Bills Committee on Juvenile Offenders (Amendment) Bill 2001 Summary of views expressed by organisations/individuals

(As at 18 September 2002)

	Organisation/Individual (LC Paper No. of written submission)	Response
1.	Against Child Abuse [LC Papers Nos. CB(2) 2778/01-02(01) & (20)]	- <u>proposes</u> to raise the minimum age of criminal responsibility to 14 as currently enforced in China and Taiwan
		- considers that criminal sanction is not the only and most effective way to curb crime
		- <u>proposes</u> that separating the delinquent child from the community and providing him/her with effective counselling and therapy can better meet the full interests of children and the society
2.	The Boys' & Girls' Clubs Association of Hong Kong [LC Paper No. CB(2) 2778/01-02(02)]	- <u>supports</u> raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility from seven to ten, and retaining the rebuttable common law presumption of doli incapax for children aged between the revised minimum age of ten and below 14
		- proposes that the Police should consult a panel of professionals comprising psychologists and social workers before deciding whether to bring about prosecution against children aged below 14
		- <u>proposes</u> extending existing rehabilitation and counselling services to all juvenile offenders

3.	Caritas Outreaching Social Work Team - Aberdeen [LC Paper No. CB(2) 2778/01-02(03)]	 supports in principle raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility from seven to ten urges the Administration to provide adequate support services to help children below the minimum age of criminal responsibility
4.	Hong Kong Christian Service	- supports raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility from seven to ten, and
	[LC Paper No. CB(2) 2778/01-02(04)]	retaining the rebuttable common law presumption of doli incapax for children aged between the revised minimum age of ten and below 14
5.	Hong Kong Committee on Children's Rights [LC Paper No. CB(2) 2778/01-02(05)]	 supports raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility to 14 considers that intensive family and community rehabilitative programme works much better than incarceration and punishment considers that leaving decision of whether to institute criminal proceedings against a child aged between seven and 14 to the discretion of the Police and/or the Prosecution, subject to the doli incapax presumption, as unsatisfactory, and
		inconsistent standards may be applied
6.	The Hong Kong Family Law Association [LC Paper No. CB(2) 2778/01-02(06)]	- supports raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility to 14
7.	Hong Kong Family Welfare Society [LC Paper No. CB(2) 2778/01-02(07)]	 supports raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility to 14 considers that children should not be required to undergo the trial process under the criminal justice system at a young age i.e. below 14 considers that the present minimum age is inconsistent with other legislative provisions which protect children up to and, in some cases, beyond the age of 14 proposes that existing rehabilitation services be reviewed to explore alternatives to criminalising young people aged below 14

8. The Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups [LC Paper No. CB(2) 2778/01-02(08)]	 supports raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility from seven to ten proposes to adopt a "decriminalizing" approach in handling juvenile delinquency and provide a wider range of sentencing options for juvenile offenders
9. The Hong Kong Psychological Society [LC Paper No. CB(2) 2778/01-02(09)]	- <u>supports</u> raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility from seven to ten as proposed in the Bill
10. Mr Andrew Bruce, SC [LC Paper No. CB(2) 2778/01-02(10)]	 supports raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility from seven to ten supports retaining the rebuttable common law presumption of doli incapax
11. Dr Nirmala Rao [LC Paper No. CB(2) 2778/01-02(11)]	- considers that the minimum age of criminal responsibility should be raised from seven to 14
12. Ms Corinne Remedios [LC Paper No. CB(2) 2778/01-02(12)]	 supports that the appropriate age of criminal responsibility should be set at 14, and not ten as proposed by the Administration, so as to exclude children aged ten to 13 supports the principle that children under the age of 14 should be presumed incapable of committing a crime supports the retention of the doli incapax presumption, in the event that the minimum age of criminal responsibility remains below 14
13. Fight Crime Committee [LC Paper No. CB(2) 2778/01-02(13)]	- supports raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility from seven to ten
14. Home Affairs Bureau [LC Paper No. CB(2) 2778/01-02(14)]	- supports the proposals made under the Bill

15. The Hong Kong Council of Social Service [LC Paper No. CB(2) 2778/01-02(15)]	 supports raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility from seven to ten and retaining the rebuttable presumption of "doli incapax" for persons between the revised age and 14 years expresses concern about the provision of rehabilitation and support service to juvenile delinquency and young offenders
16. St. John's Cathedral Counselling Service [LC Paper No. CB(2) 2778/01-02(16)]	 supports raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility from seven to ten, and retaining the rebuttable common law presumption of doli incapax for children aged between the revised minimum age of ten and below 14 considers that raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility to the age of ten will bring Hong Kong more in line with many countries
17. Tai Po District Fight Crime Committee [LC Paper No. CB(2) 2778/01-02(17)]	- supports the proposals made under the Bill
18. Mr YEUNG Wai-sing, a member of Eastern District Council [LC Paper No. CB(2) 2778/01-02(18)]	- supports the proposals made under the Bill
19. Hong Kong Bar Association [LC Paper No. CB(2) 2778/01-02(19)]	 proposes raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility to 12 considers that the proposed amendment of raising the minimum age of criminal responsibility to 10 is only a "minimum step in the right direction"

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
18 September 2002