

OFFICIAL REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS**Wednesday, 26th April 1972****The Council met at half-past Two o'clock**

[Mr PRESIDENT in the Chair]

PRESENT

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR (*PRESIDENT*)
SIR CRAWFORD MURRAY MACLEHOSE, KCMG, MBE
THE HONOURABLE THE COLONIAL SECRETARY
SIR HUGH SELBY NORMAN-WALKER, KCMG, OBE, JP
THE HONOURABLE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
MR DENYS TUDOR EMIL ROBERTS, CBE, QC, JP
THE HONOURABLE THE SECRETARY FOR HOME AFFAIRS
MR DONALD COLLIN CUMYNN LUDDINGTON, JP
THE HONOURABLE THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY (*Acting*)
MR DAVID HAROLD JORDAN, MBE, JP
THE HONOURABLE DAVID RICHARD WATSON ALEXANDER, CBE, JP
DIRECTOR OF URBAN SERVICES
THE HONOURABLE JAMES JEAVONS ROBSON, JP
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS
THE HONOURABLE JOHN CANNING, JP
DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION
DR THE HONOURABLE GERALD HUGH CHOA, JP
DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL AND HEALTH SERVICES
THE HONOURABLE JACK CATER, MBE, JP
DIRECTOR OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY
THE HONOURABLE DENIS CAMPBELL BRAY, JP
DISTRICT COMMISSIONER, NEW TERRITORIES
THE HONOURABLE PAUL TSUI KA-CHEUNG, OBE, JP
COMMISSIONER OF LABOUR
THE HONOURABLE IAN MACDONALD LIGHTBODY, JP
COMMISSIONER FOR RESETTLEMENT
THE HONOURABLE SIR YUET-KEUNG KAN, CBE, JP
THE HONOURABLE WOO PAK-CHUEN, OBE, JP
THE HONOURABLE SZETO WAT, OBE, JP
THE HONOURABLE WILFRED WONG SIEN-BING, OBE, JP
THE HONOURABLE ELLEN LI SHU-PUI, OBE, JP
THE HONOURABLE WILSON WANG TZE-SAM, OBE, JP
DR THE HONOURABLE CHUNG SZE-YUEN, OBE, JP
THE HONOURABLE OSWALD VICTOR CHEUNG, OBE, QC, JP
THE HONOURABLE GERALD MORDAUNT BROOME SALMON, JP
THE HONOURABLE ANN TSE-KAI, OBE, JP
THE HONOURABLE LO KWEE-SEONG, OBE, JP

ABSENT

THE HONOURABLE HERBERT JOHN CHARLES BROWNE, OBE, JP
THE HONOURABLE LEE QUO-WEI, OBE, JP

IN ATTENDANCE

THE CLERK TO THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
MR RODERICK JOHN FRAMPTON

Papers

The following papers were laid pursuant to Standing Order No 14(2): —

<i>Subject</i>	<i>LN No</i>
Subsidiary Legislation: —	
Merchant Shipping Ordinance.	
Merchant Shipping (Control of Ports) (Amendment) (No 2) Regulations 1972	82
Preventive Service Ordinance.	
Preventive Service Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule) Order 1972	83

Sessional Paper 1971-72: —

No 53—Annual Report by the District Commissioner, New Territories for the year 1969-70 (published on 26.4.72).

Report: —

Report of the Select Committee of the Legislative Council appointed to enquire into the costs of running English-speaking schools.

Oral answers to questions

Car loans and car parking for civil servants

1. SIR YUET-KEUNG KAN asked: —

In regard to Government's car loan and car parking policy for civil servants, will the Financial Secretary say whether:

- (a) the present policy of encouraging ownership of cars by making loans to civil servants will be reviewed;
- (b) the present cost can be stated of the free parking spaces for civil servants in central urban areas calculated on the same basis as that used for costing Government car parks;
- (c) the policy of free car parking for civil servants will be reviewed?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (SIR HUGH NORMAN-WALKER): — Sir, I am answering this question because I bear the responsibility for the conditions under which civil servants work and under which they are paid.

As regards the first part of the honourable Member's question, the short answer is "Yes, Sir." The present policy of loans to civil servants for the purchase of cars is under review, and in three contexts. First, and perhaps least important, the rate of interest needs looking at in comparison with current commercial practice. Second, since at the time the scheme was introduced many years ago hire purchase facilities were not available to the extent that they are now in Hong Kong. Third, in the context of whatever you, Sir, in Council are advised to do on transport policy and more particularly on traffic problems generally.

As regards the second part of the honourable Member's question, I am afraid the short answer is "No, Sir." I am not in a position to state the cost of the free parking space provided for civil servants, but in any case it would not I think be meaningful to attempt to compare the cost of parking spaces, which are purely a derivative of the design of the building complex with which they are associated, with the cost of Government or commercial car parks especially designed for that purpose. A costing has been done on the basis of a 5-years usage, and the cost of staff supervision and the cost of the original concreting, and the cost per space on that basis amounts to about \$15 per month.

As regards the third part of the question, the implication that free car parking is available for all civil servants is without foundation. This is just not the case. Where car parking space is produced as a by-product of the design of a Government building for departmental offices, and in some cases for security reasons, that space is available to a proportion of the civil servants working in that complex. By no means all, indeed a very small proportion of, civil servants get free car parking space; it is just the way the cookie crumbles—it's an unjust world. However, again, the short answer to the honourable Member's question is "Yes, Sir"; I will certainly review the policy, though perhaps knowing my colleagues I should caution that the result of such a review might be a nasty knock to the taxpayers' pocket rather than a gain.

SIR YUET-KEUNG KAN: —Sir, perhaps I might ask a supplementary question on the last point first. In asking this question I had in mind both the case of parking within Government buildings and parking in public thoroughfares. I have in mind the space not very far—within 10 yards of this building—namely Battery Path, which is a public thoroughfare. Another case is Jackson Road outside the Supreme Court. These are public thoroughfares and these are the places in which free car parking is, up to now, allowed. Would my honourable Friend be in a position to say that he will review too the free car parking in respect of those areas I have mentioned?

Oral Answers

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (SIR HUGH NORMAN-WALKER): —Unreservedly, Sir, yes.

SIR YUET-KEUNG KAN: —Sir, may I now deal with the second question. The Financial Secretary has been able to give some definite information on the cost of car parking. May I ask why is it not possible—as in the case of the Rumsey Street car park which is a building composed of car parking spaces as well as Government offices—say in the case of Murray Building to have a more definite costing of such car parks?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (SIR HUGH NORMAN-WALKER): —This is a very difficult question to answer, Sir. It arises largely from the site formation of the Government building in question. This particular site over which we are now sitting produced a number of spaces which could properly be used for car parking and are indeed needed for security reasons. Murray Building One similarly produced a series of what look to me like elephant stalls, which are used for car parks by my honourable Friend Mr ROBSON and his staff. Murray Building Two, as I understand the preliminary designs, will be, in the main, public car parking in the lower storeys. Those storeys—whatever number they would amount to eventually—will be paid for whether used by civil servants or by members of the public. I may well have to reserve a small number of spaces on the uppermost floors specially protected for security reasons for those staff who are needed in an emergency such as a typhoon.

SIR YUET-KEUNG KAN: —Sir, one final supplementary question. Will the result of all these reviews be made part and parcel of the overall transport policy?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (SIR HUGH NORMAN-WALKER): —I find that a very difficult question to answer in the absence of my honourable Friend, Mr HADDON-CAVE. I think I can say that civil service car parking is such a small element that it might be mentioned in a footnote at the bottom of the paper . . . (*laughter*) . . . not, I think, more.

MR SZETO WAI: —Sir, is there any truth in the allegation that some civil servants are allowing their wives and friends to make use of their car parking spaces which are designated for their use in Government buildings?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (SIR HUGH NORMAN-WALKER): —If anyone will produce evidence of this I will act on it.

Traffic congestion between Supreme Court and Western Market

2. SIR YUET-KEUNG KAN asked: —

Will Government take urgent steps to relieve the increasingly serious traffic congestion between the Supreme Court and the Western Market, to which large numbers of minibuses contribute substantially?

MR J. J. ROBSON: —Sir, Government is aware that the prevailing traffic congestion between Supreme Court and the Western Market is largely attributable to public light buses and measures are being taken to relieve the situation. These measures include restrictions which will prohibit the stopping of public light buses for the greater part of the day in certain streets in the Central District in order to create a clearway system in that area. In addition, morning and evening peak hour clearways will be introduced in streets bordering the Central Market and in part of Queen's Road Central. During these periods the "no stopping" rule will apply to all vehicles except CMB buses. The effect of this should be to relieve considerably the congestion around the Market. It is also planned to provide a new on-street public light bus terminus in Wing Lok Street to coincide with these restrictions and, at the same time, to re-arrange traffic routing in this area to facilitate public light bus operations.

These measures will be introduced with effect from Friday 28th April 1972 and a public notice announcing these changes has already been issued. They represent an interim stage for improvements to traffic flow generally in the Central District as the completion of the works in Connaught Road Central will result in further improvements in the traffic situation. Further changes in traffic routing will then be introduced and general restrictions on kerbside activities are being considered.

This will mean that as part of an overall plan for improving traffic flow it will be necessary to restrict the times and locations of loading and off-loading of goods vehicles, the picking-up and setting-down of passengers from private cars as well as the activities of public light buses.

SIR YUET-KEUNG KAN: —Sir, for some time past private cars or motorcars on the west side of Ice House Street along Des Voeux Road wanting to go east have perforce had to go west right to, I think, Jubilee Street or even beyond before being able to turn eastwards. Is there any plan being made to improve this traffic?

Oral Answers

MR ROBSON: —I can't say, Sir, specifically that any plans are being made to improve the traffic in Ice House Street because unfortunately the altering of one route in the central district affects many other streets in the same area. I can certainly have a look into my honourable Friend's suggestion, but at the present moment I don't think this has been considered.

SIR YUET-KEUNG KAN: —Sir, I was referring to the traffic along Des Voeux Road and not so much in Ice House Street. In order to go east you have to go west. (*Laughter*).

MR ROBSON: —This, Sir, is again unfortunately one of the things that happen in traffic. To get the traffic moving and not stopping, and to prevent a crossing of traffic, you have to get traffic flow in one direction before you can come back in another one. This is the basic rule of a roundabout.

MR OSWALD CHEUNG: —Sir, is it planned to change the location of the public light bus terminus opposite the Banks in Des Voeux Road?

MR ROBSON: —Not at this moment, Sir.

Attendance at primary schools

3. MR WILSON T. S. WANG asked: —

Will the Director of Education state what progress has been made in enforcing the provisions of section 74 of the Education Ordinance 1971 conferring upon him the power to serve an attendance order requiring a parent to cause a child to attend regularly at a primary school?

MR J. CANNING: —Sir, since September 1971, when compulsory powers were enforced to secure the attendance of children at primary schools, 34 cases of non-attendance have come to the notice of the Education Department. These cases were referred to the Social Welfare Department for investigation of family background and were then reported back to the Education Department for recommendation of suitable school places or for consideration of the exercise of compulsory powers.

An analysis of these cases shows that 20 children have already resumed schooling and do not need any assistance; 6 children needed placement assistance and were accordingly recommended suitable school places by the Education Department; 7 cases were untraceable because of change of address (including one case in which the whole family were out at sea); and 1 case needed further counselling.

MR WANG: —Sir, can my honourable Friend give us an estimate of the number of children who are not attending schools who may or may not have come to the notice of his Department?

MR CANNING: —I think, Sir, that's rather a tall order arising as a supplementary. If my Friend would like to put down another question, I'll attempt to answer it later.

Sites for secondary schools

4. MR WANG asked: —

Will the Director of Education state how many sites for secondary schools have been granted during each of the last five years, and how many sites can be made available during the current year?

MR CANNING: —Sir, during the five-year period beginning 1st April 1967, a total of 56 sites for secondary schools were granted. A detailed breakdown is as follows: —

15 for 1967-68
6 for 1968-69
10 for 1969-70
20 for 1970-71
and 5 for 1971-72.

It is anticipated that a further 10 sites for secondary schools will be made available during the year 1972-73.

MR WANG: —Sir, can my honourable Friend account for the shortfall of sites granted in 1971-72 being 20 down to 5, and the number of sites available this year being 10 as compared with 20 in 1970-71. Is it due to the lack of applications for sponsorship or lack of the sites available?

MR CANNING: —It can be due, Sir, to a variety of causes. It's certainly not due to a lack of sponsors. Sites do become available;

[MR CANNING] **Oral Answers**

sometimes there will be a rush of sites towards the end of the calendar year and sometimes you get a shortfall at the beginning of the next year. But the overall position, I think, is reasonably satisfactory.

Generalized Preference Scheme

5. DR S. Y. CHUNG asked: —

Will Government make strong representations to the Japanese Government to extend the very limited scope of Hong Kong's inclusion in the Generalized Preference Scheme?

MR J. CATER: —Sir, my honourable Friend is correct in referring to the very limited scope of Hong Kong's inclusion in the Japanese Generalized Preference Scheme. As has already been announced publicly, the 96 items on the special Hong Kong exceptions list represent more than half our exports to Japan, which were worth about \$484 million in 1971. We had certainly hoped for better than that.

In addition a further 20% of our exports to Japan are in categories totally excluded from the scheme, which means that at best only 25% of our exports to Japan are in categories which will be eligible to claim preferential duty rates. Certain other non-discriminatory qualifications, such as tariff quotas and limits on any one beneficiary's share of such quotas, will reduce our potential benefit still further.

We have been examining the Hong Kong exceptions list with some care and find to our surprise that, of the 96 items on it, we have no exports to Japan in 37 of them. Indeed, there are several items in this list which are not made in Hong Kong at all. In a number of the remaining items on this list, other developing countries in the region, which are highly competitive with Hong Kong in price, are the major suppliers, and yet these countries are included as beneficiaries without discriminatory restriction. What is particularly of concern in this situation is that the existence of this degree of discrimination in favour of such close competitors of Hong Kong will tend not only to stimulate their exports to Japan faster than ours, but also possibly to draw existing trade away from Hong Kong to them. In this connection I must stress that it was the intention of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, in agreeing to the establishment of preferences schemes, that such schemes should be designed to stimulate the trade of development countries rather than to discriminate against some of them for the benefit of others.

All of this is, of course, very disappointing and puzzling treatment, especially coming from a country which has for five years been Hong Kong's major source of imports and which now holds almost a quarter of our entire import market. Japan has not only had the benefit of a very favourable trade balance with Hong Kong for many years. She also benefits from our open door for capital investment, and total absence of discrimination in the allocation of public works contracts. There can be few, if any, parallels to this situation anywhere else in the world today. Why then should she, Japan, discriminate against us in favour of our close competitors?

My honourable Friend asks if the Hong Kong Government will be making strong representations to the Japanese Government to extend the scope of these preferences. The answer, Sir, is yes. The form of such representations is now under active consideration and I am in consultation on the matter with both the Textiles and Trade and Industry Advisory Boards.

DR CHUNG: —Sir, in view of the very wide and adverse implications of this discrimination against us, will my honourable Friend assure this Council that our representations will be made to the Japanese Government as soon as possible?

MR CATER: —Yes, Sir.

MR K. S. LO: —Sir, in view of the discriminatory reciprocation given by Japan in return for the very favourable trade balance which she enjoys with us, does the Government intend to take other more effective measures besides just making strong representations?

MR CATER: —As I have said, Sir, the form which our representations to the Japanese Government will take is still under active consideration and so I am not at this stage able to make a statement on them. I imagine that my honourable Friend in fact is referring to the possibility of "retaliatory action", and all I would say as a general comment to this is that the whole field will be considered by us—all the options possible. But it would, of course, be quite a departure from our normal action if Hong Kong were to retaliate in this or any similar situation and would be a very significant departure in policy.

Cigarette advertising and smoking in public places

6. DR CHUNG asked: —

Will the Director of Medical and Health Services make a statement on the progress made in regard to the introduction

[DR CHUNG] **Oral Answers**

of control on cigarette advertising and of restriction on smoking in public places since his statement in this Council in January 1971?

DR G. H. CHOA: —Sir, as I indicated in my reply to my honourable Friend's question in January last year, one of our major aims is to educate the next generation on the hazards of smoking. Health education on this subject has gradually been extended in schools.

The voluntary curtailment of advertisement by cigarette advertisers on the two television companies' programmes has also continued.

During the past year, those government departments which are most concerned with the consequences of cigarette smoking have been further examining the feasibility of introducing effective restrictions as well as the best means of doing so.

Many of the courses of action open to a government are well known and several of them are being tried in other countries where the problem is more extensive than ours. These include the prohibition of smoking in certain public places and the overprinting of a warning notice on every cigarette packet.

It is of course possible for us to impose similar restraints here in Hong Kong. But there are a number of circumstances which affect their implementation. Perhaps the most important of these circumstances is the relative priority which other addictions have over cigarette smoking; the claims that these priorities have on our public resources and the degree to which our population, young and adult alike, can be effectively exposed to public persuasion. As in all forms of addiction, including cigarette smoking, society itself must be actively involved in their eradication.

These, and other similar questions associated with the smoking problem, have been examined by my department and others concerned in Government during the past months; I would only add that they have not been found easy to solve.

However I am most hopeful that it should soon be possible to recommend acceptable measures which will further reduce the threat to public health presented by cigarette smoking.

DR CHUNG: —Sir, with due respect, I find it rather difficult to follow the remark made by my honourable Friend that he could only add that it has not been found easy to solve the problems. Will my honourable Friend tell us the difficulties in introducing prohibition of smoking in certain public places?

DR CHOA: —As I said, Sir, it is a question of priorities. We feel that there are certain things which we must do regarding addiction of other forms before we come to cigarette smoking.

Annual departmental reports

7. MR G. M. B. SALMON asked: —

Will Government state why the Annual Report by the District Commissioner, New Territories for the year 1969-70 has taken until 26th April 1972 to be tabled in this Council; when the same report for 1970-71 may be expected; and whether in future arrangements will be made for all Departmental Reports to be tabled within six months of the end of the financial year?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (SIR HUGH NORMAN-WALKER): —Sir, as regards the first part of the honourable Member's question, I can really only roll over with my paws in the air! The District Commissioner, New Territories has asked me to express his regret at the delay in tabling the New Territories Administration Report for 1969-70. The delay was caused by a remarkable upsurge in work connected with land administration, by a most unfortunate but unavoidable coincidence of staff changes and, finally, when the Report was in proof, by a diversion of effort to deal with natural disasters. The New Territories Administration Report for 1970-71 will be tabled next month, and the Report for 1971-72 will be ready for the printer by the end of next month.

As regards the second part of the question, I would like to differentiate very clearly between the Colony Annual Report and individual departmental Annual Reports. The first is designed not only as a working document but also for public consumption both here and overseas. It gives a broad picture of the progress of Hong Kong and also, as honourable Members are aware, contains a synopsis of all departmental progress and achievements. It is a matter of pride to those responsible for producing the Annual Report that we have never for many years—indeed, for more years that I can trace after an investigation—failed to lay it on the table at the opening of the budget session. It is, I would add, a publication that has received considerable acclaim from all over the world and is widely read. At the expense of my honourable Friend, the Financial Secretary, I would add we distribute some 11,000 copies free to universities and other institutions and the demand increases steadily.

Individual departmental reports on the other hand are working documents and, though to an extent used by specialists in certain

[THE COLONIAL SECRETARY] **Oral Answers**

fields overseas, are principally a record for local use, and go into very great detail. Many such reports can be tabled, and I will endeavour to see that this is done, within the 6 months suggested by the honourable Member, but others—and this particularly refers to departments where the results of experiments, the analysis of statistics and other detailed work, form the main value of the finished product—would not be able to meet this deadline if they were to fulfil their principal function. In this answer I have been speaking in the terms of the honourable Member's question. I would not wish any Head of Department to think that I am in any way relaxing the existing instructions which relate to the presentation of the draft report—printing, translation and laying on the table necessarily add to the period, which as prescribed is a good deal shorter than that suggested by the honourable Mr SALMON.

Sir, we will do our best to ensure that all reports are tabled as soon as is reasonably possible.

Swimming hazards at Repulse Bay beach

8. MR WILFRED S. B. WONG asked: —

Is the Director of Urban Services aware of the appalling conditions at Repulse Bay where rocks line the beach both above and under water at low tide making it hazardous for swimmers? Could the Director indicate what positive measures he proposes to take to restore Repulse Bay as a beach for swimmers?

MR D. R. W. ALEXANDER: —Sir, this is a hardy annual which invariably promotes questions in the press and in the Urban Council. The situation is therefore not unknown to me. Unfortunately, there is no easy solution to the problem.

Much of the sea bed at Repulse Bay is covered with large rocks. The majority of these are below the low water mark and normally do not impede swimming. As for removing smaller rocks and stones from above the low water mark, the advice we have received is that this might lead to an unacceptable degree of sand erosion while, in any case, past experience has shown that fresh stones are very quickly washed up in place of those removed. Consideration is being given to covering at least some of the rocks with a layer of sand, and I hope that it will be possible to try this out soon even though there may be more than a fair chance of this sand again being washed away.

In the meantime, however, since last year we have been clearly marking two "safe passages", each about 20 feet wide, down to the normal low water mark so as to allow swimmers unimpeded access to the sea, and I have asked my staff to consider providing more such passages—not only at Repulse Bay but wherever they may be needed at other gazetted beaches.

MR WONG: —Sir, as surprisingly the rocks at Repulse Bay beach above the waterline almost disappeared a few days after the question was sent in . . . (*laughter*) . . . would the Director of Urban Services keep up the pressure on the beach staff to continue the good work and also keep on solving the problem of rocks below the waterline?

MR ALEXANDER: —Certainly I give this assurance, Sir, but I must make it quite clear that over the past off-season my staff have removed enough stones to build a wall 120 feet long by 6 feet by 5 feet, so there is no question of this being a last minute show in response to the question. (*Laughter*).

Statements

Report of the Select Committee of the Legislative Council appointed to enquire into the costs of running English-speaking schools

DR CHUNG: —Sir, among the various papers laid before honourable Members today is the Report of the Select Committee.

Honourable Members will recall that on 1st December 1971 a resolution was passed by this Council to appoint a Select Committee to enquire into the costs of running English-speaking schools and to make a report to this Council not later than 31st March 1972. The Select Committee subsequently appointed by you, Sir, consisted of myself as Chairman and my honourable Friends, Mr J. CANNING who is the Director of Education, Mr Wilson WANG, Mr Q. W. LEE and Mr G. M. B. SALMON as Members. The Committee submitted its report to you, Sir, on 30th March 1972 and copies have been circulated to honourable Members of both the Legislative and Executive Councils.

Sir, it may be appropriate for me to say something briefly about the salient contents of this Report. First, we have examined in considerable detail the operating costs of Government and aided schools for both English and Chinese speaking children. We find that the operating cost of providing a place at an English-speaking school is very much higher than that at a Chinese-language school. This is mainly because the type of education as required by English-speaking

[DR CHUNG] **Statements**

children is basically more expensive. On the other hand, we have also found that certain areas of running costs tend to be higher than really necessary and we think that the English-speaking schools could take some economic measures without adversely affecting the character or standard of education in these schools.

Without going into too much detail, if the relevant factors discussed in Chapter V of the Report were implemented, the annual gross cost per pupil in Government English-speaking schools would be of the following order:

Secondary — \$3,100

Primary — \$1,700

As for aided English-speaking schools, the annual gross cost per pupil according to the estimates supplied by the English Schools Foundation and based on 100 percent enrolment would be of the following order:

Secondary — \$3,750

Primary — \$2,200

We were, however, advised by the Director of Education that these costs could be reduced to come closer to the levels of Government schools.

Secondly, having enquired into the costs of running English-speaking schools, we proceeded to examine the operating costs of and the amount of Government subsidy provided for each pupil in Government and aided Chinese-language schools. Although it is, strictly speaking, not within our terms of reference, we have attempted in Chapter VI of the Report to assess the probable level of fees for the English-speaking schools.

In this connection, we have applied a fresh interpretation of the principle of parity of subsidy, in that we have taken the view that the subsidy provided for each pupil by Government for Government schools, whether it be English-speaking or Chinese-language schools, ought to be the same. On this basis and having regard to the likely operating costs as we think they ought to be, the fees per pupil per annum at Government English-speaking schools are probable to be of the following order:

Secondary — \$1,500

Primary — \$1,000

As for aided English-speaking schools, the fees per pupil per annum, as estimated by the English Schools Foundation and using the

same subsidy as for aided Chinese-language schools, would be of the following order:

Secondary — \$2,450

Primary — \$1,640

The English Schools Foundation has included in its school fees certain provisions such as repayment of Government loan, *etc.*, amounting to approximately \$250 per pupil for the secondary and \$110 per pupil for the primary. In the case of aided Chinese-language schools, such provisions are, as a rule, met from subscriptions, so called "ton fai" (堂費), and not from fees.

However, if the Foundation were to accept certain economies that would bring its operating costs into line with those in Government English-speaking schools, its annual fees per pupil (excluding subscriptions) could possibly be reduced to about \$1,800 for the secondary and \$1,100 for the primary.

Finally, Sir, I wish to take this opportunity to record my personal appreciation, first, to my honourable colleagues on the Select Committee for their advice and co-operation; secondly, to the two Clerks of the Committee, Mr David LAI and Mr K. Y. YEUNG, for their able assistance; and lastly to the Principal Treasury Accountant, Mr G. D. EDEN, for his unfailing support in the preparation of costings.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (SIR HUGH NORMAN-WALKER): —Sir, out of a statement made on a paper laid on the table it is impossible to develop a debate but I think I am in order—and I have advice to that effect—that, as long as I don't answer my honourable Friend, Dr CHUNG, I am able to look to the future as he has looked to what he has achieved.

Perhaps I might be permitted to take this opportunity to express, on Government's behalf, our thanks to Dr CHUNG and his colleagues on the Select Committee for producing a most useful and comprehensive report on this vexed issue. Their findings, I am certain, will give general re-assurance to many parents that fees at English-speaking schools are unlikely to be as much of a burden as was thought to be the case last year.

I would like to assure honourable Members that the report is now being given the most serious and urgent consideration by my staff in conjunction with the Director of Education. We are also inviting such interested organizations as the English Schools Foundation, the Joint Council of Parent-Teacher Associations of English-speaking Schools and the civil servants' association for their comments and views.

[THE COLONIAL SECRETARY] **Statements**

If the report is read with the goodwill and the attention which it deserves, Government should soon be able to put forward specific proposals to the Finance Committee of this Council. The concern of parents is of course not so much with the actual relative costs of schools, but what they will actually have to pay for their children's education. This depends on this Council's agreement on the duration of present subsidy arrangements, on the remission system and its continuation or variation in the light of the new information disclosed by the Select Committee's report, and also on the allowances which employers, including the Government, decide to give to their employees. It is obviously desirable that the longest possible notice should be given to parents, and the Director of Education and I have agreed that the announcements which directly concern the Government will be made in the shortest possible time, and that the matter should in our respective fields be treated as one of the highest priority.

Government business

First reading

ADOPTION (AMENDMENT) BILL 1972

INLAND REVENUE (AMENDMENT) BILL 1972

ESTATE DUTY (AMENDMENT) (NO 2) BILL 1972

Bills read the first time and ordered to be set down for second reading pursuant to Standing Order No 41(3).

Second reading

ADOPTION (AMENDMENT) BILL 1972

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (MR D. T. E. ROBERTS) moved the second reading of: —"A bill to amend the Adoption Ordinance."

He said: —Sir, honourable Members will recall that during the debate on the Adoption (Amendment) Bill 1971 the honourable Mr P. C. Woo suggested that section 25 of the Adoption Ordinance should be repealed.

The Intestate Estates Ordinance 1971, which came into force on the 7th October of last year, abrogated the previous Chinese law of succession and gave certain rights, in the distribution of the estate of an intestate, to children who were adopted by means of adoption orders made under the Adoption Ordinance. No such rights were conferred on persons adopted by the customary method.

It therefore seems appropriate in the future to dispense with customary adoptions and clause 2 of the bill provides that adoptions which take place after the end of this year may be carried out only in accordance with the provisions of the Adoption Ordinance, if they are to have legal effect.

The interval between the enactment of this bill and the 31st December of this year should give adequate notice to members of the public of this change in the law and afford them an opportunity to carry out customary adoptions during that period if they wish.

Subsection (2) of the proposed new section 25 in clause 2 of the bill preserves to persons who have been adopted in the past by the customary method such rights as do not conflict with the recently enacted family legislation.

MR P. C. WOO: —Sir, I support this bill. I have already previously mentioned undesirable posthumous adoptions under the Chinese law and custom. There is yet another form of customary adoption among the Chinese in Hong Kong, who have no children of their own and who adopt children of their poor relatives or clansmen by payment of a sum of money in the guise of a "red packet" or "lai sze" (利是) to the natural parents who would then sign a piece of paper giving the child to the adopter. Such adoption has been recognized by the former Secretary for Chinese Affairs and now also by my honourable Friend, the Secretary for Home Affairs. With the passing of this bill, Sir, this form of adoption will no longer be possible.

I think there is now only one form of Chinese law and custom still applicable in Hong Kong. I mean Chinese wills. Section 30(2) of the Wills Ordinance (Chapter 30) provides:

"The validity of a will which was valid under section 3 of the repealed Wills Ordinance shall not be affected by any thing in Part III, except insofar as the will may be revoked or altered by any subsequent will valid under this Ordinance."

And it is necessary to mention the said section 3 to understand this clause. Section 3 provides:

"Any written will or testamentary writing made or acknowledged by a Chinese testator (whether a native of or domiciled in the Colony or China) shall, if the same is proved to have been made or acknowledged and authenticated according to the Chinese laws or usages, so as to be effectual for the transmission of property according to such laws or usages, be deemed and taken to be lawfully made and acknowledged, and to have the same virtue and effect as if the same had been made and acknowledged according to the laws in force in this Colony, notwithstanding certain formalities

[MR WOO] **Adoption (Amendment) Bill—second reading**

prescribed by such laws in force in the Colony touching the signing, acknowledgment and attestation of written wills or testamentary writings.”

It will be necessary to preserve this peculiar aspect of Chinese law and custom for some time. Whenever a Chinese makes a will he often writes it in the Chinese language. Most, if not all, Chinese wills do not strictly comply with the provisions of the Wills Ordinance. To abolish this custom now would render most of the wills made in Chinese invalid.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill read the second time.

Bill committed to a committee of the whole Council pursuant to Standing Order No 43(1).

Explanatory Memorandum

This Bill provides that adoptions in Hong Kong after 31st December 1972, may be effected only in accordance with the Adoption Ordinance.

Subsection (2) of the proposed new section 25 saves the rights of those persons adopted in Hong Kong in accordance with Chinese law and custom prior to the 31st December 1972.

INLAND REVENUE (AMENDMENT) BILL 1972

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY (ACTING) (MR D. H. JORDAN) moved the second reading of: —“A bill to amend the Inland Revenue Ordinance.”

He said: —Sir, this bill seeks to give legislative effect to a proposal which the Financial Secretary made when introducing the budget for 1972-73, that the rates at which salaries tax is charged should be reduced. The existing rates are 2¾% on the first \$5,000 of net chargeable income, rising in scale by 2¾% on each additional \$5,000 up to a maximum of 30% on any amount above \$50,000. It is proposed that, for all assessments made in respect of the year of assessment commencing on 1st April 1972 and of subsequent years of assessment, the rate on the first \$5,000 of net chargeable income should be reduced to 2½%; and that the steps on the scale should be at intervals of 2½% up to the maximum rate of 30%. This means that tax on each step of the scale will be reduced and that the maximum

rate will be reached only on income over \$55,000. At present, this rate is reached on income over \$50,000.

The cost of this concession to the revenue in 1972-73 will be about \$7 million.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill read the second time.

Bill committed to a committee of the whole Council pursuant to Standing Order No 43(1).

Explanatory Memorandum

This Bill implements the proposal made by the Financial Secretary in his Budget speech to change the rates at which salaries tax will be charged.

2. Clause 2 of the Bill amends the Second Schedule to the principal Ordinance so as to supersede the present rates of tax by new rates. Under the new rates tax on net chargeable income will be charged at 2½ per cent upon the first five thousand dollars rising in scale by 2½ per cent on each succeeding 5,000 dollars up to a maximum rate of 30 per cent on any amount above 55,000 dollars.

ESTATE DUTY (AMENDMENT) (NO 2) BILL 1972

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY (ACTING) (MR JORDAN) moved the second reading of:—"A bill to amend the Estate Duty Ordinance."

He said:—Sir, this bill seeks to give legislative effect to proposals which the Financial Secretary made in respect of estate duty when introducing the budget for 1972-73, and to a proposal made by my honourable Friend, Mr P. C. Woo, for an increase in the maximum allowance for reasonable funeral expenses.

The Financial Secretary's proposals were that the maximum rate of duty should be reduced from 20% to 15% and that the number of steps in the sliding scale on which duty is charged should be reduced from 14 to 11. In giving effect to these proposals, the bill provides that, while the lowest rate of duty remains at 5% on estates valued at between \$200,000 and \$300,000, the rate of duty on each step in the scale over \$300,000 will be reduced until the new maximum rate of 15% is reached on estates valued at over \$1 million.

[THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY (ACTING)] **Estate Duty (Amendment) (No 2)**
Bill—second reading

In the course of the budget debate, my honourable Friend, Mr Woo, proposed that the maximum allowance for funeral expenses should be increased from \$2,000 to \$3,000 or \$4,000 to take account of present day costs. An amendment to section 13(1) of the Estate Duty Ordinance has been included in the bill to raise the present maximum allowance of \$2,000 to \$5,000.

These concessions would apply in respect of estates of persons dying on or after 1st April 1972. The cost to revenue is difficult to estimate but is likely to be around \$2½ million.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill read the second time.

Bill committed to a committee of the whole Council pursuant to Standing Order No 43(1).

Explanatory Memorandum

The purpose of this Bill is to implement the proposals of the Financial Secretary, made during the Budget Debate, to reduce the rates of estate duty and to increase, from \$2,000 to \$5,000, the allowances for reasonable funeral expenses.

2. Clause 3 amends section 13(1) of the Ordinance so as to increase from \$2,000 to \$5,000 the allowances which may be made for reasonable funeral expenses in determining the value of estates of persons dying on or after the 1st day of April 1972, for the purpose of estate duty.

3. Clauses 4 and 5 are consequential to clause 6.

4. Clause 6 adds a new Tenth Schedule setting out the rates applicable to the estates of persons dying on or after the 1st April 1972. The rates range from 5 per cent on estates valued between \$200,000 and \$300,000 rising by ten steps of 1 per cent to 15 per cent on estates valued at over \$1,000,000.

CHIT-FUND BUSINESSES (PROHIBITION) BILL 1972

Resumption of debate on second reading (12th April 1972)

Question again proposed.

MR T. K. ANN:—Sir, operation of chit-funds by limited companies is new to Hong Kong. Its proliferation in accelerated pace since August last year is not a sudden spontaneous rush to offer loans to needy individuals. It is a profit-making business. It is others' money that is being managed and loaned to people who need ready cash.

Private chit-funds generally known as “yee wui” (義會) have been in operation among Chinese from time immemorial. The popular private practice of pooling money for common good among the populace originally stems from a genuine desire on the part of participants to assist a “wui tau” (會頭) or host of an association who is really in need of assistance and who, through his own efforts, assembles a number of friends or relatives, also with limited means, to pool their resources on a monthly or semi-monthly basis, each contributing a fixed sum. It stems also from their desire to save up with some reasonable returns. The first pool money, of course, goes to the “wui tau”, while the others wait for their turn. The cycle usually lasts not more than two years depending upon the number of participants and the frequency of assembly. The interest rate is generally fixed.

In such cases, the “wui tau” acknowledges favour from each of the participants and he himself is not required to pay interest as each of the others has to after receiving the pool. The sequence of receiving the subsequent pools is decided by balloting or prior mutual agreement. Since the bidding system was introduced, attractiveness of the high rate of interest offered by member bidders has become the predominating factor in deciding who is to receive the pool prior to others. In fact, there is no limit as to how high the interest rate may go.

Although “yee wui” is practised among acquaintances and friends, irregularities, default or abscondence do occur partly because very high interest burden is being borne by the early successful bidders and sometimes because the “wui tau” is involved in too many chit-funds, since such is so easy a way of raising funds.

Operation by a third independent party in gathering money at agreed intervals from participants who do not know each other but are grouped together arbitrarily in units of 12, 20 or more persons and, on the other hand, paying the total to the successful bidder after deduction of its commission or charges is a very recent development.

The practice of the company chit-funds also allows participants to bid a payment of interest from 10% up to 50% of the total chit face value. I have before me a copy of printed leaflet freely distributed by one of the chit-funds. Therein is given an illustrative example on a twelve month and twelve person basis with a total chit face value of \$3,600, *i.e.* \$300 from each person each month for a duration of twelve months. According to the example, the actual monthly contribution to

[MR ANN] **Chit-fund Businesses (Prohibition) Bill—resumption of debate on second reading (12.4.72)**

be made by each participant, whether he bids or not or has successfully bid, varies from \$180 to \$270 depending on the amount bid by the successful bidder each month. In the example, the amount bid for the first month is \$1,620 or in the neighbourhood of 45% of the total chit face value and, therefore, the first successful bidder receives only \$1,980 including his own payment of \$180 and his down payment of \$300 netting only \$1,500 of others' money. On the other hand, it is shown that the amounts actually paid by the last collector in twelve payments total \$2,935 although he is then to receive the full chit value of \$3,600. The participant who collects his money last will therefore have earned \$665 as rebate or profit. According to the leaflet, it is said that the gain to the last collector is 18.5%.

Sir, this is a fallacy, since the participant who collects last did not pay the whole amount of \$2,935 in the first month but on a month-to-month basis in amounts varying from \$180 to \$270 in addition to the first down payment of \$300. By simple arithmetic, we can calculate from the example and conclude that the last collector's actual gain in interest is 44.1% per annum. This is a very high rate of interest. To be sure, we must not lose sight of the fact that it is the early successful bidders who are paying the interest.

The other side of the coin shows that the first successful bidder who bid 45% of the chit face value has actually received on the scene of the first assembly only \$1,500 of others' money, whereas he will have to pay \$2,455 in aggregate during the subsequent period of eleven months. From this angle we can work out that the borrower is to pay an interest of \$955 or 63.7% per annum. The difference in interest rate arises from the fact that the chit-fund company is holding such participant's down payment till the end of the cycle for the last collector.

The above establishes the fact that chit-funds including all private "yee wui" operating on the bidding basis are in effect usuries under the cloak of savings when there is no limit to the interest rate that can be offered. Participants of chit-funds are generally people with small means. It is grievous to note that the needy have to pay as high a rate of interest as 63.7% per annum for some small sum that he solicits.

Now again from the standpoint of the late or last collector of a particular chit-fund group he is running a serious risk especially when there are limitless number of groups in actual operation by one chit-fund company and there is no control on participants who may at the same time be participating in several different groups, or groups belonging to different chit-fund companies. It is axiomatic that larger profits are always accompanied by higher risks. Although chit-fund companies

might be controlled by Government given adequate resources and they in practice require the successful bidder to put up a guarantee before the payment is made, there is no foolproof method of stopping or preventing malpractice on the part of participants: such as a *mala fide* person A to bid in X fund with a conspirator B as guarantor and B in Y fund with A as guarantor in the way of cross trumping leading to the eventuality that both of them default or abscond at the same time. If the abscondence exceeds the limited liability of the particular chit-fund company, the consequence could be disastrous, as other groups of the same fund will inevitably be affected through no fault of their own. There is also the possibility that certain people may subscribe to a chit-fund merely to obtain capital for speculation or gambling. How can they in that case be reliable participants?

Sir, we cannot forget that those who collect late or last are generally also small people. They cannot afford to suffer any loss. A man who knows the risks would not participate in such chit-fund in the first place. He who participates knowing the risks must be either needy or greedy. If he is neither needy nor greedy he must be misinformed or naive.

Allowing operation of chit-funds to expand on an increasing scale as heretofore definitely cannot augur well for the community. The whole thing is rather like a time bomb and when it explodes one will learn social convulsion, which must be avoided at all costs. Besides the bidding method is surely not a sure way of answering urgent needs. As can be perceived, the one really in need may not succeed in the bidding, since bidding in this case is governed by interest rate and not degree of need. The reason advanced by some that the system is to assist the needy is again a fallacy.

Taking this opportunity to lay down minimum rules in section 5 subsection (2) to regulate private chit-funds is certainly a timely move. However, it is equally important that the whole population including illiterates should be fully informed of the existence of this law, since ignorance on the part of a private operator resulting in his failure to observe these rules will make him liable on conviction to a fine of \$10,000 and to imprisonment for 3 years under section 3. If prosecution results in his conviction, the ultimate losers will regrettably again be the ignorant participants. It is not inappropriate to suggest here that the penalty inflictable on offending private chit-fund operators be somewhat reduced and placed in a separate category.

With the above observations, Sir, I support the motion.

MR SALMON: —Sir, I rise to support my Friend, Mr ANN, and to support the bill before Council.

[MR SALMON] **Chit-fund Businesses (Prohibition) Bill—resumption of
debate on second reading (12.4.72)**

I must confess that until a few months ago I had never heard of a chit-fund, but was aware of what had been described to me as “money associations” and in particular the quite extortionate interest demands on loans by money-lenders. Indeed I once bailed out from jail a young man who, through little fault of his own, got into financial difficulties, had borrowed \$4,000 at no less than 4% interest per month or 48% for the first year, and was finding it impossible to pay back the original loan. There must be countless less well-to-do people in our community who need to borrow for some emergency, such as a funeral or for medical expenses, who do not know where to turn and have little hope of borrowing from a bank because of the lack of sufficient security.

There are, of course, many companies and organizations who already have loan schemes for their employees, and I would urge all employers to see if a loan scheme for their staff, especially for those on the lower salary scales, could be introduced or an existing scheme improved. However there will still be a great many people without this sort of help although, as my honourable Friend the Financial Secretary has said, private chit-funds within certain conditions may continue and will doubtless do so. But I for one do not think much of a system or practice, even though in association with friends or colleagues, whereby someone in need, often in some urgent need, only gets a loan by bidding the highest interest rate. Is it beyond our ability in Hong Kong, with our banks' lending potential at a record high, to set up some sort of joint venture facility, perhaps with Government participation or with an element of Government guarantee, to cater for the small loan that the man-in-the-street would be seeking? I am sure there would be every sort of difficulty, not the least the need for a quick check on the genuineness of the applicant and the uncertainty of his ability to repay; but in Hong Kong difficulties do somehow get overcome as has been seen recently by Government's announcement to set up a scheme of loans for small industrial concerns. I do hope Government and financial institutions will now see if anything can be worked out for the small borrower, which with a little imagination and some reasonably acceptable element of risk I believe it can.

Meantime, Sir, the only alternatives with regard to registered chit-fund companies are to control them or prohibit them, and on balance I favour prohibition. Whether the rules for private chit-funds under clause 5(2) of the bill are enforceable I rather doubt, and I suspect irregularities will not come to light until fingers are badly burnt. I would simply urge again that more loan schemes be introduced by

employers, and that a serious attempt be made to introduce a scheme of modest loans for the modest borrower at modest rates, so that if possible the need for the private chit-fund system, with its many unattractive features as outlined by Mr ANN, may at least diminish if not altogether disappear.

Sir, I support the motion.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY (ACTING) (MR JORDAN): —Sir, I should like to thank my honourable Friends Mr ANN and Mr SALMON for their contributions to our debate this afternoon. The detailed analysis by Mr ANN of the way a chit-fund can actually operate, and the very high rates of interest that can be involved, reinforces the case for saying that commercial chit-funds are not really satisfactory media for the small man either to borrow from or to lend to. For the borrower too often has to pay a high rate of interest for his loan and the lender stands too great a chance of losing his money.

I think too that my honourable Friend's exposition has shown that a great many of the difficulties involved are inherent in the bidding or auction system. It is difficult to see how they could really be satisfactorily overcome by a system of Government control which, as the Financial Secretary said in this Chamber a fortnight ago, would in any case involve such a degree of detailed supervision that Government has neither the resources nor the trained staff to undertake it, even if it were felt that chit-funds fulfilled a sufficient social purpose to warrant such a deployment of resources.

My honourable Friend mentioned the importance of ensuring that the whole population should be informed of the existence of this law and in particular of the rules for the operation of private chit-funds in clause 5(2) of the bill. If the bill is enacted, I will ask my honourable Friend the Secretary for Home Affairs in conjunction with the Director of Information Services to see that these rules are widely disseminated, particularly amongst those most likely to be affected.

My honourable Friend has asked whether it might be possible to reduce somewhat the penalty provided in the case of a private chit-fund operator who, perhaps through ignorance of the law, may commit some offence against the requirements laid down in clause 5(2). Although the penalties laid down in clause 3 of the bill are of course maximum penalties, and one can reasonably expect that they would not be imposed for small or technical offences, I can see the force of my honourable Friend's argument on this point. The difficulty is to prevent the exemption for properly run private chit-funds from being abused and used as a loophole by commercial operators to continue their businesses.

[THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY (ACTING)] **Chit-fund Businesses (Prohibition) Bill—
resumption of debate on second reading
(12.4.72)**

My honourable Friend, the Attorney General has agreed, however, to consider this proposal and if some means can be found to implement it without unduly detracting from the safeguards provided by the bill as it now stands an amendment will be introduced at the committee stage.

My honourable Friend Mr SALMON referred to the problems of less well-to-do people who need to borrow to meet some emergency and who do not have sufficient security to borrow from a bank. The real difficulty is that if anyone is to borrow at a tolerable rate of interest he needs either to be able to provide security or to be known to the lender. For those who cannot provide an acceptable security this means that they must have recourse to relatives, or friends, or their employers.

I hope that those employers who have not yet set up loan schemes for their employees will take note of my honourable Friend's exhortation that they should consider doing so. The Government has had such a scheme in force for its own employees for many years to deal with the necessary expenses on moving house, on the marriage of an officer's children, to meet the funeral expenses of dependents and to meet expenses generally caused by unforeseen domestic calamity, hardship or serious illness.

This sort of scheme is not so much a concession to the staff as a bit of enlightened self-interest by the employer.

My honourable Friend's other suggestion was for the banks to set up some sort of joint venture facility, with Government participation or an element of Government guarantee, to cater for the man in the street seeking small loans. I have to confess that I see great difficulties in this, both in sorting out the genuine applicants from the frauds and in securing repayment. However, this suggestion is really beyond the scope of the present bill and if my honourable Friend wishes to pursue this proposal we can do this elsewhere.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill read the second time.

Bill committed to a committee of the whole Council pursuant to Standing Order No 43(1).

Committee stage

Council went into Committee.

OATHS AND DECLARATIONS BILL 1972

HIS EXCELLENCY THE PRESIDENT: —With the concurrence of honourable Members we will take the clauses of not more than ten.

Clauses 1 to 4 were agreed to.

Clause 5.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (MR ROBERTS): —Sir, I move that clause 5 be amended in the proviso to subclause (2) by deleting the words "is now lawful" and substituting the words "is appropriate to his religious belief".

It can, I think, be implied from various other provisions of the bill that a witness who is neither Christian nor Jewish is entitled to be sworn in accordance with his religious belief. However, I think it is desirable to put this beyond doubt and this amendment will do so.

*Proposed Amendment**Clause*

5 That clause 5 be amended in the proviso to subclause (2) by deleting "is now lawful" and substituting the following—

"is appropriate to his religious belief".

The amendment was agreed to.

Clause 5, as amended, was agreed to.

Clauses 6 to 8 were agreed to.

Clause 9.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (MR ROBERTS): —Sir, I move that clause 9 be amended as set out in the paper before honourable Members.

This amendment proposes to insert a new subclause (4) to enable a notary in Hong Kong to administer or receive oaths, affidavits or affirmations which are required by the law of a foreign country for use in that country. As it is at present worded clause 9 might be argued to have prevented this being done, and notaries in Hong Kong do a fair amount of work of this kind.

Oaths and Declarations Bill—committee stage*Proposed Amendment**Clause*

- 9 That clause 9 be amended by inserting after subclause (3) the following new subclause—

"(4) Nothing in this section shall extend to an oath, affidavit or affirmation before a notary required by the law of any foreign country to give validity to any document designed to be used in that country. "

The amendment was agreed to.

Clause 9, as amended, was agreed to.

Clauses 10 to 24 and the First to the Fourth Schedules were agreed to.

ESTATE DUTY (AMENDMENT) BILL 1972

Clauses 1 to 7 were agreed to.

**HONG KONG TOURIST ASSOCIATION (AMENDMENT)
BILL 1972**

Clauses 1 and 2 were agreed to.

POLICE FORCE (AMENDMENT) BILL 1972

Clauses 1 and 2 were agreed to.

PUBLIC ORDER (AMENDMENT) BILL 1972

Clauses 1 and 2 were agreed to.

Clause 3.

MR CHEUNG: —Sir, I move that clause 3 be amended as set forth in the paper before honourable Members.

The purpose of this I have explained during the debate on the second reading.

*Proposed Amendment**Clause*

- 3 That clause 3 be amended in the proposed section 30(1) by deleting the words "to show that an offence has been committed or".

The amendment was agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, was agreed to.

Clause 4 was agreed to.

DISTRICT COURT (AMENDMENT) BILL 1972

Clauses 1 to 8 were agreed to.

INLAND REVENUE (AMENDMENT) BILL 1972

Clauses 1 and 2 were agreed to.

ESTATE DUTY (AMENDMENT) (NO 2) BILL 1972

Clauses 1 to 6 were agreed to.

Council then resumed.

Third reading

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (MR ROBERTS) reported that the

Oaths and Declarations Bill 1972

Public Order (Amendment) Bill 1972

had passed through Committee with amendment and that the

Estate Duty (Amendment) Bill 1972

Hong Kong Tourist Association (Amendment) Bill 1972

Police Force (Amendment) Bill 1972

District Court (Amendment) Bill 1972

Inland Revenue (Amendment) Bill 1972

Estate Duty (Amendment) (No 2) Bill 1972

had passed through Committee without amendment and moved the third reading of each of the bills.

Question put on each bill and agreed to.

Bills read the third time and passed.

Adjournment and next sitting

HIS EXCELLENCY THE PRESIDENT: —In accordance with Standing Orders I now adjourn the Council until 2.30 p.m. on Wednesday 10th May.

Adjourned accordingly at eleven minutes to four o'clock.