

## CHAPTER ONE

### PROCEDURE OF THE REVIEW

#### Introduction

1.1 We have so far met on eight occasions in formal Review Committee, and taken oral evidence at eight sittings.

1.2 We noted earlier the timetable of six months for the completion of our task. This time limit helped to determine our method of work, though the choice of method by which we were to accomplish our task within the time set was entirely for us to decide. We concluded early in our deliberations that we should not attempt to commission any special research studies or surveys, but should rely upon the well-tried inquiry procedure of seeking factual evidence and views from the appropriate organisations, and providing opportunities for individual members of the services with which we are concerned to make representations to us if they wished to do so. We did not of course rely exclusively on material submitted in evidence, but have ourselves sought out information on a variety of topics. We made use of published documents relating to other inquiries, including inquiries in the UK as well as in Hong Kong; information about developments following these inquiries was made available to us from a variety of sources, including government departments in other countries and the International Monetary Fund, as well as various authorities and organisations in Hong Kong.

1.3 In our use of this material to arrive at our recommendations we intend to follow the same approach as the Edmund-Davies Committee which examined police pay in the United Kingdom in 1977-78. The essential elements in the Edmund-Davies approach as set out in the Committee's report are :-

- (1) "that the correct level of police pay cannot be determined by any precise formula based on comparability and pay linkages";
- (2) "that the best way to proceed seems to us to be to review all the relevant factors and then make the best judgment we can".

This approach, we are satisfied, is equally applicable to all five of the services we have been asked to review. It is obviously essential to it that we should collect all the information we can about relevant factors. This Report is largely concerned to say what we have done to this end, and to record what we have found.

## Written submissions

1.4 We expressly invited written submissions from the organisations and individuals listed at Annex 1.1. In writing to the heads of disciplined services departments we did not only solicit evidence from departmental managements, but also asked that our invitation to give evidence should be communicated to their respective staffs. In compliance with our fourth term of reference, we set two deadlines for written submissions in our letters of 15 April 1988. The first deadline of 27 May 1988 was set specifically for the police since we were required to accord them priority and wished to have fully examined all their submissions by the time of this Preliminary Report, while a deadline of 10 June 1988 was set for all the other services. We recognised that these deadlines did not give much time to the recipients of our invitations. We have been impressed by the way in which those who have submitted evidence to us have responded to this challenge and by the considerable thought and detailed consideration that has gone into each submission we have received. We wish to thank all those, both organisations and individuals, who have responded to our invitations.

1.5 We received a total of 122 written submissions of varying complexity and length, from departmental management, staff associations, organisations and individuals. In some cases, "individual" submissions were signed by a number of staff in the department concerned. In addition, we received responses that had no substantive points to make but expressed a possible interest in more detailed comment once our Preliminary Report had been prepared. All submissions have been made in confidence and we have not therefore, listed individuals by name. The statistics on submissions and responses are as follows :-

<u>Sources</u>	<u>Number</u>
Departmental management and policy branches	8
Staff associations	17
Individuals	90
Public bodies	2
Private sector organisations	5
	-----
Total	122

## Oral evidence

1.6 We have so far conducted eight sessions to hear evidence from departmental managements and representative organisations. Our intention is to meet the heads of disciplined services departments accompanied by their

principal senior staff involved in matters relating to this Review, and the Chairmen and other representatives of all disciplined services department staff associations, to pursue in discussion issues and points raised in their written submissions, and we shall be ready also to meet any others whose evidence could be helpfully elucidated in oral sessions. We have thus far met :-

Police

Commissioner of Police  
(accompanied by his senior officers)

Expatriate Inspectors' Association

Junior Police Officers' Association

Local Inspectors' Association

Superintendents' Association

Correctional Services

Commissioner of Correctional Services  
(accompanied by one of his senior officers)

Correctional Services Officers' Association

In addition we have also met representatives of the Disciplined Services Staff Unions/Associations Liaison Group (which comprises representatives of unions and associations in Correctional Services, Customs & Excise, Fire Services, and Immigration departments) to hear their views on points of common concern to them. The Chairman also met a representative of Hay Management Consultants (Hong Kong) Ltd. to discuss with him various aspects of the 1986 Pay Level Survey.

1.7 We are grateful to all those who attended our oral evidence sessions and for the effort they have made in assisting our work.

1.8 We have not yet completed our oral evidence sessions and arrangements have been made for discussions with representatives of Customs & Excise, Fire Services, and Immigration in the near future.

**Background information and familiarisation visits**

1.9 We considered that to have seen at first-hand some of the staff with whom our work is concerned, and their working environments and activities, would be of significant help to us in our task. We are most grateful to all heads of the disciplined services departments for their assistance to the Committee especially in providing us with the services of

a designated Liaison Officer in each department who has been a valuable and efficient source of information and material; and for arranging familiarisation visits to learn about various aspects of each department's work. Our only stipulation about our visits has been that what we are shown should, as far as possible, not be "pre-arranged" but typical of the duties in question. These visits have also given us the opportunity to talk with a cross-section of local and overseas staff of all ranks, who have had a great variety of backgrounds and range of experience. We are grateful to all those whom we met and appreciate the frank and articulate expression of their views.

1.10 We have so far completed our visits to the Police Force, and the Correctional Services Department, and we have begun our programme of visits to the Fire Services Department. We arranged for our visits to precede the taking of oral evidence and we believe this has made these sessions more effective. Arrangements have been made for visits to Customs & Excise, and Immigration departments and all visits will be completed by end-August 1988.

1.11 Concurrently with the collection of information from all sources and evidence from interested parties, we have been identifying the major questions which we require to answer, and beginning to establish the framework round which we shall construct our Final Report. An account of these major issues can be found in Chapter 10.