

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(2)1076/01-02(04)

Ref : CB2/PL/HA

**Legislative Council Panel on Home Affairs**

**Background paper prepared by Legislative Council Secretariat**

**Intermediary body for the collection and enforcement of  
maintenance payments and related issues**

**Purpose**

This paper gives a brief account of past discussions held by Members of the Legislative Council (LegCo) concerning the setting up of an intermediary body for the collection and enforcement of maintenance payments, and related issues.

**Idea of an intermediary body**

2. The idea of an intermediary body for the collection and enforcement of maintenance payments was first raised at the meeting of the Panel on Home Affairs on 26 April 1996. At the meeting, the Panel met with concern groups to discuss the difficulties encountered by divorcees in collecting maintenance payments. The concern groups were of the view that setting up an intermediary body to collect maintenance payments was the solution. Members generally supported the view.

**Administration's study on overseas experiences**

3. The Administration informed the Panel on Home Affairs at its meeting on 22 November 1996 that the Administration's study on overseas experience had cast doubts on the effectiveness of an intermediary body. The Administration had pointed out that if an intermediary body would make payments to the maintenance payees even when it could not collect the money from the payers concerned, the experience in some countries showed that it would result in a high rate of default payment. In such circumstances, the taxpayers were subsidising the payees. The Administration further pointed out that savings in social security payments in some overseas countries were due partly to the fact that maintenance payments were assessed by the intermediary body. In Hong Kong, such assessments were made by

the Court and it would be a significant constitutional change to transfer the power from the Court to an executive body. The Administration considered that establishment of an intermediary body should be the last resort.

**Motion moved by Hon LAW Chi-kwong at the Council sitting on 26 February 1997**

4. At the Council sitting on 26 February 1997, Hon LAW Chi-kwong moved the motion "That, in view of the difficulties encountered by many divorcees and their children in claiming the maintenance payments, this Council urges the Government to set up a maintenance board as an intermediary body, to take up the responsibilities for the collection, recovery, payment and relevant management work of maintenance payments, and to oblige divorcees to fulfil their obligations to support their children". The motion was carried by the Council.

5. The Secretary for Home Affairs, in his speech made during the motion debate, informed LegCo that the Judiciary had published in August 1996 the report of a working group appointed by the Chief Justice to recommend changes to the practices and procedures relating to matrimonial proceedings. The Administration had given priority to processing legislative amendments to implement those recommendations to improve the enforcement of maintenance orders. He pointed out that before the improvements were implemented and their effectiveness evaluated, any fundamental change to the existing administrative machinery should not be contemplated.

**Legislative amendments to improve the enforcement of maintenance orders**

Marriage and Children (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 1997

6. As suggested by the working group appointed by the Chief Justice to recommend changes to the practices and procedures relating to matrimonial proceedings (paragraph 5 above refers), the Marriage and Children (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 1997 was introduced into LegCo on 30 April 1997. The Bill sought to amend the Guardianship of Minors Ordinance, the Separation and Maintenance Orders Ordinance, the Matrimonial Causes Ordinance and the Matrimonial Proceedings and Property Ordinance. One of the objectives of the Bill was to facilitate the collection and enforcement of maintenance payments. The Bill proposed that where a maintenance payer had defaulted in payment without reasonable cause, the Court could issue an order to attach his income, for example, to require his employer to deduct payments from his wages and pay the amount direct to the payee. The Bill also empowered the Chief Justice to make rules to provide for court procedures concerning the application for an attachment of income order and the enforcement of such an Order. Under the Bill, maintenance payers were required to notify the maintenance payees concerned of any change of address, by registered mail, within 14 days of such a change. Failure to comply with the requirement without reasonable excuse would constitute an offence.

7. The resumption of the Second Reading debate of the Bill took place at the Council sitting on 11 June 1997. At the debate, Hon LAW Chi-kwong expressed the view that the existing legislation gave very little help to women and families receiving maintenance. He urged the Government to reconsider the possibility of establishing an intermediary body after it had finished amending the legislation.

8. The Bill was passed on 11 June 1997 and the Marriage and Children (Miscellaneous Amendments) Ordinance 1997 was enacted on 27 June 1997 (Ord. No. 69 of 1997).

#### Attachment of Income Order Rules

9. The Attachment of Income Order Rules were gazetted on 20 February 1998 (L.N. 118 of 1998) and tabled in Council on 25 February 1998. These Rules were made by the Chief Justice under the Marriage and Children (Miscellaneous Amendments) Ordinance 1997 in respect of the court proceedings concerning the application for an Attachment of Income Order and the execution of such an Order (paragraph 6 above refers). A subcommittee was formed on 27 February 1998 to study the Rules.

10. At the Council meeting on 1 April 1998, Hon CHAN Kam-lam, Chairman of the subcommittee formed to study the Attachment of Income Order Rules, moved a motion to amend the Rules to improve the clarity of the provisions. He also took the opportunity to convey the view of some members of the subcommittee that the existing channels for maintenance payees to recover payments in arrears still had serious deficiencies. These members urged the Administration to consider setting up an intermediary body and providing additional channels for collecting maintenance payments on behalf of the payees to assist such payees in recovering the outstanding sums from the maintenance payers.

11. The Secretary for Home Affairs informed Members during the debate on Hon CHAN Kam-lam's motion that the Administration would conduct a review one year after the implementation of the Rules to ascertain their effectiveness. The Administration would also consider whether it was necessary to introduce any new measures to assist maintenance payees.

12. The amendments moved by Hon CHAN Kam-lam were supported by the Council. The Rules as amended came into effect on 3 April 1998 (L.N. 197 of 1998).

13. With the enactment of the Marriage and Children (Miscellaneous Amendments) Ordinance 1997 and the making of the Attachment of Income Order Rules, the Attachment of Income Order Scheme came into operation in April 1998.

### **Study on the operation and effectiveness of overseas intermediary bodies**

14. In response to an article provided by a concern group which described the success of the Child Support Agency in Australia for the collection of maintenance payments, the Panel on Home Affairs requested the Research and Library Services Division of the LegCo Secretariat to conduct a research on the operation and effectiveness of overseas intermediary bodies.

15. The Panel on Home Affairs was briefed on the research report entitled "Child Support Agencies in Overseas Countries" (RP04/98-99) prepared by the Research and Library Services Division at its meeting on 14 December 1998. Members noted that there was insufficient comparable data to conclude which was the best child support agency in terms of child support collection in Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom (UK) and United States (US) because these countries had adopted different approaches in calculating the collection rates. There was also no available official information on how the collection rates were calculated before the establishment of the child support agencies in US, Australia and UK. However, members noted that the Research and Library Services Division had calculated a cost-effectiveness ratio in each of the countries under study by dividing the total collection in a year by the operating cost of that year. The calculation showed that for every US\$1 spent on the operation cost of these child support agencies, it would lead to the collection of more than US\$1.

16. The Administration responded that while establishing a child support agency in overseas countries had its merits, it also had substantial financial implications. The Administration considered that the Attachment of Income Order Scheme which had come into operation in April 1998 provided an efficient and less costly means to enforce maintenance payments. The Administration requested members to allow time for the Attachment of Income Order Scheme to operate before taking a view on its effectiveness in addressing the problem of maintenance arrears.

17. Some members opined that a review of the Attachment of Income Order Scheme and a review on the need to set up an intermediary body were not mutually exclusive. To facilitate members' future discussion on the cost-effectiveness of setting up a similar body in Hong Kong, members requested the Research and Library Services Division to conduct further research on whether the four overseas countries under study, i.e. Australia, New Zealand, UK and US, had reviewed the operation of their child support agencies, and whether shortcomings or improvements had been identified in such reviews.

### **Supplementary information on child support agencies in overseas countries**

18. The Panel on Home Affairs was briefed on the research report entitled "Supplementary Information on Child Support Agencies in Overseas Countries" (RP09/98-99) (paragraph 17 above refers) at its meeting on 14 June 1999. Members noted that Australia, New Zealand and UK had conducted reviews on the operation of

their child support schemes. Members further noted that the reviews had reaffirmed the value and principles behind the child support schemes, and a range of recommendations had been put forward to improve the efficiency and fairness of the schemes.

19. The Administration was of the view that it was difficult to draw a conclusion from the findings of the research that the overseas child support agencies were cost-effective, as the collection rate of maintenance payments before setting up some of these agencies was not available for comparison. The Administration further pointed out that child support schemes had been set up in the countries under study because the Court-based system could not provide adequate and equitable maintenance for the children in divorce cases. However, members of the Panel had not proposed to transfer the judicial power of assessing maintenance from the Court to an executive authority. A member pointed out that the Administration should not preclude the possibility of changing the present Court-based system. He remarked that it might be worth considering empowering an intermediary body to make the preliminary assessment of maintenance while the Court could deal with appeals on the assessment.

20. Members considered that setting up an intermediary body would encourage divorcees to claim maintenance instead of relying on the financial support under the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA) Scheme. They pointed out that the Attachment of Income Order Scheme could not deal with cases where the default maintenance payers were self-employed or had no attachable income. The Administration responded that the Social Welfare Department had since August 1998 required all single-parent applicants for CSSA to apply for court proceedings to request for maintenance payment or to enforce the maintenance payments. However, single-parent applicants would be exempt from the requirement under certain conditions : if the maintenance payers could not afford to pay; if the whereabouts of the maintenance payers could not be traced; or if the maintenance payees might be subject to violence when they requested for maintenance payments.

21. Members stressed that in assessing the merits of setting up an intermediary body, the Administration should conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the benefits, such as savings on CSSA payments and legal proceedings as well as the social impact of making a cultural shift towards recognition of parents' responsibility. It was equally important to give weight to the protection of maintenance payees' dignity when collecting maintenance payments in the evaluation.

#### **Debate on motion on "Establishing an organisation for recovering alimony" at the Council meeting on 8 December 1999**

22. At the Council meeting on 8 December 1999, Hon CHOY So-yuk moved a motion on "Establishing an organisation for recovering alimony" urging the Government to draw on overseas experience and immediately set up an intermediary organisation.

23. Hon CHOY So-yuk expressed the view during the motion debate that setting up an intermediary body could help ease the CSSA burden and avoid hurting the dignity of the maintenance payees in the process of collecting payments. She considered the Attachment of Income Order Scheme ineffective in recovering maintenance. She also pointed out that setting up an intermediary body could also call on parents not to neglect their inherent duty to raise their children despite the break-up of their marriage.

24. An amendment was proposed by Hon Miriam LAU to Hon CHOY So yuk's motion. Ms LAU expressed reservations about the setting up of an intermediary body. She considered that a more appropriate step to take was to conduct a comprehensive review and reform the administrative measures and legal proceedings to expedite maintenance recovery and strengthen support for those in financial difficulty.

25. An amendment was proposed by Hon LAW Chi-kwong to Hon Miriam LAU's amendment. Mr LAW was of the view that the setting up of an intermediary body would greatly facilitate the recovery and payment of maintenance, and could reinforce the message that parents had a responsibility towards their children who were not living with them. He pointed out that overseas experience also indicated that it would save welfare expenditure.

26. The Secretary for Home Affairs, in his speech made during the motion debate, pointed out that the Administration had been conducting a review of the law and administrative measures affecting persons eligible for maintenance. The Administration would examine in the review how to synchronise and streamline the procedures in applying for CSSA and legal aid. Upon completion of the review, the Administration would take a view on whether or not to establish an intermediary body to collect and enforce maintenance payments.

27. Hon CHOY So-yuk's motion as amended by Hon Miriam LAU and further amended by Hon LAW Chi-kwong was carried by the Council. The wording of the amended motion is as follows -

"That, as the existing mechanism in Hong Kong for the recovery of alimony is ineffective, this Council urges the Government to improve the procedure for recovering alimony so as to enhance its efficiency, and to set up an alimony council to assist in the collection and payment of alimony to single-parent families, in order to prevent them from suffering financial difficulties due to defaulted alimony and enable those people who are eligible for Comprehensive Social Security Assistance to receive assistant payment immediately, so as to meet their urgent needs."

**Report on Inter-departmental Working Group on Review of the law and administrative measures affecting divorcees and children who are eligible for alimony**

28. An Inter-departmental Working Group on Review of the law and administrative measures affecting divorcees and children who are eligible for alimony had been set up in April 1999 to conduct the review referred to by the Secretary for Home Affairs during the motion debate on "Establishing an organisation for recovering alimony" at the Council meeting on 8 December 1999 (paragraph 26 above refers).

29. The Administration briefed the Panel on Home Affairs at its meeting on 2 June 2000 on the recommendations of the report presented by the Inter-departmental Working Group. The Administration informed the Panel that the Inter-departmental Working Group had concluded that an intermediary body would not be able to offer maintenance payees or taxpayers any significant benefits over and above those that could be achieved by improving the existing administrative system.

30. The Administration further explained that the Inter-departmental Working Group's recommendation not to set up an intermediary body had been accepted by the Government on the following considerations -

- (a) payment and collection of maintenance was a private affair between the payer and the payee, and the Government should not interfere unless there was a very strong reason to do so;
- (b) if an intermediary body was going to arrange advance payments to the maintenance payee, it might give the wrong impression to the maintenance payer that he could pass the burden to the intermediary body;
- (c) an intermediary body probably would not be able to recover all arrears from the maintenance payers and as a result taxpayers had to shoulder the financial responsibility which should be that of the maintenance payers; and
- (d) the job of an intermediary body could be achieved by improving the existing administrative systems.

31. Members expressed strong dissatisfaction at the Administration's decision. They pointed out that -

- (a) only 18 of the 57 applications for Attachment of Income Orders during the 24 months from April 1998 to March 2000 were approved and it took as long as six months for some applications to be approved. The statistics showed that the Attachment of Income Order Scheme was not an effective means to address the problem of maintenance arrears;

- (b) although implementation of the recommendations of the Inter-departmental Working Group could be of some assistance, the hardship and torment suffered by the maintenance payees and their children in collecting maintenance payments would not be alleviated in the absence of an intermediary body;
- (c) the Government had an obligation to protect needy people from financial hardship and mental stress, and setting up an intermediary body did not represent an intervention into private disputes;
- (d) an intermediary body would always be more effective than an individual in recovering arrears of maintenance payments; and
- (e) the Government's decision not to set up the intermediary body was tantamount to telling all maintenance payers that they could evade the responsibility to pay maintenance payments and even a government body was unable to recover the arrears.

### **Implementation of the Inter-departmental Working Group's recommendations**

#### Attachment of Income Orders (Amendment) Bill 2001

32. To address the difficulties encountered by divorcees in collecting and enforcing maintenance, the Inter-departmental Working Group had recommended to relax the circumstances for the issue of Attachment of Income Orders. The Attachment of Income Orders (Amendment) Bill 2001 was introduced into LegCo on 4 April 2001 to implement the recommendation. The Bill sought to relax the circumstances in which Attachment of Income Orders could be made under the Guardianship of Minors Ordinance, the Separation and Maintenance Orders Ordinance and the Matrimonial Proceedings and Property Ordinance, and to provide that rules made under these Ordinances may empower the Court to dispense with or relax any procedure or abridge any time limits specified in the rules under certain circumstances. A Bills Committee was formed on 20 April 2001 to study the Bill.

33. The Resumption of the Second Reading debate on the Bill took place at the Council meeting on 4 July 2001. Some Members expressed the view during the debate that the Bill could only make limited improvements to the protection of maintenance payees. They reiterated their support for an intermediary body for the collection and enforcement of maintenance payments. A member urged that the Government should conduct another review some time, such as one year or one and a half years, after putting the administrative measures and legislative amendments proposed in the Inter-departmental Working Group's report into effect, and find out how effective they were before carefully considering the need to set up an intermediary body.

34. The Secretary for Home Affairs reiterated during the debate that the Administration had carefully considered the proposal of setting up an intermediary body. The Administration considered that the proposed body would not bring, either to the maintenance payees or taxpayers, any significant benefits over and above those that could be achieved by improving the existing system.

35. On the recommendation of the Subcommittee, the Secretary for Home Affairs moved some amendments to the Bill to improve its provisions. The amendments were supported by the Council.

36. The Bill as amended was passed on 4 July 2001 and the Attachment of Income Order (Amendment) Ordinance 2001 was enacted on 13 July 2001 (Ord. No. 20 of 2001).

#### Attachment of Income Order (Amendment) Rules 2001

37. The Attachment of Income Order (Amendment) Rules 2001, made by the Chief Justice to provide for the court procedures to implement the Attachment of Income Order (Amendment) Ordinance 2001 (L.N. 260 of 2001), were gazetted on 7 December 2001 and tabled in Council on 12 December 2001. A subcommittee was formed on 14 December 2001 to study the Amendment Rules.

38. At the subcommittee's suggestion, the Administration undertook to introduce administrative measures to make the application procedures for a new Attachment of Income Order on change of income source more user-friendly. The Administration also agreed to make some amendments to improve the drafting.

39. The amendments to the Rules moved by the Administration were supported by the Council. The Amendment Rules came into effect on 25 January 2002 (L.N. 12 of 2002).

#### Interest on Arrears of Maintenance Bill 2001

40. The Inter-departmental Working Group had recommended to empower the Court to impose a surcharge against defaulting maintenance payers. The Hong Kong Bar Association had, however, expressed concern about the recommendation on the grounds that -

- (a) a surcharge amounted to a punitive measure, which was against the philosophy at family law; and
- (b) a maintenance payee might be unjustly enriched as a result of the proposed surcharge.

41. At the suggestion of the Bar Association, the Administration has proposed to empower the Court to impose interest rather than a surcharge in the Interest on Arrears of Maintenance Bill 2001. The Bill was introduced into LegCo on 9 January 2002.

42. A Bills Committee was formed on 11 January 2002 to study the Bill and has been placed on the waiting list. The Bills Committee will be activated when a vacant slot is available.

43. The Inter-departmental Working Group has made the following recommendations -

- (a) to relax the circumstances for the issue of Attachment of Income Orders;
- (b) to relax the requirement for judgement summonses to be served personally and to enable the Court to order payment of maintenance arrears accrued up to the date of court hearing instead of up to the date of application for judgement summonses at present;
- (c) Court Bailiffs to serve judgement summonses for maintenance payees who are not legally represented;
- (d) the Court to order that maintenance specified in maintenance orders be paid into Court in appropriate cases;
- (e) to empower the Court to impose a surcharge against defaulting maintenance payers;
- (f) to inform non-governmental organizations and professional bodies that cases of maintenance payers failing to notify the maintenance payees of changes of address can be reported to the police station nearest to the maintenance payer's last known address;
- (g) to request the Law Society of Hong Kong to inform its members that they can, with the use of a standard letter, request the Immigration Department, Transport Department, and Housing Department to search their records for addresses of maintenance payers against whom legal actions will be taken to sue for arrears in maintenance;
- (h) to conduct a pilot scheme to synchronise the procedures in processing applications for CSSA and legal aid;
- (i) Social Welfare Department to streamline the procedures in referring single-parent families to obtain timely counseling and family services; and
- (j) to mount publicity and public education measures on matters relating to maintenance.

44. According to the Administration, all the recommendations which do not require legislative amendments have already been implemented. Legislative amendments to

implement the recommendation in paragraph 43(a) above have been made. The Administration will brief the Panel on Home Affairs at its meeting on 8 February 2002 on the implementation progress of other recommendations of the Inter-departmental Working Group.

**Chronological account of past discussion**

45. For members' easy reference, a chronological account of the past discussions held by LegCo Members is in **the Appendix**.

Council Business Division 2  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
6 February 2002

**A chronological account of past discussions by LegCo Members  
on the setting up of an intermediary body  
for the collection and enforcement of maintenance payments**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Council/ Committee meeting</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
<p><u>1995-1996</u> <u>Legislative session</u></p> <p>26 April 1996</p>	<p>Meeting of Panel on Home Affairs</p>	<p>The proposal of an intermediary body was first raised.</p> <p>The Administration informed members that it was conducting a study of overseas experience on the effectiveness of an intermediary body for the collection of maintenance payments.</p>
<p><u>1996-1997</u> <u>Legislative session</u></p> <p>22 November 1996</p> <p>26 February 1997</p>	<p>Meeting of Panel on Home Affairs</p> <p>Council sitting</p>	<p>The Administration briefed members on the result of its study which cast doubts on the effectiveness of an intermediary body.</p> <p>The motion moved by Hon LAW Chi-kwong on "Setting up of a maintenance board" was carried by the Council.</p> <p>The Administration informed Members that it would introduce legislative amendments to implement the recommendations of a working group appointed by the Chief Justice to recommend changes to the practices and procedures relating to matrimonial proceedings.</p>

<p>30 April 1997</p>	<p>Council sitting</p>	<p>The Marriage and Children (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 1997 which sought to implement the changes to the practices and procedures relating to matrimonial proceedings was introduced.</p>
<p>11 June 1997</p>	<p>Council sitting</p>	<p>The Marriage and Children (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 1997 resumed its Second Reading debate and was passed.</p> <p>Hon LAW Chi-kwong expressed the view that as the existing legislation gave little assistance to the maintenance payees, the Administration should re-consider the establishment of an intermediary body.</p>
<p><u>1997-1998</u> <u>Legislative session</u></p>		
<p>19 November 1997</p>	<p>Council meeting</p>	<p>An oral question about facts and figures on divorced women was raised by Hon Mrs Peggy LAM.</p> <p>In response to Hon CHAN Choi-hi's supplementary question as to whether the Administration would consider setting up an intermediary body, the Secretary for Home Affairs pointed out that the Administration would plan the way forward after the new legislation to implement the Attachment of Income Order Scheme came into effect.</p>
<p>25 February 1998</p>	<p>Council meeting</p>	<p>The Attachment of Income Order Rules were tabled in Council. The Rules were made by the Chief Justice in respect of the court proceedings concerning the application for an Attachment of Income Order and the execution of such an Order.</p>

27 February 1998	House Committee meeting	A subcommittee was formed to study the Attachment of Income Order Rules.
23 March 1998	Meeting of Panel on Home Affairs	Members requested the Research and Library Services Division to conduct a research on the operation and effectiveness of overseas intermediary bodies.
1 April 1998	Council meeting	<p>Hon CHAN Kam-lam, the Chairman of the Subcommittee to study the Attachment of Income Order Rules, moved a motion to amend the Rules to improve the clarity of the provisions.</p> <p>Some members of the Subcommittee urged the Administration to consider setting up an intermediary body.</p> <p>The Administration undertook to conduct a review one year after the implementation of the Rules and consider new measures for assisting maintenance payees.</p> <p>The amendments moved by Hon CHAN Kam-lam were supported by the Council.</p>
<u>1998-1999</u> <u>Legislative session</u>		
14 December 1998	Meeting of Panel on Home Affairs	<p>Members were briefed on the research report entitled "Child Support Agencies in Overseas Countries".</p> <p>Members requested the Research and Library Services Division to conduct a further research on the reviews conducted by the countries under study on the operation of their child support agencies.</p>

<p>21 April 1999</p>	<p>Council meeting</p>	<p>Hon CHOY So-yuk and Hon LAW Chi-kwong called for the Administration to re-consider the setting up of an intermediary body during the debate on Hon Emily LAU's motion on "Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women".</p>
<p>14 June 1999</p>	<p>Meeting of Panel on Home Affairs</p>	<p>Members were briefed on the research report entitled "Supplementary Information on Child Support Agencies in Overseas Countries".</p>
<p><u>1999-2000</u> <u>Legislative session</u></p>		
<p>8 December 1999</p>	<p>Council meeting</p>	<p>Motion on "Establishing an organisation for recovering alimony" was moved by Hon CHOY So-yuk.</p> <p>The amended motion urging the Government to improve the procedures for recovering maintenance payments and to set up an intermediary body was carried by the Council.</p> <p>The Secretary for Home Affairs informed Members that the Administration had been conducting a review of the law and administrative measures affecting persons eligible for maintenance. The Administration would take a view on whether or not to establish an intermediary body upon completion of the review.</p>
<p>2 June 2000</p>	<p>Meeting of Panel on Home Affairs</p>	<p>The Administration briefed members on the recommendations of the Inter-departmental Working Group on Review of the law and administrative measures affecting divorcees and children who are eligible for alimony.</p>

<u>2000-2001</u> <u>Legislative session</u>		
4 April 2001	Council meeting	Attachment of Income Orders (Amendment) Bill 2001 which sought to relax the circumstances for the issue of attachment of income orders was introduced.
20 April 2001	House Committee meeting	A Bills Committee was formed to study the Bill.
4 July 2001	Council meeting	Attachment of Income Orders (Amendment) Bill 2001 resumed its Second Reading debate.  Some Members reiterated their support for setting an intermediary body.  The Bill as amended was passed.
<u>2001-2002</u> <u>Legislative session</u>		
12 December 2001	Council meeting	Attachment of Income Order (Amendment) Rules 2001 were tabled.
14 December 2001	House Committee meeting	A subcommittee was formed to study the Amendment Rules.
9 January 2002	Council meeting	Interest on Arrears of Maintenance Bill 2001 which sought to empower the Court to impose interest against defaulting maintenance payers was introduced.
11 January 2002	House Committee meeting	A Bills Committee was formed to study the Bill. The Bills Committee will be activated when a vacant slot is available.

16 January 2002	Council meeting	Upon the recommendation of the Subcommittee to study the Attachment of Income Order (Amendment) Rules 2001, the Secretary for Home Affairs moved a motion to amend the Rules. The amendments were supported by the Council.
-----------------	-----------------	---

Council Business Division 2  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
6 February 2002