

立法會

Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)1618/02-03

(These minutes have been
seen by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/PL/AJLS

Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services

Minutes of meeting held on Monday, 24 February 2003 at 4:30 pm in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building

Members present : Hon Margaret NG (Chairman)
Hon Jasper TSANG Yok-sing, GBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Hon Martin LEE Chu-ming, SC, JP
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yee, JP
Hon Mr Ambrose LAU Hon-chuen, GBS, JP
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP

Members absent : Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, JP
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP

Member attending : Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan

Public officers attending : Item V

Judiciary

Mr Wilfred TSUI
Judiciary Administrator

Mr Augustine L S CHENG
Deputy Judiciary Administrator (Operations)

Department of Justice

Miss Annie TAM, JP
Director of Administration and Development

Mr John READING, SC
Deputy Director of Public Prosecutions

Clerk in attendance : Mrs Percy MA
Chief Assistant Secretary (2)3

Staff in attendance : Mr Arthur CHEUNG
Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 2

Mr Paul WOO
Senior Assistant Secretary (2)3

Item IV only

Mr Watson CHAN
Head of Research and Library Services Division

Mr Michael YU
Research Officer 7

Miss Kitty LAM
Research Officer 8

Action

I. Confirmation of minutes of meeting
(LC Paper No. CB(2)1248 /02-03)

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 January 2003 were confirmed.

II. Information papers issued since the last meeting

2. Members noted the following papers which had been issued -

- (a) LC Paper No. CB(2)1063/02-03(01) - Revised Part 3 of the Law Amendment and Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill relating to the Conveyancing and Property Ordinance;

Action

- (b) LC Paper No. CB(2)1149/02-03 - "Guide to Court Services" Booklets; and
- (c) LC Paper No. CB(2)1187/02-03(01) - Paper provided by the Administration on "Law Amendment and Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill : proposed amendments to section 9AA of the Legal Practitioners Ordinance".

Law Amendment and Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill : proposed amendment to section 9AA of the Legal Practitioners Ordinance (LPO)

3. The Chairman said that in response to the Panel's suggestion made at the last meeting on 27 January 2003 that the Administration should take out the proposed amendment to section 9AA of LPO from the Law Amendment and Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill (the Bill), the Administration had provided a paper (LC Paper No. CB(2)1187/02-03(01)). Under the proposed amendment, section 9AA of LPO would be amended to add "officer", which was defined under section 2(1) of LPO to include the non-legally qualified director, manager, executive or secretary of a solicitor corporation. The proposed amendment would result in bringing any non-solicitor director etc of the corporation within the disciplinary framework of the Law Society.

4. The Chairman informed members that she had met representatives of the Law Society to discuss the issue subsequent to the meeting of the Panel on 27 January 2003. The Law Society had explained to her that the inclusion of the proposed amendment to section 9AA of LPO in the Bill would not pre-determine the conclusion on whether there should be non-solicitor members or directors of a solicitor corporation, since the Legislative Council (LegCo) would still have the opportunity to consider the relevant issues in detail when the Solicitor Corporation Rules were submitted to LegCo for scrutiny. On the other hand, if the Rules were supported by LegCo without amendment, it would not be necessary to make consequential amendments to LPO as the relevant provisions would already be in place. This would save time in bringing the new legislation into effect at the earliest possible opportunity. The Chairman said that the Administration recommended that the proposed amendment should remain in the Bill.

5. The Chairman said that the Administration's recommendation was acceptable to her. She sought members' view on the matter.

6. In response to Ms Miriam LAU, the Chairman said that the proposed amendment to section 9AA of LPO would enable non-solicitor members or directors of solicitor corporations to be brought under the disciplinary authority of the Law Society. This would facilitate a sole practitioner in getting the approval of the Law Society to establish a solicitor corporation. Under the

Action

requirements of the Companies Ordinance, a company must have two members and two directors, the second member might be any other person, whether a solicitor or not.

7. Members raised no objection to the proposed amendment remaining in the Bill. The Chairman requested the Clerk to convey the Panel's stance to the Administration.

8. The Chairman pointed out that the draft Solicitor Corporation Rules had not been examined by the Panel. She requested the Clerk to clarify with the Administration regarding paragraph 5 of the Administration's paper, which stated that "the Draft Rules were last examined by the Panel on 27 May 2002".

(Post-meeting note - In response to the Clerk, the Administration confirmed that only Rules 2, 3 and 8 of the Draft Rules were examined by the Panel on 27 May 2002.)

III. Items for discussion at future meetings

(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1250/02-03(01) and (02), 1266/02-03(01))

Items for discussion at the next meeting on 31 March 2003

9. Members agreed to discuss the following items at the next regular meeting on 31 March 2003 at 4:30 pm -

- (a) Operation of the Legal Aid Services Council (LASC) (originally scheduled for this meeting but deferred to the next meeting at the request of LASC);
- (b) Review of the financial limits of the civil jurisdiction of the District Court; and
- (c) Government's policy on implementation of resolutions and conventions made by the United Nations.

Items for future meetings

Labour Tribunal

(paper prepared by the Judiciary Administration - LC Paper No. CB(2)1250/02-03(02))

(letter dated 21 February 2003 from the Judiciary Administrator - LC Paper No. CB(2)1274/02-03(01))

10. The Chairman referred members to the paper prepared by the Judiciary Administration in response to the request of the Panel at its meeting on 25

Action

November 2002. She added that arising from the Panel's recent visit to the Judiciary on 20 January 2003, some members considered that issues relating to the operation of the Labour Tribunal should be discussed by the Panel.

11. Ms Emily LAU pointed out that there had been feedback on cases where the Labour Tribunal had pressurised reluctant parties to enter into a private settlement.

12. Ms Audrey EU noted that the Judiciary Administrator had advised in his letter dated 21 February 2003 that night sittings of the Labour Tribunal had been suspended with effect from 20 February 2003. She said that the comment made by the Judiciary Administration that night courts were not as effective as the day courts might not represent the general view of the interested parties. She further said that paragraph 13 of the Administration's paper only provided information on waiting times from filing of a case to callover hearing. However, such information did not reflect the actual length of time for the case to be concluded, as the case might require more than one hearing and there might be adjournments.

13. Ms Audrey EU suggested and members agreed that the Judiciary Administration should be requested to provide the following supplementary information -

- (a) the average number of court hearings required for the Labour Tribunal to dispose of a case; and
- (b) the average number of days from first hearing to delivery of judgment by the Labour Tribunal.

Admin

14. Members agreed that the item "Operation of the Labour Tribunal" should be discussed at a joint meeting of this Panel and the Panel on Manpower to be held in April/May 2003. Members also agreed that the major labour organisations should be invited to give views on the matter.

(Post-meeting note - A joint meeting with the Panel on Manpower was scheduled for 6 May 2003.)

15. Mr Albert HO asked whether the issue of legal costs for parties involved in appeals from the Labour Tribunal should be included for discussion. The Chairman said that the issue had been discussed by the Panel previously. However, the issue could be followed up as a separate item at a later stage if necessary.

Action

"Request for review and amendment of section 18(3) of the Hong Kong Court of Final Appeal Ordinance" by Mr CHAN Siu-lun
(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1266/02-03(01) and 1014/02-03(03))

16. The Chairman said that as agreed by the Panel at its meeting on 27 January 2003, the Director of Administration (D of A) had been requested to comment on Mr CHAN Siu-lun's request for the Panel to discuss the above item, in the light of any new or additional information provided by Mr CHAN. D of A had replied (vide LC Paper No. CB(2)1266/02-03(01)) that having consulted the Department of Justice and the Judiciary Administrator, the Administration considered that there were no new points or information which might affect its view as set out in its responses to Mr CHAN's former requests (Appendices V and VI to LC Paper No. CB(2)1014/02-03(03)). The Chairman sought members' views on the way forward.

17. Members decided that the issue raised by Mr CHAN should not be further discussed. The Chairman asked the Clerk to give a reply to inform Mr CHAN of the Panel's decision.

(Post-meeting note - A reply was issued to Mr CHAN Siu-lun on 25 February 2003.)

Review of jury system in Hong Kong

(Item 4 on the list of outstanding issues for discussion)

18. The Clerk informed members that the Administration had advised that it aimed to complete the review in the first quarter of 2003.

Clerk 19. The Chairman asked the Clerk to consult the Administration on whether the item could be discussed at the Panel's meeting in April 2003.

Review of provision of legal aid services

(Item 7 on the list of outstanding issues for discussion)

Clerk 20. Members agreed that the Administration should be asked to advise on when it could revert to the Panel on the item.

Reciprocal enforcement of judgments in commercial disputes between the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Mainland

(Item 11 on the list of outstanding issues for discussion)

Clerk 21. Members agreed that the Administration should be requested to provide an update on the developments.

Action

Promotion of mediation service in communities and districts
(Item 17 on the list of outstanding issues for discussion)

22. Members noted that issues relating to the progress on the establishment of a non-statutory mediation mechanism to resolve building management disputes were being considered by the Subcommittee on Review of the Building Management Ordinance (the Subcommittee) formed under the Panel on Home Affairs (HA Panel). Ms Emily LAU informed members that the Subcommittee had supported in principle the provision of facilities to promote mediation service to resolve disputes at the district level. The Subcommittee would make a report to the HA Panel on its deliberations in due course.

23. Ms Miriam LAU opined that promotion of mediation service in communities should not be limited to building management disputes. She said that the Administration should be asked to provide information on whether it had formulated any concrete plans for the implementation of mediation schemes, including information on the types of disputes to be handled, the expertise required and the resource implications for providing the mediation service etc. Mr Albert HO pointed out that the two legal professional bodies provided pro bono legal services to parties involved in small claim disputes. He said that the legal profession might be consulted on the matter.

24. The Chairman said that the item could be considered jointly by this Panel and the HA Panel. She asked the Clerk to circulate the record of previous discussions of the Subcommittee for members' information before deciding on the way forward at the next meeting.

(Post-meeting note - An extract from the minutes of the meeting of the Subcommittee on 10 July 2002 was circulated to the Panel on 26 February 2003 vide LC Paper No. CB(2)1312/02-03(01).)

Issues relating to the imposition of criminal liabilities on the Government
(Item 18 on the list of outstanding issues for discussion)

25. The Clerk informed members that the Secretariat had prepared a background brief to facilitate the discussion of the Working Group formed under the Panel. The Chairman asked the Clerk to arrange for a meeting of the Working Group to be held before the next meeting of the Panel.

(Post-meeting note - The first meeting of the Working Group was held on 13 March 2003.)

Action

IV. Proposed outline on research projects

Proposed research outline on "Budgetary arrangements for overseas judiciaries"

(LC Paper No. CB(2)1250/02-03(03))

Proposed research outline on "Operation of Youth Courts in selected overseas places"

(LC Paper No. CB(2)1250/02-03(04))

26. Head of Research and Library Services Division briefed members on the above two research outlines. He said that the research project on "Budgetary arrangements for overseas judiciaries" would be completed in June 2003 while the research project on "Operation of Youth Courts in selected overseas places" would be completed in April 2003.

RLSD

27. The Panel endorsed the above two research outlines.

V. Implications of cost saving proposals of the Government and Judiciary on the system of administration of justice

(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)436/02-03(05), 1034/02-03(01) and (2), 1224/02-03(01) and (02))

Cost saving proposals of the Judiciary

28. At the invitation of the Chairman, Judiciary Administrator (JA) briefed members on the paper prepared by the Judiciary Administration on "Initiatives on efficiency savings in the Judiciary" (LC Paper No. CB(2)1224/02-03(01)). He informed members that the proposed initiatives to achieve the target of saving 1.8% in recurrent expenditure in 2003-04 (about \$18 million) included -

- (a) tightening departmental expenses of the Judiciary by streamlining provision of information technology services, re-prioritising enhancements to information technology systems, tightening up payment of overtime allowance, and ceasing Dialect Allowance for Putonghua interpretation;
- (b) rationalising support staff structure and work process re-engineering at Magistrates' Courts;
- (c) economies of scale in deployment of resources in the Court Language Section and de-layering of supervisory structure of Court Interpreters; and
- (d) rationalising typing services provided by typing pools.

Action

29. JA added that given that further savings would be required in the years 2004-07, consideration was being given to the possibility of rationalising the number of Magistrates' Courts, reducing the number of temporary judges and leaving some judicial posts vacant.

30. JA further informed members that the Chief Justice (CJ) had stated that despite budgetary constraints, the quality of justice must be maintained, even if it might mean lengthening of waiting times for some cases to be heard by the courts.

Cost saving proposals of the Department of Justice (DoJ)

31. Director of Administration and Development of DoJ (D/AD) introduced the paper prepared by DoJ on "Implications of cost saving proposals of DoJ on the system of administration of justice" (LC Paper No. CB(2)1224/02-03(02)). She informed members that DoJ, like other Bureaux and Departments, was required to achieve 1.8% efficiency savings on the operating expenditure in 2003-04 (about 17.5 million). DoJ's draft Estimates for 2003-04 had been formulated on that basis. Details of DoJ's Estimates would be announced at the same time as the Budget Speech in early March 2003. In gist, DoJ proposed to achieve cost saving in the following major areas -

- (a) de-layering the departmental structure, restructuring of various administrative units, streamlining work processes and reducing some support services;
- (b) rationalising payment of allowances;
- (c) reducing expenditure on stores and equipment;
- (d) reducing expenditure on hire of Information Technology services;
- (e) rationalising expenditure on transport and travelling;
- (f) streamlining contract maintenance and workshop services;
- (g) reducing expenditure on overseas visits and entertainment;
- (h) reducing expenditure on training;
- (i) reducing expenditure on publications by maximising electronic communication; and

Action

- (j) achieving savings in other areas such as telephone, stationery, recruitment, etc.

32. D/AD advised that it was expected that the above measures would achieve a total saving of about \$18.2 million for 2003-04. Beyond 2003-04, DoJ would need to make further significant reduction in expenditure by 2006-07. The Divisions in DoJ had been requested to review the overall expenditure relating to departmental expenses, personal emoluments and the briefing out vote to identify savings. Moreover, DoJ was working towards the Chief Executive's overall target of cutting the civil service establishment by 10% by 2006-07. The question of reducing the number of posts and corresponding savings on the Department's personal emoluments was being addressed in the context of its cost saving proposals which were currently under consultation within the Government.

33. D/AD assured that in pursuing the cost saving measures, DoJ would strive to ensure that the professional services would be delivered in a cost-effective manner, without erosion of the quality of the services.

34. The Chairman requested D/AD to provide a breakdown of the amount of savings which would be achieved from the cost saving measures for 2003-04 as set out in paragraph 31 above.

(Post-meeting note - The information provided by the Administration was circulated vide LC Paper No. CB(2)1604/02-03 on 26 March 2003.)

Issues raised by members

Rationalisation of staffing structure and services provided by the Judiciary

35. Ms Emily LAU enquired about the proposal to rationalise the staffing structure of the Judiciary's Accounts Offices, the Court Language Section and Typing Services. JA responded as follows -

- (a) an internal management review on the registries and judicial support services of the nine Magistrates' Courts showed that the workload of the Accounts Offices had been decreasing. The Judiciary Administration therefore planned to reduce the number of payment counters and rationalise the staffing structure of the other units. A total of 32 clerical and support posts in the Magistrates' Courts would be deleted as a result;
- (b) the Judiciary Administration planned to merge the Use of Chinese Unit and Judgment Translation Unit. Also, the supervisory structure of Court Interpreters would be de-layered by removing the regional managers. The two measures would

Action

result in deletion of a total of six senior Translator/Interpreter posts;

- (c) the Judiciary Administration planned to merge the existing three typing pools into one. A total of two Personal Secretaries, one Senior Typist and two Typist posts would be deleted; and
- (d) surplus manpower resulting from the rationalisation exercises would be absorbed through redeployment and the second round of the voluntary retirement scheme for civil servants. The retirement scheme would soon be open for application by eligible officers.

36. In response to the Chairman's enquiry about the Court Language Section, JA informed members that the Judiciary was considering engaging a reputable and experienced publishing agency to translate and publish certain court judgments. For the more important cases and those with high jurisprudence value, however, the translation would continue to be done in-house by the Judiciary.

37. The Chairman and Ms Audrey EU expressed serious concern that the proposed measure, if implemented, would produce translated judgments which were not up to standard. They pointed out that under the common law system, judgments made by the courts carried the same effect as the law and they served as important reference for similar cases. As Hong Kong was practising a bilingual system under which both English and Chinese were used as the official language in courts, the standard of translation of judgments must not be compromised. The Chairman opined that the proposal to brief out the translation work to a private body should be dropped. Ms Cyd HO shared her view.

38. In the light of the above discussions, the Chairman requested JA to -

- (a) provide a comparison of the existing staffing structures of the Judiciary's Accounts Offices, the Court Language Section and Typing Services with the proposed rationalised structures;
- (b) explain the duties and responsibilities of the translator posts proposed to be deleted;
- (c) explain the reasons for the Judiciary's proposal to brief out translation of court judgments to a private agency and its assessment of the implications of the proposal; and

Action

- Admin (d) explain the legal effect of translated court judgments.

Improvement of services provided by the Judiciary

39. Ms Cyd HO said that the Judiciary should continuously modernise its operation and improve its services provided to the public. She asked whether the Judiciary had conducted any review in this regard.

40. JA drew members' attention to paragraph 14 of the Judiciary Administration's paper. He advised that the Assistant Judiciary Administrator (Quality) in the Judiciary was responsible for promoting quality service provided to the public.

41. The Chairman requested JA to provide a written response on -

- (a) measures to take forward any modernisation programme of the Judiciary and the resource implications of such programme; and

- Admin (b) whether the introduction of any improvement measures would be hampered by the existing financial constraints.

Charges for services provided by the Judiciary

42. In response to Ms Audrey EU, JA said that there were no plans for the Judiciary to increase charges for its services provided to the public. He added that fees received from court users for judicial services formed part of the General Revenue.

Future initiatives to achieve cost saving beyond 2003-04 - merging of Magistrates' Courts and reduction in the number of temporary judges

43. The Chairman said that the number of reported crimes in recent years had been increasing, though the rate of increase was not significant. Referring to paragraph 12 of the Judiciary Administration's paper, she asked whether the proposed merging of Magistrates' Courts would result in a reduction of the number of Magistrates' Courts and hence affect their ability to handle prosecutions.

44. In response, JA said that there had been no marked increase in the number of cases prosecuted in the Magistrates Courts. The present proposal contemplated by the Judiciary was to merge the physical location of the Magistrates' Courts by making the best use of existing court premises and support facilities, without reducing the number of courts and judges.

Action

45. Mr Martin LEE said that to reduce the number of temporary judges and leave some judicial posts vacant would inevitably lengthen the waiting time for litigants to seek justice through the courts. This would affect the quality of justice because "justice delayed is justice denied".

Admin

46. The Chairman requested JA to provide the number of judges vis-à-vis temporary judges for members' reference.

47. The Chairman said that a clear message that flowed from the Judiciary Administration's paper was that further savings required in the years 2004-07 would be much more substantive than that for 2003-04, and would adversely impact on the quality of justice.

48. JA admitted that it was possible that the implementation of the cost saving measures would result in lengthening of the waiting time for some cases to be heard. However, it was expected that the delay would not be serious. He said that except for cases heard in the High Court, the existing waiting time for cases handled in the other levels of court was kept well within the timeframe set by the Judiciary. He further said that no conclusion had been reached at this stage as to the cost saving measures to be implemented beyond 2003-04, and as assured by CJ, the quality of justice would not be sacrificed despite any cost saving measures.

Assistance to unrepresented litigants

49. In response to members' enquiry, JA advised that actions were in progress to set up a resource centre to provide free legal assistance to unrepresented litigants. A working group within the Judiciary was responsible for the task. He further advised that resources for the operation of the centre would come mainly from the Judiciary and perhaps private legal practitioners willing to offer free legal service. The resource centre was expected to come into operation by mid 2003.

Ranking of the post of JA

50. Ms Emily LAU asked whether the ranking of the post of JA, which was pitched at D8 level at present, had been reviewed. JA replied that the ranking of the post had not been reviewed since he assumed the office three years ago.

51. Ms Emily LAU opined that the existing level and responsibilities of JA might not justify pitching the post at D8. She considered that the Administration should proceed with a review. JA noted Ms LAU's view.

Admin

Action

Briefing out cases to private legal practitioners

52. Mr Albert HO and Ms Emily LAU said that DoJ should review the proposal to achieve savings through reducing the number of briefing out cases to private sector lawyers. Ms LAU said that as pointed out in DoJ's paper, briefing out helped promote a strong and independent local Bar, give the junior Bar exposure to prosecution work, and secure a pool of experienced prosecutors to supplement those within DoJ.

53. D/AD responded that DoJ was aware of the concerns about the matter. She informed members that the average total expenditure on briefing out criminal and civil cases in recent years was in the region of \$150 million to \$200 million per year. She said that DoJ had not proposed to reduce the Briefing Out Vote for 2003-04 as a cost saving measure.

54. D/AD further said that the principles stated in paragraph 7 of DoJ's paper continued to apply in deciding the need for briefing out. However, it would be difficult to assess at this stage the positions in the years beyond 2003-04 since the actual need for briefing out would very much depend on the nature of the cases concerned and the outcome of consultation within the Government on the post 2003-04 financial envelopes. She added that in the present financial climate, it was necessary to achieve a delicate balance between briefing out and prosecuting cases in-house by DoJ.

55. The Chairman said that in-house counsel in DoJ were shouldering rather heavy caseloads. She requested D/AD to provide information on the years of experience of counsel in DoJ for members' reference.

(Post-meeting note - The information provided by the Administration was circulated vide LC Paper No. CB(2)1604/02-03 on 26 March 2003.)

De-layering of departmental structure

56. In reply to the Chairman, D/AD advised that the present proposal on de-layering was only restricted to restructuring of various administrative units in DoJ. The proposal would not affect the structure of the legal professional grade in the Department.

Training for counsel in DoJ

57. Mr Albert HO and Ms Emily LAU expressed the view that reducing training for counsel in DoJ would be a retrograde step in providing opportunities to upgrade their professional expertise.

58. D/AD replied that there were no plans to reduce legal professional training for counsel of DoJ. As regards training of a general nature such as

Action

those relating to enhancement of management skills and language proficiency etc, staff in DoJ were encouraged to take part in courses organised by Government for participation by civil servants on a service-wide basis. This would maximise cost-effectiveness of such courses and reduce the need to provide such training by DoJ itself. Some savings could therefore be achieved.

Acting arrangements

59. In response to Ms Emily LAU, D/AD explained that under existing arrangements, allowance was payable to civil servants acting in a higher rank for a period exceeding 30 days, while no allowance would be paid for a more senior officer "acting" in a post of a junior officer. She advised that DoJ would encourage the adoption of the latter arrangement during officers' absence from duty as far as possible. She added that acting arrangements were necessary under certain circumstances, such as for the purpose of assessing the suitability of officers for substantive promotion.

Directorate posts in DoJ

60. D/AD informed members that there were a total of 1 106 civil service posts in DoJ, of which 72 were directorate posts. Of the 72 directorate posts, 67 were legal professional staff. On top of 603 non-directorate administrative posts, there were five directorate administrative posts. She said that the post of Director of Administration and Development was ranked at the level of AOSGA (D6).

61. In response to Ms Emily LAU, D/AD said that the number and ranking of the directorate posts in DoJ were fully justified by need. All the directorate posts had been created with the approval of the Establishment Subcommittee and Finance Committee of LegCo.

Publications

62. The Chairman and Ms Emily LAU opined that some Government publications, e.g. Annual Departmental Reports, were too flashy, hence incurring unnecessarily high production costs. They suggested that the Administration should review the matter.

63. D/AD agreed to convey members' view to the Editorial Board in DoJ for its consideration.

Motion moved by Mr Martin LEE

64. Mr Martin LEE expressed the view that the Judiciary, being independent from the executive authority, should not be bound by the Government's target

Action

to reduce operating expenditure. He said that it was undesirable for the Judiciary to take any cost saving measures that would undermine people's confidence in the ability of the Judiciary to administer justice.

65. Mr Martin LEE moved the following motion -

" 本委員會要求司法機構不應爲了落實行政機關節約的計劃，而落實任何使司法服務質素受到負面影響的措施。 "

(Translated version of the motion : "That this Panel urges the Judiciary not to introduce, for the purpose of implementing the Administration's austerity programme, any cost saving measures which would adversely affect the quality of judicial services.")

66. The motion was passed by members.

67. The Chairman said that the principle inherent in the resolution, which stressed the importance of preserving justice at all costs, should equally apply to DoJ.

68. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:45 pm.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
28 March 2003