LC Paper No. CB(2)1431/99-00(01)



LAW ASSOCIATION (HKUSU)

ROOM 532, FACULTY OF LAW, K.K. LEUNG BUILDING. THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG. Tel: 2108 4180 Fax: 2108 4559

Email: lawassn@hkusuc.hku.hk

Miss Margaret Ng

15th March, 2000

Room 116, New Henry House

10 Ice House Street

By Fax and Mail

Central

Hong Kong

Fax no. 2108 4559

Dear Miss Ng,

Re: The reduction of subsidies of tuition fees for PCLL

According to the news articles in Mingpao and South China Morning Post on 2nd March 2000, the University Grants Committee (UGC) has proposed a reduction of government subsidies for the Postgraduate Certificate in Laws (PCLL) programme in two years' time. If this proposal comes into reality, the tuition fees of the PCLL will rise significantly to \$170,000 (based on a preliminary calculation by our faculty, details please refer to the annex 6) from the present \$42,000.

Many of our law students worry about this proposal because not many of us can afford the high proposed tuition fees. In response to this proposal, we have written a public letter to Mrs Alice Lam, the Chairlady of the UGC (please refer to the annex 3) and we have also collected signatures from our fellow law students to show our strong opposition against this proposal (please refer to the annex 2).

We understand that the influence we can exert is limited, your help is sincerely needed. As the Chairman of the Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services in Legislative Council, you would be in a stronger position to trigger discussion in the Legislative Council, which will surely bring pressure on the UGC so as to make them reconsider the proposal.

Attached is also the article "PCLL Education in Hong Kong and the Question of Public Funding" prepared by Professor Albert H V Chen who is the Dean of the Faculty of Law(please refer to the annex 5).

Thank you for your kind attention.

Yours truly,

Hon Wai Hon, Wayne

The Chairman of the Law Association, HKUSU 2000-2001

報章:東方日報 日期:13-3-2000

Annex

資會陳情,要求該會收回成命。面對「群線、一致反對有關建議,並會各自去信教團問提供課程的大學罕有地聯成同一陣法律界引起極大回響,律政司、律師會及 會擬撒除法律文憑課程 情洶湧」的反響,預料教資會在下月的例 上:會就此進行檢討。 記者任秀群報道】

分科收费事宜,頭炮是先取消部分導修式 一士課程及法律文憑課程。一旦轉為自負 (士)静程的資助,被點名的包括工商管理 為重新分配資源,教資會正研究大學

大學教育資助委員 (PCLL) 資助,在 由現時的四萬二千元,倍增至近九萬元。 盈虧方式經營,法律文憑課程的學費 律政司港大城大關注

程,其實是法律學士課程的第四年,因為 件亦甚為關注,司長梁愛詩更親自去函教 必須修畢法律文憑課程才可執業,若法律 資會,強網法律文憑課程並非一般碩士課 去信教資會提出反對外,律政司高層對事 一個學生在完成三年的法律學士課程後, 消息稱,除了香港大學及城市大學已 周內召開理事會確認立場後,才會正式去 才作出改變資助決定。但他強調該會要待 會應待現正進行的法律教育檢討完成後,

明,強烈譴責撤回資助會造就學位貴族化較早前港大及城大的學生會已發表聲 函教資會。 要求取消有關決定。

師的本科生收取高昂學費

發展為國際金融及服務中心,並認為教資 源,培育更多合适的法律專才,配合香港 ,培育更多合適的去拿手上,沒有一個反對撤銷資助,相反認為應增加資 律師會副會長葉成慶表示,該會初

_			
Roff Jon	O Annex	2	
1 Eq - V	We are collecting signature	ene to not as a series	
		es to act as a voice against	
\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \		Committee's (UGC)	13/27/2
	-	government subsidies for	
/)		ificate in Laws(PCLL)	Ruc U.
- Clare of All		N区到八字员的安员督	. 4
	對法律學素證書課程()	PCLL)削減資助之計劃	3 mlan
Asiling.	m	Jo mos	2145
22	Sufa	PeerHog	Jul
Englis	Carr	William	Care
of the second	- - - - -	Dadone	45W
为处外	1 mil	ZWel	gur
bol.	ton	17/2	Palie
Monathan	Example has	-3932 3/3	Micon
Sto		Yn Un Pony	Salsamnioux
Syl	Janetto	Your for	Mar
by	tedilet	Jane -	(silve
deanna	Florence	Hell	Ari Chi
teress	(a f	GUA	1am
ciholog	Ro-J	[0	(2)
joe	Cha	2	Billy
Tirkey	Carante V	Caustra	21/5 {2 PZ
Muettre	VA.	July,	Dryk.
County	Alfred (JAG.,	Jones
Hara.	de-	ne likeling.	ACC
Galery	1 dx	1.1	JO IN MY
Anne	124	Jul 1	V Jean Maria





Chys

			·
Jean Stan	Gung	Market	容别
Jemy Le.	ARIBL KWOR		- Cas
Clairfy	J.M.	molhi	3 W88
yeza	Caix. Chen	1	学 25~7世
Ref	life-g.	1297	July 1
July	ne	Sail.	Jani Chy
شاحات		On De K	May
Carlan	Aifela-	Mis	Harrier So
Can for	Yun Suk Ling.	75 B.	So
TVOX	! De mue mi	Durello	
- Herry Cu.	le pue Mi	- Ham	
ChangaCho	Pro P	Jatt Und	
	Tan	Viole	
The son	Samo Jan	Jamie	
Jana.	Inde-"	Pripripassa	
CO 1/2	- Hall	antex	
Your -	Min 1	7.S. HAU.	
il illy to	V.		





	對法律專業證書課程(F	PCLL)削減資助之計劃	
Juje.	Dulalo.	luhe.	1/2m
Mark	Joreeney Wan	One	Do-
Wide.	Japan	barre	Jam
Wong Fri	Mistane	3	
Dak	Conffr.	Blogh	Alim C.
wander	Smilesting	John (guori Jan
Janie Chan		84. (am	Hormony Ne
James Kwok	3 3	Mayor's Wong.	Toans.
Natalie Cheny	Erle Chan C.W.	Minon.	1734
Chan-	Mod las	, Afor	Jan Jan
Janice Un	Caroline	Susan	
Wenne Some	Dan	12-4.	They
Adria Plas	Jules:	Kame Chan	Acc
Mario 7 AM	Mru J	Cho fray	
Chi	Can 1 =		
	18.		
Calcidiey.		Ž.	
Cakel	& Dong	ni	





7			
Journ Fung. Was	Han (i)	Mok monich	CHAN WAI HAN Carie Chen
Works HOSIH wyhish	Emmy La Cali	Gace Ng Que.	CARMEN TUNG
CHRISTSE ChiTSE	SAUJINDER SINDY	Wong Wair Ching Circles	9-3
Edecta Chan Phil	Andy Jang	, Carmen Tang and	
Toy lam Juf	Reforcatee 112	Hear Can posts	
ERIKA WAN YOU	CITEUNG YING.	Annie Szeto Hay	
STEPHANIE FANG	CHUYIK Nam Such	Mak Ki May	·
TUNG HOI KUAN Thy than		Ho vois IAN Relieva Ho	
CHENDSHUN Zis-	PUSA KARAI (LAM FA TUE	
CHOW WHEE SMERIT	Michelle Poon Michelle	11. I FOR	
Charles Town	Ma Lep Yen.	The Mark W	ν
Catheen Cheme	Jacquelia Janko	Ja Kan Yt	5
CHAN LOT PING JWEY.	Peggy Peggy	Shirin Con 2	
Miranda Chan Miranda	HUNG CHING TVEN CRYSTAL MYSEL	Low I	
Wery taking God	KO HON PIK	Rickie Cath	/
NG YAT FAN NOWY	HO MAN CHI Joenus	SUWING STE Ceclia	
(an) of gener	TRACY YIP LIN PO (DUMON)	Alwin chan pela	
Annio Com	Tark 1 52 Ho 7 FLOETS	elle CY.	





		4
Sarah Cheng	Gueenie Tsao	
Noboles Men.	Thermie Cham	
Martin Wong	CHRIS CHINA	
Li /a /an	RachelWory	
One Xand	Lomaine PAO	
Chisti man.	MARCIUS CHAN	
py la		·
Xld. Xu		
Jonathan Horn		
Roanna Clien		
Aldo Chan		
Isabella Li		
Annold Denny		
Hick blak		
Dereschala.		
Perelc Male. Dogue L:		
Venual lang.		
M.K. Loung.		





			•
Jordha	Rinald lee.		
Pada -	Lora Xi		
Myssire Les	Bounie for		
Say	Cardy Co		
S	Camer	·	
Warden	Juffe		
firmeri	Clife		·
Parter	Sean Fang		
TUZ	mosó		
=	malle		
	82		
(Can	danny No	·	
\ lauss	Malis O-	·	
Day.	Phoo Kà		
Cha.	Jonathan		
Tranky.	men		
Thing	0		
1111			

Annex3



LAW ASSOCIATION (HKUSU)

ROOM 532, FACULTY OF LAW, K.K. LEUNG BUILDING. THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG. Tel: 2108 4180 Fax: 2108 4559 Email: lawassn@hkusuc.hku.hk

A Letter to Mrs Alice Lam, the Chairman of the University Grants Committee (UGC).

It was reported in the media that the University Grants Committee has proposed a reduction of government subsidies for the Postgraduate Certificate in Laws (PCLL) programme in two years' time. Three criteria were stated as guidelines for this proposed reduction:

- 1. Whether the curricula concerned are second degrees (for instance master or doctorate degree);
- 2. Whether the purposes of the curricula concerned are for the personal enhancement;
- 3. Whether the curricula concerned train people for whom the community has a special need.

In response to the proposed reduction in subsidies, we put forward the following comments:

- 1. The increase in tuition fees as suggested by the media should not be regarded as the official figure. The University of Hong Kong will determine the ultimate figure. However, it is foreseeable that without such subsidies, there will be a huge increase in PCLL's tuition fees inevitably. The entry of the profession will be hinged on wealth. If this proposal comes into a reality, the situation will go backwards to the time when the legal profession was only available to the upper class. In fact, to maintain the quality of the future legal profession, tightening the entry requirement would be a more sensible way instead of increasing the tuition fees.
- 2. The nature of PCLL is fundamentally different from other postgraduate courses:
 - According to the Legal Practitioners Ordinance (Cap 159), PCLL is the statutory pre-requisite course for entering the legal profession while



ROOM 532, FACULTY OF LAW. K.K. LEUNG BUILDING, THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG. Tel: 2108 4180 Fax: 2108 4559 Email: lawassn@hkusuc.hku.hk

other postgraduate courses may not be a must to enter into the respective professions.

- The PCLL programme has been designed as an integral part of a 4-year package. For example, tax law is taught in some bachelor programmes for business and accountancy, but is not taught in the Bachelor of Laws (LLB) programme and is left to the PCLL.
- Law students enter the LLB course on the expectation that PCLL is an integral part of the legal education. The proposal that undermines such an expectation is unfair to current LLB students.
- In fact, an overwhelming majority of LLB graduates continue to study PCLL. The proposal will deprive law students of the opportunities to pursue a career in the legal field.
- 3. Legal Education is under a current overall review, during which there will be a consultation period. In the mean time, the government has proposed a reduction of subsidy which might invite no formal consultation. We suggest that the UGC should consider the recommendations made pursuant to thorough review and consultation before they apply the proposal to PCLL.
- 4. It is reported in the mass media that those courses considered to be beneficial to the society would not be subject to this proposed reduction. It is not clear on what basis the UGC regards a course as necessary or not. We put forward that the following considerations should be taken account of.
 - In view of the transformation of the political, economic and legal aspects, the legal profession has distinct roles to play. For instance, the advent of the new constitutional order, the advancement of information technology and even the introduction of the Mandatory Provident Funds makes it obligatory to train a lot of legal professionals to encounter the forthcoming challenges.
 - The mission of legal profession is to uphold the Rule of Law. A sound legal system is vital to the competitiveness of Hong Kong.

We sincerely hope the University Grants Committee can give our comments



ROOM 532. FACULTY OF LAW, K.K. LEUNG BUILDING. THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG.

Tel: 2108 4180 Fax: 2108 4559

Email: lawassn@hkusuc.hku.hk

thorough consideration.

Regards,

Law Association Executive Committee, HKUSU 2000-2001

13th March, 2000

Persons to contact: Hon Wai Hon, Wayne

Tang Chun Pong, Carfield



ROOM 532, FACULTY OF LAW, K.K. LEUNG BUILDING, THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG.

Tel: 2108 4180 Fax: 2108 4559 Email: lawassn@hkusuc.hku.hk

一封致大學教育資助委員會主席林李翹如太太的公開信

根據傳媒報導,大學教育資助委員會正考慮在兩年後逐步撤回對法律專業文 憑課程(PCLL)之資助,其考慮因素主要爲以下三點:

- 一)是否屬於第二個學位,即碩士或博士學位課程;
- 三) 修讀有關課程是否對個人增值有更大幫助;
- 三) 該課程是否培訓社會特別需要之人才。

對於大學教育資助委員之建議,我們有以下回應:

- 1. 大學教育資助委員撤回法律專業文憑課程(PCLL)之資助的建議必然會令法律專業文憑課程之學費大幅提高,到時能否付得起高昂之學費將取代學生之能力而成爲能否成爲律師之主要因素,律師這一行業便將再次變爲有錢人之專刊。其實,要保持法專業人才之質素,提高收生標準比增加學費實爲更適常之解決方法。
- 2. 法律專業文憑課程在本質上和其他研究生課程有很大之分別:

第一,根據香港法例第 159 條之法律執業者條例,法律學士必須修讀此 文憑課程方可成爲見習律師。而其他研究生課程卻並不是其他行業入行的必 要條件。

第二,法律專業文憑課程在課程設計上是培養法律專業人上的主要一環,可說和法律學士之課程不可分割。例如,很多關於稅制的知識就是只能在法律專業文憑課程而非在法律學士課程中所能學到的。

第三,由於正就讀法律學士學位的同學於入學前對專業文憑課程學費將 激增的變化一無所知,故此學對他們甚爲不公。

第四,絕人多數的法律學士皆修讀法律專業文憑課程,大學教育資助委員會此一建議將令很多有志從事法律專業之法律學士畢業生因無法負起高昂學費而被拒諸門外。

3. 整體法律教育模式正在檢討當中,於此時在毫無咨詢的情況下提出縮減資



ROOM 532, FACULTY OF LAW, K.K. LEUNG BUILDING, THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG. Tel: 2108 4180 Fux: 2108 4559 Email: lawassn@hkusuc.hku.hk

助,將對法律教育改革做成深遠的負面影響。我們建議大學教育資助委員應 在看過法律教育改革報告之提議後方決定是否撤回政府對法律文憑課程之資 助。

4. 對於大學教育資助委員是否考慮撤回法律文憑課程之資助的第三個考因案(即該課程是否培訓社會特別需要之人才),我們予以質疑。大學教育資助委員究 第用基麼基準來說法律專業文憑課程並不是培訓社會特別需要之人才呢?我 們確實難以理解,我們希望以下爾點能列入大學教育資助委員考慮之列:

第一、邁向新世紀,香港之社會及經濟正在急速轉型中。隨著新的憲制情況,高科技之發展及社會保障政策之逐步展開,社會上下將不斷出現各種不同問題,急需法律的配合與調解。香港此時應當積極培訓具多方面知識之法律人才,而非倒行逆施,縮減其資助。

第二 完整的法治制度一直是香港繁榮之重要基石,而法律人才對維護法治則扮演相當重要的角色。

特區政府對於教育責無旁貸,在這轉變中的時代,政府應加強對法律專業訓練的支持,以提高香港長遠的競爭力。我們在此促請有關當局三思而後行。莫為 短暫的財政利益而罔顧長遠的法律發展,以致最後傷害全體香港市民的利益。

香港大學學生會法律學會執行委員會 2000-2001

聯絡人: 韓偉溪 鄧振邦

二零零零年三月十三日

Annex 4

聋明

反對政府撤除資助法律文憑課程

大學教育資助委員會(教資會)於三月一日表示法律文憑課程(PCLL)會逐步適向自員盈虧的運作模式,搬回對課程的資助,教資會主席林亭翹如解釋,政府為節省資源及資助其他社會上更有迫切需要的專業培範疇,因而在下個撥款年度(01 年-04 年)的法律文憑學賣會由現時的四萬多元急增至九萬,對教資會是次的決定,香港大學學生會子以發烈的反對。

(一) 反對課程標籤, 職業階級化

政府以節省資源為由,強行將學科或課程分類為「社會特別的人才需要」和「幫助個人增值」等區別,完全扭曲了教育以人為本的成長空間,催化了教育為經濟服務的人力培訓所。

由於修設法律的本科同學必須考畢法律文憑才可成為執業律師,學費的暴增絕對影響同學選擇課程及職業的考應,更甚法律課程變為有幾人的科目,律師成為有幾人的職業。這樣的教育,不但無助於提升人民的素質,更加劇化了階級的矛盾衝突,將社會推至兩極化的境地。

(二) 反對政府減少教育承擔

在高失業,經濟低迷的情況下,港府將「節省資源」和「資源增值」視為打殺香港的出路。這邊廂政府要求市民勒緊褲頭,減綜緩、減社會福利撥款、減新入職公務員薪金、地鐵私營化、計劃分科收費、擬徵陸路離境稅及銷售稅......處處向低下市民開刀,令普羅市民百上加斤,徬徨無助;那邊廂政府卻高姿態地全情投入興建迪士尼,以低價撥地發展數碼港,更對壟斷大眾服務袖手考觀,不聞不問,如此不負責任的政府,令社會仍在低迷氣氣下徘徊,社會問題叢生,政府無視市民的血汗辛勞,卻處處迎合大財團大商家,劫資濟富。

政府減少教育承擔意圖明顏,最近,政府不單考慮分科收費,更擬將學費與學科前景掛鈎,政府不但沒有教育理念可言,沒有洞悉教育對促進社會發展的真正含意,卻以「成本效益」等商業概念主導教育政策,單向地為「高科技」製造「工人」,不斷削減人文科學的生存空間,政府斷言無意在產業資訊科技及研究生等課程收回成本,因為是社會急需的人才(明報,2/3/2000,A13)如此看來,其他課程亦同樣面對撤回資助的危機,以迎合政府「高科技」的口味,這和政府施政的短視和劫資濟富的方向完全是同出一轍。

(三) 重申反對分科收費

港府撤回對法律文憑的資助與分科收費的本質無異此舉除了引起社會分化的嚴重社會後果外,即使政府有資助計劃協助經濟能力低的同學,畢業生根本沒力償還數項,甚或影響自身前途的選擇,我們同樣憂慮分科收費—旦推行,將來會有更多的服務和設施亦有藉口向同學收回成本或費用。



因此,我們要求:

- 1. 政府及教資會收回「撤除資助法律文憑」的方案;
- ,2. 停止推行分科收费

香港大學學生會 聯 络 人:張韻琪

二零零零年三月六日

P.14