think my honourable Friend's questions—or rather statements, if I may say so, are drawn from certain figures which were circulated to the Traffic Advisory Committee some two months ago. According to those figures, what my honourable Friend says is correct, assuming—and I would stress the word assuming—that no further multi-storey car parks are built by the dates he mentioned.

MR K. A. WATSON said: —I am grateful for the assurance that this matter will be looked into carefully and that there is a possibility of a new multi-storey car park being built before 1968 and 1969. May I ask that when the question of parking spaces is considered that it is not treated in isolation and that all other factors, including individual wishes and desires, traffic congestion, the need for new road works and particularly improved public transport, will be taken into account and may I further ask that in view of the long time which is required to build the new multi-storey car park may this be treated as a matter of considerable urgency?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: —Sir, I think I should just correct one point. I did not this afternoon give an assurance that a multi-storey car park would be built. I merely said that the figures that my honourable Friend quoted were based on the assumption that it would not be built. He did not take into account the possibility of such a building and a possibility certainly exists.

As to the second part of my honourable Friend's question, certainly we will do our best to take into account all the considerations and points which he has mentioned.

MR K. A. WATSON: —Thank you.

ILLEGAL STRIKES AND LOCK-OUTS ORDINANCE, CHAPTER 61

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the following resolution: —

Resolved, pursuant to section 8 of the Illegal Strikes and Lock-outs Ordinance, Chapter 61, that the duration of the said

Ordinance be extended for the term of one year with effect from 1st January 1965.

He said: This Ordinance makes illegal strikes and lock-outs which are not in furtherance of a genuine trade dispute and which are designed or calculated to coerce the Government. The Ordinance has no effect on a strike or lock-out arising out of a genuine trade dispute. It is considered that the time has not yet come to dispense with the Ordinance.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

DEFENCE REGULATIONS (CONTINUATION) ORDINANCE, 1958

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the following resolution: —

Resolved, pursuant to section 6 of the Defence Regulations (Continuation) Ordinance, 1958, that the duration of the said Ordinance be extended for the term of one year with effect from 1st January 1965.

He said: Sir, this Ordinance keeps in force certain Defence Regulations and the Defence (Finance) Regulations and it is considered necessary to certain these regulations for the time being.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

SOCIETIES ORDINANCE, CHAPTER 151

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the following resolution: —

Resolved, pursuant to section 26 of the Societies Ordinance, Chapter 151, that the duration of the said Ordinance be extended for the term of one year with effect from 1st January 1965.

He said: Sir, this Ordinance confers on the Commissioner of Police powers which assist him in curbing the activities of triad and other undesirable and unlawful organizations. It is the Government's view that the continuance in force of this Ordinance is essential to the maintenance of law and order in the Colony.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

**COMPANIES (PREVENTION OF EVASION OF THE
SOCIETIES ORDINANCE) ORDINANCE, 1959**

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the following resolution: —

Resolved, pursuant to section 16 of the Companies (Prevention of Evasion of the Societies Ordinance) Ordinance, 1959, that the duration of the said Ordinance be extended for the term of one year with effect from 1st January 1965.

He said: Sir, this Ordinance was enacted in July 1959 with the object of preventing persons who associate together for undesirable purposes from evading the control imposed by the Societies Ordinance by registering under the Companies Ordinance.

It is considered that the maintenance of law and order requires that this Ordinance should remain in force.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

SUMMER TIME (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1964

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved the First Reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the Summer Time Ordinance, 1953".

He said: Sir, honourable Members will recall that last March, during the course of the Budget Debate, I gave an undertaking, at the request of my honourable Friend Mr. GORDON, that we would review the arguments for and against the dates which now determine the beginning and end of "Summer Time". These dates, as I stated then, have remained the same within narrow limits for some eleven years.

Under the present 1955 Ordinance "Summer Time" begins on the first Sunday after the 17th of March and ends on the first Sunday after the 30th of October. We have canvassed the views of a considerable number of organizations and associations, and this has shown that there is, indeed, a substantial body of opinion, particularly in the middle and lower-income groups, in favour of considerably reducing the length of "Summer Time". Obviously, on a question like this, one would hardly expect public opinion to be unanimous, but it is evident that the majority of the organizations and bodies we have consulted are in favour of bringing "Summer Time" in later and ending it earlier. The dark early mornings for school-children have, in particular, been widely cited as grounds to justify the later introduction of "Summer Time", and it must, I think, be admitted that the additional daylight in the evening resulting from the commencement of "Summer Time" in mid-March does not

adequately compensate for the inconvenience and unpleasantness of the dark early mornings at that time of year. There is apparently rather loss unanimity about the need to end "Summer Time" earlier, but a majority of representative opinion nevertheless favoured this date, too, being advanced to some extent.

The present Bill therefore seeks to reduce the duration of artificial "Summer Time" by four weeks in the spring and by two in the autumn. If honourable Members approve this measure, "Summer Time" in future will start on the first Sunday after 18th April and finish on the first Sunday after 15th October. These dates are, to some extent, a compromise between a variety of suggestions. Inevitably it is not possible to satisfy every taste in a matter of this kind, but I have reason to believe that the changes proposed will commend itself to the great majority of people.

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 seeks to provide that summer time starts on the first Sunday after 15th April and that it ends on the first Sunday after 15th October. It will reduce the existing period of summer time by four weeks in the spring and a further two weeks in the autumn.

HONGKONG AND SHANGHAI BANKING CORPORATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1964

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

He said: Sir, section 9(1) of The Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation Ordinance, Chapter 70, provides that the prior approval of the Governor is required for any special resolution of shareholders which relates to the re-organization of the Bank's capital by the consolidation of shares of different classes or by the division of the shares into shares of different classes.

Since 1957 the approval of the Governor has not been required under Section 7 to an increase in the capital of the Bank by the issue of further shares of any class, and it is therefore anomalous that his approval should still be required for a re-organization of existing capital.

Furthermore Section 12(2) of the Ordinance, which imposed a special additional liability on shareholders equal to the nominal value of their shares, was repealed in 1957 when the fiduciary element in the backing for the Bank's note issue was eliminated. The requirement of the Governor's prior approval for re-organization of the Bank's capital has therefore lost its original *raison d'être*.

The purpose of this Bill is to remove the requirement and so put the shareholders in the same position in this respect as those in other companies.

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: —

Subsection (1) of section 9 of The Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation Ordinance makes provision for the shareholders, subject to the prior approval of the Governor, by special resolution to re-organize the capital of the Bank. It is considered that the prior approval of the Governor is no longer necessary as any proposal to re-organize the capital of the Bank has now become solely a commercial matter which should be dealt with by the shareholders especially as the reserve liability of the shareholders has been removed, all the shares of the Bank are fully paid up and the whole of the note issue is covered by securities. The purpose of this Bill is to seek amendment to The Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation Ordinance to dispense with the need for obtaining the prior approval of the Governor to a re-organization of the capital of the Bank under section 9 of the Ordinance.

COLONIAL TREASURER INCORPORATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1964

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY moved the First reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance to amend the Colonial Treasurer Incorporation Ordinance."

He said: Sir, as the two purposes of this Bill are fully set out in the Objects and Reasons attached to it, I do not think that I need elaborate them further; but perhaps I should formally declare my interest as one of the objects is to relieve me of the burden of carrying out

personally on all occasions the minor, but often time-consuming, formalities which at present fall upon me in my corporate capacity of Colonial Treasurer Incorporated.

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: —

Arising from the recommendations in the Gordon Committee Report approved by the Executive Council, a private company, the Hong Kong Building and Loan Agency Limited, has been incorporated for the purpose of making loans to private individuals for the purchase of their own homes. In order that Government can participate in this home ownership scheme it is necessary to amend section 2 of the Ordinance to permit the acquisition of shares in private as well as public companies. Clause 2 of the Bill provides the necessary amendment.

2. As the vast majority of cases where public funds are committed and which now have to be dealt with by the Financial Secretary personally as the Colonial Treasurer Incorporated are referred to the Finance Committee for prior approval or administered in accordance with approved policy, it is considered desirable that the Financial Secretary should have powers to delegate such duties when necessary. Accordingly, clause 3 of the Bill makes provision for the insertion into the Ordinance of a new section 3A to cover such eventuality.

3. Clause 4 of the Bill provides for an amendment to section 4 of the Ordinance consequential on the introduction of the new section 3A.

SOCIETIES (AMENDMENT) (NO 2) BILL, 1964

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the Second Reading of a Bill intituled "An Ordinance further to amend the Societies Ordinance."

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

The Bill was read a Second time.

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

Clauses 1 to 4 were agreed to.

Council then resumed.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL reported that the Bill before Council had passed through Committee without amendment and moved the Third reading.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY seconded.

The question was put and agreed to.

The Bill was read a Third time and passed into law.

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

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