

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(2)2032/02-03  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/PL/AJLS+SE

**Panel on Security  
and  
Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services**

**Minutes of joint meeting held on Thursday, 6 February 2003  
at 10:45 am in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

**Members  
present** : Panel on Security

Hon LAU Kong-wah (Chairman)  
\* Hon James TO Kun-sun (Deputy Chairman)  
\* Hon Albert HO Chun-yan  
Dr Hon LUI Ming-wah, JP  
Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong  
Hon Howard YOUNG, JP  
\* Hon Ambrose LAU Hon-chuen, GBS, JP  
Hon IP Kwok-him, JP

Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services

◆ Hon Margaret NG (Chairman)  
Hon Jasper TSANG Yok-sing, GBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, JP  
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-ye, JP  
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP

**Member  
attending** : Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan

**Members  
absent** : Panel on Security

Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-ye, GBS, JP  
Hon Andrew WONG Wang-fat, JP  
Hon WONG Yung-kan

Hon Michael MAK Kwok-fung  
\* Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP

Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services

Hon Martin LEE Chu-ming, SC, JP  
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP

- \* Also a member of Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services
- ◆ Also a member of Panel on Security

**Public Officers** : Mrs Regina IP, GBS, JP  
**attending** Secretary for Security

Mr Timothy TONG, JP  
Permanent Secretary for Security (Acting)

Mr Bob ALLCOCK, BBS, JP  
Solicitor General

Miss Adeline WAN  
Senior Government Counsel

Ms Angelina KWAN  
Assistant Secretary for Security

Mr Dennis CHIU  
Executive Officer

**Clerk in** : Mr Raymond LAM  
**attendance** Senior Assistant Secretary (2)5

**Staff in** : Mr Jimmy MA, JP  
**attendance** Legal Adviser

Ms Bernice WONG  
Assistant Legal Adviser 1

Ms Dora WAI  
Senior Assistant Secretary (2)4

---

Action

**I. Election of Chairman**

Mr LAU Kong-wah was elected Chairman of the joint meeting.

**II. Proposals to implement Article 23 of the Basic Law**

(Volume 1 of the Compendium of Submissions on the Consultation Document on Proposals to Implement Article 23 of the Basic Law and leaflet entitled "Implementation of Article 23 of the Basic Law -Way Forward" issued by the Security Bureau on 28 January 2003, LC Paper Nos. CB(2) 1066/02-03(02) and CB(2) 1069/02-03(02))

Compendium of Submissions on the Consultation Document on Proposals to Implement Article 23 of the Basic Law

2. Secretary for Security (S for S) informed Members that after the Compendium of Submissions on the Consultation Document on Proposals to Implement Article 23 of the Basic Law (BL23) was issued on 28 January 2003, some organizations and individuals had complained that their submissions had not been included in the Compendium or were inappropriately categorized. She stressed that any errors and omissions were unintentional. In view of such complaints, the Administration had verified again the submissions classified as belonging to Category C, i.e. the content of submission did not enable it to be identified as either supportive of or opposed to introducing legislation to implement BL23. It noted that the following submissions originally classified under Category C should be included under Category B -

- (a) submission from Hong Kong Bar Association (serial number A000035);
- (b) submission from JUSTICE - The Hong Kong Section of the International Commission of Jurists (serial number A000059);
- (c) submission from the Foreign Correspondents' Club, Hong Kong (serial number A000075); and
- (d) one of the submissions from the Democratic Party (serial number A000278).

3. S for S added that the Administration had also noted that the following submissions originally classified under Category C should be included under Category A -

- (a) submission from East Kowloon District Residents' Committee (serial number A000382);
- (b) submission from the Hong Kong Island Federation (serial number A000642);

Action

- (c) submission from 港九勞工社團聯會 (serial number A000921); and
- (d) submission from 關注香港發展聯席會議 (serial number A001114).

4. S for S said that she had also received a submission from SynergyNet, which was originally included in the database of submissions. Unfortunately, it was not included in the final version of the Compendium due to human errors and computer problems.

5. S for S explained that these classification errors were due to the sheer number of submissions received, over 100 000 in number. She apologized to the organizations concerned for the errors, albeit very small in number, in the Compendium. She invited organizations/individuals who considered their submissions not correctly categorized in the Compendium to inform the Security Bureau in writing by 20 February 2003. She informed Members that an addendum would be issued and a CD-ROM on the updated Compendium would be produced and made available to the public. The updated Compendium would also be made available on the BL23 web page of the Security Bureau.

6. S for S accounted for the reasons for not including the following submissions in the Compendium -

- (a) the submission from the Bar Association of England and Wales was received after the consultation period on 27 December 2002;
- (b) there was no record receiving the submission by the International Bar Association;
- (c) the submission from Hon MAK Kwok-fung, dated 28 December 2002, was received after the consultation period; and
- (d) the submission claimed to have been faxed by a member of the public within the consultation period actually reached the Security Bureau by mail on 30 December 2002.

7. Miss Margaret NG said that the Panel on Security and Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services had held a number of joint meetings to receive public views on the proposals in the Consultation Document and received many submissions which had been copied to the Administration. She questioned why a number of these submissions were not found in the Compendium.

8. S for S responded that the Administration had looked into the matter and noted that submissions which had been provided to the Administration as well as the Legislative Council (LegCo) had already been included in the Compendium. Some submissions which had been submitted to the two Panels only and copied by the LegCo

Action

Adm

Secretariat to the Administration might have been treated as meeting papers and thus not included in the Compendium. At the request of the Chairman, S for S agreed to include the submissions to the two Panels which had also been provided to the Administration in the updated Compendium.

9. S for S said that the Compendium was on the whole a comprehensive record of all the submissions. She stressed that the Administration had considered all the views received, including those received after the public consultation period and views expressed at various meetings and forums attended by the Administration in the past few months. She said that it could be noted from the leaflet entitled "Implementation of Article 23 of the Basic Law -Way Forward", issued by the Security Bureau on 28 January 2003, that the Administration had considered the views received.

10. Miss Margaret NG said that many people had commented that the categorizations in the Compendium were too brief and many views expressed in the media or through other channels had not been included. She asked whether the Administration would categorize organizations and individuals supporting and opposing the respective proposals in the Consultation Document and the justifications given by both sides.

11. S for S responded that it had been stated in the Consultation Document that submissions should be sent to the Security Bureau by 24 December 2002 through the three channels referred to in the Consultation Document. The Compendium only covered submissions submitted to the Administration through the three channels within the consultation period. However, all the views received, including those submitted after the consultation period, views expressed at different forums and in the media, had been considered by the Administration. She added that the Administration considered it more appropriate to include the original submissions in the Compendium instead of summarizing the submissions.

12. Miss Margaret NG considered that the Administration should, in line with past practice, analyze and summarize the views received and respond to the points raised.

13. S for S responded that the Administration could consider preparing a summary of submissions received, although it would take some time to complete. Miss Margaret NG said that Members might wish to discuss at a future joint meeting how the Administration should analyze and summarize the views received.

14. Mr Albert HO said that the LegCo Secretariat had prepared a summary of views expressed by organizations and individuals on the proposals in the Consultation Document. He considered that the Administration should not have any difficulty summarizing the views received. He expressed concern that the submission from Dr Frances D'Souza was not covered in the Compendium.

15. Mr TAM Yiu-chung said that it was unnecessary for the Administration to summarize the views received. He considered that the Administration should focus

Action

its effort on the drafting of the Bill.

16. Mr IP Kwok-him said that while errors in the Compendium should be rectified, it would be difficult to analyze and summarize more than 100 000 submissions. He considered that the Administration should focus its effort on the drafting of the bill.

17. Ms Cyd HO said that if the Compendium would form the basis of legislation to implement BL23, the Administration should summarize the views received and respond to the points raised. She asked whether such a summary would be included in the CD-ROM to be prepared by the Administration.

18. S for S responded that the Administration would issue an addendum on the Compendium. On the question of whether the Administration should summarize the submissions received, she noted that Members had different views on the issue.

19. Mr CHAN Kam-lam said that the Compendium was on the whole a good one giving a comprehensive picture of submissions in support of and opposing the Administration's proposals while allowing readers to refer to individual submissions for detailed views. He considered that it might sometimes be difficult to summarize or classify the submissions received. He recalled that the Chairman of the Hong Kong Bar Association had indicated at a joint meeting of the two Panels that he was not opposed to the enactment of legislation to implement BL23. He said that the Administration should focus its work on the drafting of the Bill.

20. S for S said that while there were some minor classification errors in the Compendium, it was sometimes difficult to determine whether a submission should be categorized as in support of or opposed to the proposals in the Consultation Document, such as the submission from the Hong Kong Bar Association and that from the Law Society of Hong Kong. Thus, the Administration had invited organizations and individuals who considered their submissions not correctly categorized to inform the Security Bureau in writing by 20 February 2003.

Proposals to implement Article 23 of the Basic Law

21. Mr James TO commented that the Administration should not describe its revision of proposals in the Consultation Document as clarifications. He said that existing provisions in the Societies Ordinance (SO) had already empowered S for S to prohibit an organization from registration and operation on national security grounds. He questioned why there was a need for the proposed proscription mechanism. He asked whether it was proposed in order to please the Central People's Government (CPG) or because of other secret agenda. He also asked whether the proposed proscription mechanism would expand S for S's power under SO. He considered that explicitly providing the proscription mechanism in legislation would only confuse the public, who might thought that S for S's power was only confined to circumstances where a local organization was subordinate to a Mainland organization proscribed in the Mainland on national security grounds.

Action

22. S for S responded that there was no secret agenda and there was no question of proposing the proscription mechanism to please the CPG. Although existing provisions in SO already provided for S for S to make an order prohibiting the operation or continued operation of a society on national security grounds, it would be desirable in terms of clarity of law to provide explicitly the circumstances under which an organization would be proscribed.

23. Solicitor General (SG) added that there was already a general power under SO to prohibit an organization from operation on national security grounds. No expansion of such a power was proposed. The proposed power of proscription was more focused in that it only applied under certain circumstances. He said that the existing power in the Societies Ordinance was confined to societies, while the proposed power was broader in coverage and covered organizations which were not societies. However, the proposed mechanism provided more safeguards with the introduction of appeals to the court.

24. Mr James TO asked whether it would be substantially more difficult to challenge a decision to proscribe an organization under the proposed power than a decision to prohibit a society from operation under existing provisions in SO. SG responded that a study of the detailed provisions in the Bill would be needed before a response could be provided. Mr TO said that this was why a white bill should be introduced.

25. Miss Margaret NG considered that the proposed proscription mechanism would expand the power of S for S under existing provisions in SO because the definition of an organization would be much broader than the existing definition of society. She asked why there was a need for the proposed proscription mechanism and whether it was proposed by the Mainland. She said that the Administration should inform Members of the views received on the proposal in paragraph 7.15(c) of the Consultation Document.

26. S for S responded that concerns on the proposal mainly fell into the following categories -

- (a) the proposal would lead to the introduction of Mainland laws into Hong Kong;
- (b) the proposal would result in the introduction of Mainland's national security protection mechanism into Hong Kong;
- (c) after a Mainland organization was proscribed in the Mainland on national security grounds, a local organization would be automatically proscribed; and
- (d) one organization thought that it would be automatically proscribed under the proposed proscription mechanism.

Action

27. S for S stressed that no organization could be automatically proscribed after the proposal was enacted. She said that there was no reason why Hong Kong, as a part of the People's Republic of China (PRC), should not begin to consider proscribing a local organization subordinate to a Mainland organization proclaimed by the Central Authorities by an open decree that its operation was prohibited on national security grounds.

28. Miss Margaret NG said that existing legislation had already provided the Administration with the power to deal with emergency situations. She questioned why there was a need for the proposed proscription mechanism which was not directed at exceptional situations.

29. SG said that although BL18 provided for the CPG to issue an order applying the relevant national laws in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) when there was turmoil in the HKSAR, the proposed proscription mechanism was not directed at such an extreme situation. The proposed power would enable the HKSAR Government to deal with situations which could be dangerous rather than waiting for a state of emergency to arise and national laws to be applied to the HKSAR.

30. SG added that the Government of the PRC had never proscribed an organization on national security grounds in the past fifty years. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong disagreed and said that a large number of Mainland organizations had been proscribed in the Mainland during the Cultural Revolution for counter-revolution offences.

31. S for S responded that a number of Mainland specialists had commented that the Cultural Revolution was an abnormal era. During the period, the courts in the Mainland had ceased operation for some 15 years. Many people had been sentenced for counter-revolutionary offences without any trial in courts. However, it should be noted that the proposed proscription mechanism was confined to local organizations subordinate to a Mainland organization proscribed by the Central Authorities by an "open decree" on national security grounds and where the local organization was a threat to national security. She stressed that whether the local organization was a threat to national security would be interpreted in accordance with local legislation where "national security" would be narrowly defined as the safeguarding of territorial integrity and independence of the State.

32. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said that BL23 provided, among others, that the HKSAR should enact laws to prohibit foreign political organizations or bodies from conducting political activities in the HKSAR. He pointed out that Mainland organizations were not foreign political organizations. Local organizations endangering national security were dealt with under the existing SO. He questioned whether the proposed proscription of an organization subordinate to a proscribed Mainland organization was beyond the scope of and furthermore in contravention of BL23.

Action

33. S for S responded that the proposed proscription mechanism was intended to deal with organized acts of more than one person that endangered national security. Had the proposal not been included under the part of the Consultation Document on foreign political organizations, it could have been included in each of the proposals on treason, secession and subversion. The proposed proscription mechanism was necessary for the safeguarding of national security and within the ambit of BL23.

34. SG added that the mechanisms referred to in paragraph 7.15(a) and (b) of the Consultation Document were appropriate because the power to prohibit acts of treason, secession, sedition and subversion should include the power to prohibit organizations which conducted such criminal activities. The mechanism for proscribing an organization subordinate to a Mainland organization proscribed in the Mainland on national security grounds was proposed because an organization could endanger national security without actually committing treason, secession, sedition or subversion. For example, a local organization could train people to use explosives to accomplish acts that endangered national security.

35. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said that until a democratic political system and an independent legal system were in place in the Mainland, many people were concerned that organizations could be easily branded as endangering national security in the Mainland. He considered that any proscription should be made only in accordance with local legislation. As there was existing power under SO, he questioned why the Administration refused to consider withdrawing the proposal to proscribe a local organization subordinate to a Mainland organization proscribed in the Mainland on national security grounds.

36. S for S responded that there had been much development in the Mainland in recent years. She said that besides the proscription of a Mainland organization in the Mainland by an open decree in accordance with Mainland laws, S for S had to be satisfied by evidence that a local organization was subordinate to the proscribed organization in the Mainland, and that the local organization endangered national security as defined under local legislation.

37. S for S stressed that under the existing SO, S for S could, in the event that there was serious social instability in the Mainland, consider whether it was necessary to take action for national security reasons against a local organization subordinate to a Mainland organization which had been proscribed in the Mainland. Setting out the proscription mechanism in legislation would be desirable in terms of clarity of law and freedom of association.

38. Referring to page 4 of the leaflet entitled "Implementation of Article 23 of the Basic Law -Way Forward ", Mr Howard YOUNG asked whether the criminal means of "hacking, theft or bribery" only referred to those committed within the territory of Hong Kong.

Action

39. SG responded that the Administration was drafting the relevant legislative proposal. It was examining the extent to which access outside Hong Kong to protected information should be regarded as access through criminal means and whether the disclosure of information obtained through such means should be criminalized only if the disclosure was made within the territory of Hong Kong. He welcomed Members' views on the issue.

40. Mr Albert HO said that while the Cultural Revolution was an abnormal era, many organizations and people had been sentenced without trial in connection with the 4 June 1989 incident for counter-revolutionary offences. Many areas in the Mainland legal system were still to be improved.

41. Mr Albert HO asked whether the proscription of a local organization subordinate to a Mainland organization proscribed in the Mainland did not require the local organization to commit any offence under local legislation. He also asked what criteria would be adopted by S for S in considering whether to proscribe a local organization subordinate to a Mainland organization proscribed in the Mainland on national security grounds.

42. S for S responded that the Mainland had sought to improve its legal system and had repealed counter-revolutionary offences in recent years. She said that the Association of Falun Dafa in the Mainland was proscribed in 1999 in accordance with provisions in the Criminal Law of the PRC concerning evil cults and unlawful societies. Relevant decisions were made by the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress. The Supreme People's Court and Supreme People's Procuratorate had also issued relevant interpretations. She stressed that the proposed proscription mechanism was only confined to a local organization subordinate to a Mainland organization proscribed in the Mainland by an open decree on national security grounds. It was also a requirement in the proscription mechanism that the local organization endangered national security as defined under local legislation. She added that under the existing SO, the proscription of an organization only involved prohibiting the organization from continuing to operate and did not involve the arrest of persons concerned.

43. Mr Albert HO said that although a proscription involved prohibiting the continued operation of an organization, it would be an offence for not complying with the proscription. In this connection, Legal Adviser said that the penalties for being an office-bearer or member of an unlawful society were provided in sections 19 and 20 of SO. Section 5 of the Public Order Ordinance (Cap.245) also prohibited persons to be members or adherents of a quasi-military organization.

44. SG responded that the proscription of a Mainland organization by an open decree in the Mainland was only a pre-condition for the proscription of a local organization subordinate to the Mainland organization. He informed Members that it would be expressly provided in legislation that the provisions relating to proscription of organizations had to be applied in a manner consistent with BL39. He added that

Action

in view of some people's concern regarding the proposed appeal mechanism, the Administration had proposed that all appeals would be adjudicated by the courts, which would also examine whether S for S's decision was consistent with BL39. He said that as it was not possible to provide an exhaustive list of acts that endangered national security, it would be desirable from a legal policy point of view to have a system prohibiting people from conducting activities that endangered national security.

45. Mr Albert HO asked whether the proscription mechanism was proposed because of the "one country" principle.

46. S for S responded that the proscription mechanism was proposed not because of the "one-country" principle, but because of the need to protect national security.

47. Mr TAM Yiu-chung queried whether S for S should disregard the proscription of a Mainland organization by the Central Authorities by an open decree on national security grounds. He considered that the proposed proscription mechanism, which required S for S to examine whether the local organization was subordinate to the proscribed Mainland organization and whether there was evidence of threat to national security, was a reasonable one especially given that the proscription had to be enforced in a manner consistent with international human rights covenants and a mechanism for appeal to the court would be established.

48. S for S stressed that the proposed proscription mechanism, which embodied many safeguards, sought to implement BL23 while not restricting human rights and freedom in Hong Kong.

49. Ms Cyd HO asked whether drafting instructions for legislation to implement BL23 would be issued after the summary of views was discussed. She also asked whether the drafting instructions had been issued to the Department of Justice (D of J) and, if so, when such instructions were issued.

50. S for S responded that while the drafting instructions had been issued to D of J, she had no information on hand as to the exact date of issue.

51. Ms Cyd HO said that the Security Bureau should not issue drafting instructions until the submissions received had been summarized and the Administration had responded to issues raised in the submissions. She asked whether the drafting instructions were issued to D of J before or after the completion of the Compendium. She also asked about the time needed for law drafting work and whether such work was already completed.

52. S for S responded that it was not a requirement in the legislative process that drafting instructions should be issued only after completion of a summary of views received. SG added that D of J was working at full speed in the drafting of the relevant Bill.

Action

53. Ms Cyd HO said that many members of the media were concerned whether the Johannesburg Principles, under which an act would amount to sedition only if there was a direct and immediate connection between the expression and violence, would be adopted in the proposed legislation. She asked whether the adoption of the Johannesburg Principles would lead to difficulties in enforcement or prosecution. She also questioned why the Administration had proposed removing the time limits for bringing prosecution against sedition.

54. S for S responded that while the Administration had no difficulties complying with many of the Johannesburg Principles, there were some principles, such as Principle 6, which might not be appropriate for Hong Kong. She said that there should not be a time limit for bringing prosecution against sedition, as was the case with other serious offences. Ms Cyd HO requested the Administration to provide a paper on the provisions in the Johannesburg Principles which would not be adopted in Hong Kong due to enforcement difficulties and to explain such enforcement difficulties.

Adm

55. Mr IP Kwok-him asked why the suggestion of providing a public interest defence for unauthorized disclosure was not adopted.

56. S for S responded that a public interest defence and a prior disclosure defence had been proposed by the relevant Bills Committee when the Official Secrets Ordinance was enacted in 1997. At that time, both the Liberal Party and the Democratic Alliance for Betterment of Hong Kong opposed the two defences.

57. SG added that both offences and defences relating to unauthorized disclosure should be clear and precise. The introduction of a public interest defence would make it unclear to members of the public as to whether they could or could not disclose documents. He said that the provision of a public interest defence had been mainly suggested in relation to the unlawful disclosure of information relating to relations between the Central Authorities of the PRC and the HKSAR. However, the proposal was already narrowed to information on matters concerning the HKSAR that were within the responsibility of the Central Authorities under BL and the disclosure of such information would only be an offence if it was damaging to national security. It was also questionable whether it would be in the public interest to make a disclosure damaging to national security. Thus, it would be unnecessary and inappropriate to introduce a public interest defence.

58. Mr IP Kwok-him said that many members of the media had expressed concern about the proposal relating to unauthorized disclosure. He asked whether the issue could be dealt with from the perspective of the public's right to know.

59. S for S responded that she had attended a number of meetings with members of the media and was aware of their concerns. However, it should be noted that "right to know" and "public interest" were subjective and difficult to determine.

Action

60. Regarding the proposed proscription mechanism, Mr James TO asked why there was a need to proscribe a local organization which had not committed any BL23 offence but was subordinate to a Mainland organization proscribed in the Mainland under Mainland national security laws.

61. SG reiterated that the proscription of a Mainland organization in the Mainland by open decree on national security grounds was only one of the pre-conditions for the proscription of a local organization subordinate to the Mainland organization. It would also be necessary to establish evidence to the court that there were reasonable grounds to believe that it was necessary and proportionate to proscribe the organization on national security grounds. Under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the freedoms of association and assembly could be restricted if it was necessary in the interests of national security. There was also case law indicating that if the activities of an organization were sufficiently threatening to national security, a rational and proportionate decision could be made to restrict the rights of the organization.

62. Miss Margaret NG requested the Administration to clarify media reports that a bill on proposals to implement BL23 might be considered by the Executive Council (ExCo) on 11 February 2003 and the Bill would be published in the Gazette on the following Friday. S for S responded that she was not in a position to provide a response, as the agenda of ExCo were confidential.

Adm

63. Miss Margaret NG suggested that when the Bill was published in the Gazette, the Administration should also issue explanatory notes and a comparison of existing and amended provisions in legislation so as to facilitate the public's understanding of the legislative amendments proposed in the Bill.

64. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong asked whether the proscription of a local organization endangering national security could be dealt with under the existing SO. He said that the proscription of a local organization subordinate to a Mainland organization proscribed in the Mainland without the requirement that the organization had committed any offence would undermine the rule of law in Hong Kong.

65. S for S responded that in the event that there was serious social instability in the Mainland, it was necessary for S for S to consider whether it was necessary to proscribe a local organization subordinate to the Mainland organization. She stressed that the proscription of a Mainland organization by an open decree on national security grounds was only one of the pre-conditions for the proscription of the local organization.

66. Mr Albert HO asked whether the offences of displaying, distributing or reproducing seditious publications would be abolished together with the offence of possession of seditious publications.

67. S for S responded that the existing offence of possession of seditious publications would be abolished. It would be an offence to deal with seditious

Action

publications only if it would incite offences that endangered national security.

68. Mr Albert HO asked whether HKSAR residents who had emigrated to other countries would retain their permanent status. Miss Margaret NG said that the Administration had already been requested at the last meeting to provide a paper on the issue.

LA 69. Miss Margaret NG requested the Legal Service Division to prepare a marked-up copy of the relevant Ordinances as soon as the relevant Bill was published in the Gazette. Mr James TO requested the Legal Service Division to update the observations in the paper entitled "Existing legislation relevant to the Proposals to implement Article 23 of the Basic Law" in the light of the Administration's latest proposals.

Adm 70. Miss Margaret NG requested the Administration to provide a paper explaining whether the proposed appeal mechanism for proscribed organizations was an appeal or a judicial review.

Clerk 71. Miss Margaret NG requested the LegCo Secretariat to circulate for Members' reference the relevant official record of proceedings on the Official Secrets Ordinance enacted in June 1997.

### **III. Dates of subsequent meetings**

72. Members noted that further joint meetings of the two Panels had been scheduled as follows -

- (a) Saturday, 15 February 2003 from 9:00 am to 12:00 noon;
- (b) Thursday, 20 February 2003 from 8:30 am to 10:30 am; and
- (c) Thursday, 27 February 2003 from 8:30 am to 10:30 am.

73. The meeting ended at 12:50 pm.

Council Business Division 2  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
9 May 2003