

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

No. S. 167.—The following draft of a bill which will be introduced at the Meeting of the Legislative Council to be held on Thursday, the 23rd June, 1921, is published for general information.

CLAUD SEVERN,
Colonial Secretary.

17th June, 1921.

A BILL

INTITULED

An Ordinance to repeal the Non-Ferrous Metal Industry Ordinance, 1919, and the Non-Ferrous Metal Industry Amendment Ordinance, 1920.

BE it enacted by the Governor of Hongkong, with the advice and consent of the Legislative Council thereof, as follows:—

Short title. 1. This Ordinance may be cited as the Non-Ferrous Metal Industry Ordinance, 1921.

Repeal of Ordinances No. 1 of 1919 and 4 of 1920. 2. The Non-Ferrous Metal Industry Ordinance, 1919, and the Non-Ferrous Metal Industry Amendment Ordinance, 1920, are repealed.

Objects and Reasons.

It is recognised that the licence system introduced by the Non-Ferrous Metal Industry Ordinance, 1919, is of no practical use in Hongkong, which, as regards the metal industry, is a transshipping centre and not a producing country.

J. H. KEMP,
Attorney General.

6th June, 1921.

No. S. 168.—The following draft of a bill which will be introduced at the Meeting of the Legislative Council to be held on Thursday, the 23rd June, 1921, is published for general information.

CLAUD SEVERN,
Colonial Secretary.

17th June, 1921

A BILL

INTITULED

An Ordinance to amend the law relating to criminal procedure in the Supreme Court.

BE it enacted by the Governor of Hongkong, with the advice and consent of the Legislative Council thereof, as follows:—

Short title and construction. Ordinances Nos. 9 of 1899 and 27 of 1913. 1. This Ordinance may be cited as the Criminal Procedure Ordinance, 1921, and shall be read and construed as one with the Criminal Procedure Ordinance, 1899, and with the Criminal Procedure Amendment Ordinance, 1913, and the said Ordinances and this Ordinance may be cited together as the Criminal Procedure Ordinances, 1899 to 1921.

Amendment of Ordinance No. 9 of 1899. s. 78 (2). 2. Sub-section (2) of sections 78 of the Criminal Procedure Ordinance, 1899, is repealed and the following sub-section is substituted therefor:—

(2.) Upon the consideration of the question so reserved it shall be lawful for the Full Court to affirm or to quash the conviction or to direct a new trial, and to make such other orders as may be necessary to give effect to its decision, provided that the Full Court may, notwithstanding that it is of opinion that the question so reserved might be decided in favour of the convicted person, affirm the conviction if it considers that no substantial miscarriage of justice has actually