

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(2)661/99-00  
(These minutes have been  
seen by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/PL/HA

**LegCo Panel on Home Affairs**

**Minutes of meeting  
held on Monday, 14 June 1999 at 4:30 pm  
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

- Members Present** :
- Hon CHOY So-yuk (Chairman)
  - Hon Albert HO Chun-yan (Deputy Chairman)
  - Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
  - Hon LEE Wing-tat
  - Hon MA Fung-kwok
  - Hon James TO Kun-sun
  - Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum, JP
  - Hon Christine LOH
  - Hon Gary CHENG Kai-nam
  - Hon Jasper TSANG Yok-sing, JP
  - Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
  - Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
  - Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, JP
  - Hon LAW Chi-kwong, JP
- Members Absent** :
- Hon Edward HO Sing-tin, JP
  - Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, JP
  - Hon Andrew WONG Wang-fat, JP
  - Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBS, JP
- Member Attending** :
- Hon CHAN Yuen-han

**Public Officers :**     Item III  
**Attending**

Mr KWAN Wing-wah, Leo, JP  
Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs

Mr NG Hon-wah  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs

Mr M B DOWIE  
Assistant Commissioner of Police (Support)

Mrs R M CARTLAND  
Assistant Director (Social Security)

Mr WU Shu-wing  
Chief Social Security Officer (Social Security) 3

Item IV

Mr KWAN Wing-wah, Leo, JP  
Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs

Mr NG Hon-wah  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs

Item V

Mr Arthur NG  
Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs

Mr Peter CHEUNG  
Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs

Consultant to Home Affairs Bureau  
Mr Albert LAM

Item VI

Mr David TSUI  
Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs

Mr Augustine CHENG  
Deputy Director of Home Affairs

**Attendance by : Item III**  
**Invitation**

Office of the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data

Mr Stephen LAU  
Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data

Mr R McLEISH  
Deputy Commissioner for Personal Data

Mr Tony LAM  
Assistant Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data

**Clerk in : Mrs Constance LI**  
**Attendance : Chief Assistant Secretary (2) 2**

**Staff in : Ms Eva LIU }  
Attendance : Head, Research & Library Services Division }For  
}Item V  
Ms YUE Sin-yui }only  
Research Officer 2, }  
Research & Library Services Division }**

Miss Flora TAI  
Senior Assistant Secretary (2) 2

---

**I. Confirmation of minutes of meeting**  
[LC Paper No. CB(2)2199/98-99]

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 May 1999 [LC Paper No. CB(2)2199/98-99] were confirmed.

**II. Information paper issued since the last meeting**  
[LC Paper No. CB(2)2077/98-99]

2. Members noted the Administration's report on the Arts and Sport Development Fund.

### III. Work of the Office of the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data (PCO)

[Paper Nos. CB(2)2196/98-99(01) to (04)]

3. At the invitation of the Chairman, Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data (Privacy Commissioner) briefed members on the current work of PCO in monitoring, supervising and promoting compliance with the Personal Data (Privacy) Ordinance (the Ordinance), Cap. 486 [Paper No. CB(2)2196/98-99(01)].

#### *Time-bar for legal actions*

4. Referring to paragraph 9 of the paper provided by the Privacy Commissioner's Office (PCO), Miss Emily LAU expressed much concern that the performance measurement to close a complaint was set at 180 days. It appeared that PCO was unaware of the time-bar of six months for initiating legal proceedings if the case was subsequently found in breach of the Ordinance. Privacy Commissioner responded that the performance measurement was set having regard to the substantial increase in workload and the relatively small staff establishment of PCO. He explained that the time-bar for initiating legal proceedings was subject to interpretation and PCO was now studying the relevant court ruling for an internal review of the investigation procedures. Miss LAU was strongly of the view that the current time span for investigation of complaints was too long and that an urgent review should be carried out to modify the performance pledge to address the problem of time-bar for taking legal actions. Privacy Commissioner pointed out that most complaints would not lead to criminal proceedings. He assured members that PCO would expedite the processing of any complaint if it involved possible criminal offences.

5. Responding to the Chairman's enquiry on the normal time to close a complaint, Assistant Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data informed members that most complaints were closed within four months upon receipt. Cases which could be resolved through conciliation were normally closed within 45 days upon receipt. In this regard, Mr James TO suggested that staff of PCO should remind the complainant of the time-bar for legal actions if it was anticipated that investigation of a complaint would not be able to complete within six months.

#### *Disclosure of general information*

6. Mr LEE Wing-tat said that he had received complaints that some public and statutory bodies refused to disclose general information, such as attendance records of their members, on grounds of privacy. He therefore asked whether disclosure of such information would require consent of the individuals concerned. Privacy Commissioner responded that it was not always possible to give a clear-cut answer as to whether a particular action or practice was justifiable or in contravention of the Ordinance. Each case would have to be examined on its own merits. He pointed out that the Ordinance was enacted to protect the privacy of

individuals in relation to personal data and it also provided for exemption in some circumstances. Privacy Commissioner advised that for release of personal data for purposes other than the purpose of collection, consent of the persons concerned was necessary. PCO would definitely follow up any complaint if there was possible breach of the statutory requirements. Mr LEE expressed concern that statutory and public bodies would make use of the Ordinance to block access to general information which was of public interest and which should be made available to the general public.

7. In response to Mr LEE Wing-tat, Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs (PAS(HA)) explained that attendance records of individual members of a committee were personal data protected by the Ordinance. In accordance with Data Principle 3 of the Ordinance, personal data could not, without the prescribed consent of the data subject, be used for any purpose other than the purpose for which the data were collected. Such personal data could only be released if it had been specifically stated at the time of collection that it would be made available to the public. However, there was an exemption provision that disclosure to the news media could be made if there were reasonable grounds to believe that publishing of the data was in the public interest. For avoidance of doubt, it would be advisable to seek consent of committee members for the publication of attendance records. In this regard, Mr James TO suggested that the Administration should notify members of these statutory and public bodies at the time of their appointment that relevant general information including their attendance would be made available to the public.

*Adequacy of current state of law*

8. Mr James TO said that there had been cases recently relating to breach of privacy rights e.g. secret video-recording in female washrooms and changing rooms. He remarked that there might be deficiencies in the current state of law to deal with these cases. He therefore asked whether PCO would review the Ordinance to recommend improvements. In response, Privacy Commissioner said that secret video-taping was a case of unlawful surveillance which might be beyond the scope of the Ordinance. In this connection, he informed members that the Privacy Subcommittee of the Law Reform Commission (LRC) was reviewing the legislation for protection of personal privacy including unlawful interception and surveillance, and that a report on stalking behaviour had been published. He hoped that the Privacy Subcommittee of LRC would put forward its recommendations on unlawful surveillance for early consultation as legislation in that area was inadequate. Privacy Commissioner further advised that PCO would follow up on any necessary legislative amendments required of the Ordinance.

9. Mr James TO was of the view that secret video-recording could be regarded as unlawful collection of personal data instead of unlawful surveillance. He inquired whether this could be dealt with under Summary Offences Ordinance or other existing legislation. PAS(HA) responded that if the data subject could be

identified in the video tape, it could be a case of collection of personal data by unlawful and unfair means which constituted a breach of Data Principle 1 of the Ordinance. As regards whether other legislation was required to improve the protection of personal privacy, PAS(HA) advised that the Privacy Subcommittee of LRC was now studying regulation of media intrusion and remedies for invasion of privacy. The Administration would await its recommendations before giving consideration to the need for new legislation.

*Discovery of Police witness statements at a refuse collection point*

10. In response to Miss Emily LAU, Assistant Commissioner of Police (Support) (AC of P) informed members that the requirements for data users to take reasonably practicable steps to ensure compliance with the provisions of the Ordinance had been incorporated in a Police order. He said that the recent incident that Police witness statements were found at a refuse collection point was clearly a breach of the privacy guideline, and disciplinary investigation was now being carried out. At the request of Miss Emily LAU, AC of P agreed to advise the Panel of the result of the investigation when it was completed. Miss LAU further asked whether the Police had taken any step to prevent recurrence. AC of P replied that arising from the incident, the Police was reviewing the training package on personal data protection and was discussing with the Security Bureau the classification of documents containing personal data or which might have data privacy implications.

*Extension of the data matching procedures*

11. Miss Emily LAU asked about the list of government departments or organizations to which Social Welfare Department (SWD) would seek to extend data matching procedures. Assistant Director (Social Security) (AD(SS)) replied that the Director of Audit had specifically pointed out in his Report No. 32 the possibility of data matching with the Treasury to cross-check whether civil pensioners were receiving Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA) and with the Correctional Services Department to ensure that prisoners would not be receiving CSSA. She added that the SWD was preparing the application for approval from the Privacy Commissioner for relevant matching exercises. Miss LAU then asked whether CSSA recipients would be informed of the possibility of data matching. AD(SS) responded that the CSSA Scheme Application Form had already contained explanations relating to possible data matching exercises. The Application Form could also specify which departments or organizations had been included in the data-matching exercises and include a warning against providing false information. She said that caseworkers were required to fully explain the provisions of the Application Form to CSSA applicants.

12. Miss Cyd HO said that when a CSSA recipient had taken up part-time job, he/she had to ask the employer to certify his/her income on a prescribed form. She pointed out that the requirement had forced CSSA recipients to disclose their

status as CCSA recipients, and this could lead to possible discrimination or exploitation by employers. She asked whether SWD would review such requirements. AD(SS) responded that SWD was also concerned about employers reducing the wages of CSSA recipients. However, SWD would need to verify the income of CSSA recipients to prevent fraudulent claims. In this connection, front-line staff had already been advised that alternative verifiable documents such as salary advice slips could be accepted as income proof for CSSA recipients.

#### **IV. Difficulties encountered by divorcees in collecting maintenance payments**

[Paper Nos. CB(2)2196/98-99(05), CB(2)2261/98-99(01) & (02) and CB(2)2310/98-99]

13. At the invitation of the Chairman, Head, Research and Library Services Division (H/RL) briefed members on the research report entitled "Supplementary Information on Child Support Agencies in Overseas Countries" [Paper No. CB(2)2196/98-99(05)]. The briefing notes were tabled at the meeting and subsequently issued to absent members vide LC Paper No. CB(2)2310/98-99.

14. The Chairman then invited PAS(HA) to brief members on the Administration's responses [Paper No. CB(2)2261/98-99(01) & (02)]. PAS(HA) said that the Administration had noted the two research reports of the Legislative Council Secretariat, in particular the operational experience of those overseas countries which had set up child support agencies. It was his understanding that members of the Panel had not proposed to transfer the judicial power of assessing maintenance from the court to an executive authority. He said that while the Administration had reservations about establishing an intermediary body for collecting maintenance payments, the Administration would have regard to the recommendations made by overseas countries in addressing the operational difficulties of their child support agencies when reviewing the Attachment of Income Order (AIO) system. The Administration would also welcome members' suggestions on ways to address difficulties encountered by divorcees in collecting maintenance payments.

15. Mr LAW Chi-kwong asked whether the Administration had considered that establishing an intermediary body for collecting maintenance payments would help reduce social security payments. In this regard, he provided the following information -

- (a) there were at present 25 000 single-parent families receiving CSSA, and the CSSA payments for these families amounted to about \$240 million a year; and

- (b) the number of single-parent families receiving CSSA had increased tenfold in the past ten years, with an average annual increase of 28.5% in the past five years.

16. PAS(HA) responded that not all single-parent families receiving CSSA were on maintenance payments. He informed members that the number of single-parent families who had to rely on CSSA due to failure to receive maintenance payments was 700 as at March 1999, and the expenditure of CSSA payments to these families was about \$7.4 million a year. Mr LAW Chi-kong pointed out that the Administration's figures did not reflect the full picture because many single parents receiving CSSA did not apply for maintenance in view of the cumbersome court procedures and difficulties in collection.

17. Deputy Chairman shared the views of Mr LAW Chi-kwong, considering that establishment of an intermediary body for collection of maintenance payments would encourage divorcees to claim maintenance instead of relying on CSSA. Deputy Chairman was also of the view that the Administration should not preclude the possibility of changing the present court-based system in the review. 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.

18. The Chairman asked whether the Administration had any information on the number of single-parent families which chose to rely on CSSA rather than claiming maintenance. PAS(HA) said that the Administration was aware that there were such cases but did not have the relevant statistics. To address this concern, SWD had since August 1998 required all single-parent applicants to apply for court proceedings to request for maintenance payments or to enforce the maintenance orders. The applicants had to sign undertakings to this effect before CSSA payments would be approved. However, single-parent families belonging to the following categories would be exempt from the requirement -

- (a) if the maintenance payers could not afford to pay;
- (b) if the whereabouts of the maintenance payers could not be traced; or
- (c) if the maintenance payees might be subject to violence if they requested for maintenance payment.

19. Miss CHAN Yuen-han asked whether the Administration had ascertained the number of cases in which the maintenance payees were able to receive payments due to them by means of the AIO and the amounts so recovered. PAS(HA) replied that in addition to the AIO scheme, there were other legal remedies to assist maintenance payees in recovering arrears of maintenance. He informed members that according to the Judiciary, there had been 24 applications for AIOs from April 1988 to March 1999, of which three were successful, two

were withdrawn by applicants and the remaining 19 applications were in progress. PAS(HA) said that as the scheme was only established last year, more publicity would be required. He added that the AIO scheme might have a deterrent effect against defaults in maintenance payments as maintenance payers would not wish to bother their employers with their personal problems. The possible deterrence effects would also be covered in the Administration's review. Miss Cyd HO remarked that the AIO scheme might also have encouraged some maintenance payers to delay payment until the day before the case was scheduled for court hearing.

20. Miss CHAN Yuen-han pointed out that the AIO scheme could not deal with cases where the default maintenance payers were self-employed or have no attachable income. She was strongly of the view that the Administration should seriously consider the Panel's views that an intermediary body should be established to collect maintenance payments on behalf of maintenance payees, if the AIO scheme was found not very effective. Recapitulating the discussion of the Panel meeting on 14 December 1998, the Chairman said that the Administration had argued that the child support agencies in overseas countries were not as effective as its proponents had claimed. The Panel therefore requested the Library and Research Division to provide further information on the review findings of these overseas agencies. The Chairman asked whether the Administration now had any views on the matter after studying the supplementary research report of the Legislative Council Secretariat on the effectiveness of child support agencies in overseas countries. PAS(HA) responded that the Administration had considered the review findings of these agencies. The Administration's analysis of the findings was however different from that of members. He pointed out that it was difficult to draw a conclusion from the findings that these overseas agencies were cost-effective, as the collection rate of maintenance payments before establishment of some of these agencies was not available for comparison. The Administration therefore had reservation that these agencies alone could effectively address the difficulties of collecting default maintenance payments. In response to the Chairman, H(RL) provided information on New Zealand. She said that the collection rates under a scheme run by the Department of Social Welfare in New Zealand ranged from 42% to 47% in 1988/89-1990/91, while that after the establishment of the child support agency was 91% in 1996/97.

21. Deputy Chairman asked the Administration to evaluate the effectiveness of the AIO scheme by comparing the administrative and legal costs of the scheme and the amount of default maintenance payments recovered through AIOs. He stressed that in assessing the merits of establishing a child support agency, 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 in the analysis to the protection of maintenance payees' dignity when collecting maintenance payments.

22. In concluding the discussion, the Chairman said that members were in support of the establishment of an intermediary body for collection and enforcement of maintenance payments. She therefore requested the Administration to take account of members' views in conducting the review. PAS(HA) noted the comments.

**V. Consultancy Report on Culture, the Arts, Recreation and Sports Services (the Consultancy Report)**

[Paper No. CB(2)2196/98-99(08)]

23. The Chairman informed members that the Panel had heard the views of the two Provisional Municipal Councils and nine deputations at its special meetings on 18 May and 27 May 1999, and that the Administration was requested to give its response at this meeting. Members noted the Administration's written response to the representations made to the Panel [Paper No. CB(2)2196/98-99(08)].

24. The Chairman asked whether the Administration could give a positive and clear-cut response to the submissions which indicated views different from those in the Consultancy Report. She added that some organizations had also requested the Administration to re-consider the Consultant's recommendations on the proposed transfer of the Music Office to Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts (APA). Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs 3 (DS(HA)3) explained that the Administration's written response was largely based on the Administration's Initial Responses to the Consultancy Study on Culture, the Arts, Recreation and Sports Services issued in March 1999. The Administration's Initial Responses had already set out the Administration's position on a number of policy issues, while the Task Force was now examining details of the Consultant's recommendations. He pointed out that the Administration's written response to submissions had reflected the progress of work of the Task Force during the last few months in following up the Consultant's recommendations.

25. The Chairman asked whether the Administration would consult the Panel before the institutional framework for the delivery of culture, the arts, recreation and sports services was put in place. As the Panel had expressed concern about the composition and functions of the proposed Culture and Heritage Commission, she hoped the Administration could provide more details to the Panel for further discussion. DS(HA)3 responded that the Legislative Council (LegCo) had already formed a Bills Committee to study the Provision of Municipal Services (Reorganization) Bill on the provision of municipal services after the abolition of the two municipal councils. The Administration was also working on the implementation of other Consultant's recommendations, such as the Culture and Heritage Commission, changes to the membership of the Hong Kong Sports Development Boards and introduction of more private sector initiative. Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs 5 (DS(HA)5) said that the Administration had noted the views of the concerned organizations and it would take time for the

Administration to follow up these views and further consult various parties. He assured members that the Administration would forward concrete proposals when available to the Panel for discussion. He added that the approval of LegCo would be required for the establishment of the new Department of Leisure and Culture Services and the new Environment and Food Bureau.

26. With regard to the proposed transfer of the Music Office, DS(HA)5 said that in view of the concerns expressed, the Administration had already undertaken in page 5 of the response that the existing level of services and facilities and the level of tuition fees of the Music Office would be preserved after the transfer. The Chairman asked whether the Administration was confident that APA, which was a body focusing on talent training, was capable of directing the work of the Music Office which emphasized on providing training to the general public. DS(HA)5 replied that the Consultant's recommendation to transfer the Music Office to APA was based on well-considered management and educational reasons. The Administration considered the proposal feasible and had been discussing with the management of the APA and the Music Office in that direction.

27. Mr Ambrose CHEUNG expressed dissatisfaction with the Administration's response. He said that the Administration was clearly working towards the direction of providing a new framework for the delivery of arts, culture and sport services. He suggested that the Panel should follow up discussion with the Administration if members could agree on some key areas. Miss Emily LAU supported Mr CHEUNG's proposal. The Chairman suggested and the meeting agreed that members could forward their views to the Panel Clerk before mid-July for drawing up a consolidated list to facilitate further discussion with the Administration.

28. The Chairman thanked representatives of the Administration and the Consultant to the Home Affairs Bureau for attending the meeting.

## **VI. Any other business**

### Date of next meeting

[Appendix I to LC Paper No. CB(2)2196/98-99]

29. The Chairman informed members that a special meeting of the Panel would be held on Tuesday, 29 June 1999 to discuss with members of the 18 Provisional District Boards issues relating to the proposed mandatory formation of owners' corporations and the percentage share required for appointment and termination of building managers.

30. Members also agreed that the Panel should hold another meeting on Monday, 12 July 1999 at 4:30pm to discuss with deputations HKSAR's Report on the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). As regards the

request of the Panel on Welfare Services for a joint meeting to discuss the resource implications of implementing the "One school one social worker" proposal, members agreed that the joint meeting could be held on 12 July 1999, subject to the Chairmen's agreement.

*(Post-meeting notes : With the concurrence of the Chairmen, the joint meeting of the Panels on Home Affairs and Welfare Services was scheduled for Monday, 12 July 1999 from 4:30 pm to 5:45 pm. The Panel on Home Affairs would hold its regular meeting immediately afterwards to discuss the Administration's paper on "Review of the Justices of Peace System". The meeting with deputations on HKSAR's Report on ICCPR had subsequently been postponed to September/ October 1999 as the United Nations hearings on the Report would unlikely be held before September 1999.)*

#### Allowances for District Council Members

[Paper No. CB(2)2292/98-99(01)]

31. Members noted the Administration's urgent request to discuss the proposed package of allowances for District Council (DC) members. Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs (DS(HA)) explained that it would be desirable for the prospective candidates of DC elections to know the allowances payable before they decided to stand for DC elections, nominations for which would start in early October 1999. The Administration hoped that the proposed package of allowances could be approved by the Finance Committee before the summer recess of LegCo.

#### Consultation with the Provisional District Boards

32. Mr Ambrose CHEUNG asked whether the Administration had consulted all Provisional District Boards (PDBs) on the proposed allowances. Deputy Director of Home Affairs (DD of HA) responded that during the public consultation exercise on the review of district organisations in 1998, many PDB members had reflected the view that the maximum rate of accountable allowance should be increased to help meet the costs of employing assistants. The Director of Home Affairs had mentioned the Administration's intention to raise the office rental allowance (ORA) during her meetings with 18 PDBs in March 1999, and the response was positive.

#### Amount of the accountable allowance

33. Members noted that the current maximum rate of ORA payable to members was \$4,900 per month. Mr Ambrose CHEUNG queried that the Administration's proposal to provide an accountable allowance of up to \$10,000 per month was still insufficient for DC members to meet both the office rental and employee salaries.

34. Miss Cyd HO said that the Administration had not supported her earlier proposal during the scrutiny of the District Councils Bill that DC members should be required to set up their offices to deal with complaints from members of the public. She therefore queried whether the proposed accountable allowance for DC members to set up offices was related to the DC functions as prescribed in the District Councils Ordinance. DS(HA) clarified that the proposed increase was mainly to help meet the cost of employing staff to assist DC members in discharging their duties.

35. Responding to concerns about the adequacy of the accountable allowance, DS(HA) stressed that the proposed increase of over 100% of the current accountable allowance was already a significant improvement. The allowance was to compensate DC members for the time and effort they spent in participating in public affairs. He pointed out that some DC members would set up joint offices and share out the costs of office rental and staff. In this connection, the Chairman commented that it might not always be feasible for DC members of the same district to set up joint offices if they belonged to different political parties. She said that as DCs would have to assume more responsibilities in district affairs such as building management and environmental planning, DC members would need to employ assistants for conducting the necessary research. She had doubts that the proposed allowance would be sufficient for meeting the staff costs.

36. Miss Emily LAU expressed concern that the proposed allowance of \$10,000 would not be adequate for employing assistant and renting office. She said that the Administration's paper had not clearly explained the rationale for arriving at the proposed rate of accountable allowance. She requested inclusion of such information in the Finance Committee paper. In referring to the procedures for LegCo Members to claim the operating expenses, Miss LAU asked the Administration to issue similar guidelines for DC members, for example, Members were not allowed to employ their immediate relatives as assistants. DD for HA responded that detailed guidelines would be issued to DC members for claiming the accountable allowance, based on similar principles for LegCo Members.

Adm

37. The Chairman enquired whether expenses for floral arrangements and advertisements in connection with district affairs would be reimbursable under the accountable allowance for DC members. DS(HA) responded that these were to be covered by the members' honorarium rather than the accountable allowance.

38. Miss Emily LAU remarked that that low rate of honorarium for DC members could only enable them to serve on a part-time basis, despite the fact that DC meetings were to be held during office hours.

39. Mr Ambrose CHEUNG said that he could not support the proposal as the allowance would not be adequate to assist DC members in discharging their enhanced duties.

40. In view of the absence of a quorum towards the end of the meeting, members present reminded the Administration that the views expressed at the meeting might not represent that of the Panel.

41. The meeting ended at 7:05 pm.

Legislative Council Secretariat

16 December 1999