

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(2)438/08-09(06)

Ref : CB2/PL/AJLS

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

**Background brief for the meeting on 16 December 2008**

**Criminal legal aid fee system**

**Purpose**

This paper provides information on the past discussions of the Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services (the Panel) on the criminal legal aid fee system.

**Background**

Existing criminal legal aid fee system

*Prescribed level of fees*

2. The Legal Aid Department (LAD) engages counsel and solicitors in private practice as defence lawyers in criminal legal aid cases. The scale of fees payable to these lawyers as well as the fee assessment mechanism are prescribed in Rule 21 of the Legal Aid in Criminal Cases Rules (LACCR), a subsidiary legislation of the Criminal Procedure Ordinance (Cap. 221). While legally the scale of fees only binds LAD, the Department of Justice (DoJ) adopts the same fee scale on an administrative basis in engaging lawyers in private practice to prosecute in criminal cases on behalf of the Government, with a view to ensuring that neither LAD nor DoJ would have any advantage in competing for lawyers. For the same reason, fees for duty lawyers providing legal representation under the Duty Lawyer Scheme are also based on the brief fee payable by DoJ to engage counsel in place of a court prosecutor. Since 1992, the Administration has been reviewing these fees on a biennial basis, having regard to changes in consumer prices during the reference period, actual or anticipated difficulties in engaging the services of private counsel and solicitors, and other factors such as the state of the economy and office rentals. These fees were last reviewed in December 2006 and their current rates are set out in **Appendix I**.

*Criminal legal aid fee system vis-à-vis the prosecution fees regime*

3. While the fees payable to lawyers in private practice engaged for criminal litigation work by DoJ and LAD follow the same scale on an administrative basis, the

two systems operate differently in relation to the procedure and authority for increasing the fees payable to lawyers. In response to the Panel, the Administration has explained the differences between the two systems as follows –

(a) Determination of fees

The briefs of DoJ are “marked brief”, i.e. fees are marked before the work is done. For legal aid cases, LAD can only assess the fees “having regard to the work actually and reasonably done” in accordance with Rule 21(1) of LACCR and the scale of fees permitted under LACCR. The current approach is for LAD to agree with individual assigned lawyers the fees level after the conclusion of the cases.

(b) Fees payable at a level that exceeds the statutory limits

DoJ uses broadly similar rates as those prescribed in LACCR for their standard briefing out work in accordance with the complexity and length of each case. DoJ may pay an additional fee called "reading in refresher" calculated at daily refresher fee if the pre-trial preparation work required as assessed by counsel is substantially over and above that required for normal cases.

LAD can increase the brief fee and refresher fee payable to an assigned lawyer beyond the maximum rates if the assigned solicitor or counsel obtains from the Court a certificate of exceptional complexity/length.

(c) Cases of exceptional complexity and/or length

For non-standard briefing out work involving more complex and lengthy cases, DoJ adopts a "tender" system whereby quotations (including quotation for preparation work) are sought from practitioners and critically examined by a Selection Board.

For legal aid cases of exceptional complexity and/or length, an assigned counsel or solicitor may apply to a judge for a certificate of exceptional complexity and/or length which, if obtained, would provide authority to LAD to increase the brief fee and refresher fee beyond the maximum rates permitted under LACCR. LAD has explained that it cannot adopt a tender system partly because the fees have to be assessed on "work actually and reasonably done" basis, and partly because of time constraint. LAD has no control over when a legal aid applicant may come forward for assistance. He may lodge his application for legal aid shortly before hearing, and the urgency simply precludes the possibility of selecting counsel through a tender process. Where senior counsel are assigned nonetheless, their fees are subject to negotiation and are paid at non-standard rates.

### Review of the criminal legal aid fee system

4. The request for a comprehensive review of the current remuneration system for lawyers engaging in criminal legal aid work was made by the two legal professional bodies in 2003. Such a review was supported by the Panel, the Legal Aid Services Council (LASC) and the Chief Justice.

5. At the Panel meeting on 15 December 2005, members noted the following concerns raised by the two legal professional bodies over the existing criminal legal aid fee system -

- (a) the Director of Legal Aid (DLA) has no discretion to pay more than the maximum fees stipulated in LACCR. The fees stipulated in LACCR are unrealistically low and the brief fee is far from adequate to compensate preparation work in complex cases;
- (b) while the Court may grant certificates of exceptional complexity and/or length upon application by legal aid lawyers, and thus allow DLA to award a top-up fee, this is not entirely satisfactory as there are no guidelines for the trial judge to grant the certificate and for DLA to calculate the enhanced fee; and
- (c) compared with the relatively more flexible arrangements adopted by DoJ in the prosecution fees regime, the existing criminal legal aid fee system is not conducive to the principle of equality of arms between prosecution and defence, resulting in a situation whereby the legally-aided client would be represented by a far less experienced defence lawyer.

6. In response to the call for change by the two legal professional bodies, the Administration has since March 2006 engaged the relevant stakeholders, namely, the Judiciary, the two legal professional bodies and DoJ, in a comprehensive review of the criminal legal aid fee system, which covers areas including the prescribed level of fees, flexibility to pay fees at a level that exceeds statutory limits, fees for pre-trial preparation work, the issue of certificate of exceptional complexity or length as the basis to raise assessed fees, fee for an appeal on the basis of the level of the originating trial court and conference fees.

### **Past discussions of the Panel**

#### Proposed structure of the criminal legal aid fee system

7. The Panel received a briefing from the Administration on the progress of the review on the criminal legal aid fee system at its meeting on 26 February 2007. The Panel noted that the Administration had reached a broad consensus with the two legal professional bodies on the proposed structure of the criminal legal aid fee system (the proposed fee structure), which would operate on a marked-brief basis. The

Administration advised that the proposed fee structure would bring about major improvements, i.e. proper recognition for preparation or pre-trial work, rationalisation of fee items, and enhanced transparency for the fee setting and re-determination basis. Details of the proposed fee structure are set out in paragraphs 5 to 11 of the Administration's paper in **Appendix II**. A summary of the types of payment items under the existing and proposed fee structure is in **Appendix III**.

8. The Administration further advised that the estimated increase in criminal legal aid expenditure arising from the proposed change in the fee structure alone was about 30%, or roughly \$30 million per annum, on the basis of the current rates. The estimate was based on the criminal legal aid fee expenditure in the financial year 2004-2005 (about \$91 million). The criminal legal aid fee expenditure had since 2004-2005 increased to about \$105 million in 2006-2007 and was projected to increase further.

#### Rates for various payment items under the proposed fee structure

9. In March 2007, the Administration had offered to the two legal professional bodies its proposal on the rates for various payment items applicable to different levels of court under the proposed structure. At the Panel meetings on 25 June 2007 and 25 February 2008, the Administration reported on the further changes to the proposed fee structure and progress of its discussions with the two legal professional bodies on the proposed fee rates.

10. Members noted that while the Bar Association was in general content with the proposed fee structure, the Law Society considered the rates offered unreasonable, especially for the more experienced lawyers, notwithstanding the projected overall increase of 30% in criminal legal aid expenditure. The Law Society expressed concern that the low fee rates would discourage experienced lawyers from participating in criminal legal aid work and hence affect the quality of justice. The Law Society hoped that the proposed fee structure would uphold the principle of equal pay for equal work and properly reflect the responsibilities of solicitors in criminal legal aid work. It was particularly disappointed at the Administration's refusal to deviate from the basis of the statutory rates prescribed in Rule 21 of LACCR. The two professional legal bodies also held the views that there should be no distinction in the rates between Court of First Instance and District Court cases as the venue of trial was of itself no indicator of the complexity or otherwise of a case, and that the Administration should be mindful that the proposed fee system might have implications on the way fees were calculated by DoJ and under the Duty Lawyer Scheme.

11. At the Panel meeting on 25 February 2008, the Law Society informed members that it had conducted a survey on solicitors and law firms engaged in criminal litigation in October/November 2007. The findings revealed, inter alia, that over 90% of the respondents were dissatisfied with the hourly rates proposed by the Administration for the criminal pre-trial work at \$425 and \$300 for the High Court and District Court respectively. The Law Society's position was that the hourly rates for criminal legal aid should be on par with the civil taxation rates on a party-to-party basis. For example, the

party and party taxation rates for High Court civil proceedings were \$2,400 to \$3,000 per hour for a solicitor with five to six years' experience and \$1,400 per hour for a trainee solicitor. The Law Society also considered that the conference fees for barristers and solicitors should be compatible. At present, the hourly rates for barristers and solicitors are \$1,200 and \$300/\$400 respectively.

12. Some members shared the Law Society's concern that the proposed fee rates would mean that lawyers undertaking criminal legal aid work would continue to be remunerated at a small fraction of the market rates. They considered that as criminal litigation affected the liberty of a person, it would be unfair if legal aid provided to the defence only allowed him to engage lawyers with less experience. It was also suggested that the seniority of lawyers should be considered in setting the rates for criminal legal aid fees.

13. Addressing the Law Society's concerns, the Administration explained that the estimated overall 30% increase on legal aid fee expenditure did not represent any cap on the payment items under the proposed fee structure. The actual increase in pay in individual cases could be greater, depending on the level of court involved and the complexity and length of a case. The Administration further explained that the difference in fees proposed for barristers and solicitors reflected the different nature of work engaged by the respective practitioners in a criminal case. As for the suggestion of introducing the criterion of seniority in the setting of fees, stakeholders generally preferred not to consider seniority in the determination of fees. The Administration stressed that in working out an improved criminal legal aid fee system, it was important to balance the need to provide reasonable remuneration for legal aid lawyers, and the duty to be prudent in public money spending.

14. As the Law Society and the Administration held divergent views on the proposed level of fees on the various payment items, members were concerned that the review had reached an impasse. Given that the Law Society had indicated its expected level of fees, the Panel requested the Administration to negotiate with the Law Society with a view to resolving differences, and report to the Panel in due course.

### Taxation

15. The Law Society objected to DLA being the final arbitrator on fee disputes between assigned lawyers and the LAD, having regard to the principles of natural justice, and considered taxation the best way to resolve disputes on criminal legal aid fees. Alternatively, the jurisdiction of the Legal Aid Review Committee [a committee established under section 26A(1) of the Legal Aid Ordinance (Cap.91)] could be expanded or a statutory body should be set up to adjudicate on fee disputes. The Bar Association and some members of the Panel concurred with the view of the Law Society. It was pointed out that the civil legal aid fee system also adopted a taxation system. As there were very few disputes on civil legal aid fees being resolved by taxation, the same was envisaged for criminal legal aid fees.

16. The Administration explained that under the civil legal aid system, LAD and assigned lawyer had no prior agreement on the fees; hence taxation at the end of a case would be appropriate. However, under the proposed marked brief system for criminal legal aid cases, fees were agreed beforehand which rendered taxation for resolving disputes on criminal legal aid fees unnecessary. In addition, assigned lawyers could seek LAD's re-determination of fees both during and at the end of the case. The Administration had also relayed to the Panel the concern of Mr Justice Stock over the resource implications on the Judiciary if a taxation system was to be adopted.

17. The Administration was requested to consult LASC on the Law Society's suggestion in paragraph 15 above and inform the Panel accordingly.

### **Latest developments**

18. At its meeting on 20 October 2008, the Panel noted that the Administration would give further response to the Law Society's proposal on fee rates before the end of 2008. The Administration will brief the Panel on the latest developments on its review of the criminal legal aid fee system at the coming meeting on 16 December 2008.

### **Relevant papers**

19. A list of the relevant papers available on the LegCo website (<http://www.legco.gov.hk>) is in **Appendix IV**.

**Criminal Legal Aid Fees,  
Prosecution Fees and Duty Lawyer Fees**

<u>Nature of fee</u>	<u>Department/ Service</u>	Current Maximum w.e.f. <u>4 July 03</u> (\$)
<b>1. <u>Court of First Instance Cases</u></b>		
(a) Counsel		
(i) brief fee	LAD/DOJ*	20,410
(ii) refresher fee per day	LAD/DOJ*	10,210
(b) Solicitor		
(i) brief fee	LAD^	6,790
(ii) refresher fee per day	LAD^	830 to 4,420
(c) Conference per hour (counsel)	LAD/DOJ	1,080
(d) Pre-trial review (per review)	DOJ	2,030
<b>2. <u>District Court Cases</u></b>		
(a) Counsel		
(i) brief fee	LAD/DOJ*	13,600
(ii) refresher fee per day	LAD/DOJ*	6,800
(b) Solicitor (acting as instructing solicitor)		
(i) brief fee	LAD^	4,840
(ii) refresher fee per day	LAD^	1,160 to 2,900
(c) Solicitor (acting as advocate as well as instructing solicitor)		
(i) brief fee	LAD*	16,800
(ii) refresher fee per day	LAD*	9,310
(d) Conference per hour (counsel)	LAD/DOJ	880
(e) Brief fee for mention/sentence	DOJ	2,710
<b>3. <u>Magistrates' Court Cases</u></b>		
(a) Counsel		
(i) brief fee	DOJ	8,160
(ii) refresher fee per day	DOJ	4,080
(b) Counsel or solicitor (acting as advocate) in committal proceedings		
(i) brief fee	LAD	8,160
(ii) refresher fee per day	LAD	4,080

<u>Nature of fee</u>	<u>Department/ Service</u>	<u>Current Maximum w.e.f. 4 July 03 (\$)</u>	
(c) Solicitor for instructing counsel in committal proceedings			
(i) brief fee	LAD	2,210	
(ii) refresher fee per day	LAD	1,810	
(d) Counsel or solicitor acting as advocate in preliminary inquiry			
(i) brief fee	LAD	8,160	
(ii) refresher fee per day	LAD	4,080	
(e) Brief in place of court prosecutor per day	DOJ	5,430	
(f) Duty Lawyer Fee	DLS	5,430	a day
		2,710	half day
(g) Pre-trial fee per hour	DLS	670	
<b>4. <u>Appeals</u></b>			
(a) Settling notice of appeal	LAD	2,710	
(b) Instructing solicitors for appeals to the Court of Appeal			
(i) from the Court of First Instance	LAD	9,160	first day
		1,150 to 5,910	per subsequent day
(ii) from the District Court	LAD	7,330	first day
		910 to 4,760	per subsequent day
(c) Counsel for appeals to the Court of Appeal			
(i) from the Court of First Instance	LAD/DOJ	27,210	first day
		13,610	per subsequent day
(ii) from the District Court	LAD/DOJ	21,760	first day
		10,880	per subsequent day
(d) Conference per hour (counsel)	LAD/DOJ	1,080	

Note :

LAD Legal Aid Department

DOJ Department of Justice

DLS Duty Lawyer Service

\* Subject to an increase of 10% on the base figures for each of the second to sixth defendant or appellant.

^ Subject to an increase of such amount as appears to the Director of Legal Aid to be proper in the circumstances.



**For information on  
25 February 2008**

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

**Review of Criminal Legal Aid Fees System**

**PURPOSE**

This paper reports the progress of discussions with the two legal professional bodies on the criminal legal aid fee system.

**BACKGROUND**

2. The Legal Aid Department (LAD) engages counsel and solicitors in the private practice as defence lawyers in criminal legal aid cases. The scale of fees payable to these assigned lawyers as well as the fee assessment mechanism are set out in the Legal Aid in Criminal Cases Rules (the Rules), a subsidiary legislation of the Criminal Procedure Ordinance (Cap. 221).

3. In response to the call for change by the two legal professional bodies, the Administration has since March 2006 engaged stakeholders, namely, the Judiciary, the Hong Kong Bar Association (the Bar Association), the Law Society of Hong Kong (the Law Society) and the Department of Justice in a comprehensive review. The Administration considered that it would be important to take the following principles into account in taking forward the review –

- (a) general compatibility of the criminal legal aid fee system for the defense lawyers with the fee regime for the prosecution counsel;
- (b) rectification of inconsistency between policy on payment to solicitors and counsel;
- (c) reasonable and effective remuneration for legal aid assigned lawyers within the remits of public affordability; and
- (d) prudence in public money spending.

## **PROGRESS**

4. The Administration had responded to the various suggestions by the two legal professional bodies in a positive manner. The Administration has reached broad consensus with the two legal professional bodies on the proposed structure of the criminal legal aid fee system that will operate on a “marked-brief” basis.

5. The proposed fee structure is an overhaul of the current system. The major improvements are set out below –

### **(A) Proper recognition for preparation or pre-trial work**

6. Under the current system, solicitors and counsel alike are paid a “flat” fee for pre-trial preparation, irrespective of the hours put in. We accept that this does not fully recognize the preparation and effort put in pre-trial work.

7. Under the proposed system, pre-trial work will be remunerated according to the time required. In gist, for counsel, there will be a “brief fee” to cover the first day of pre-trial work and the first day of court hearing. A new “additional preparation fee” will be payable for each subsequent half day of pre-trial work and a “refresher fee” for each subsequent court hearing day. As for solicitors, there will be a “reading fee” to be payable every hour (90 pages to be regarded as an hour’s reading), depending on the volume of material to be read, a “preparation fee” to be paid on a half-day basis for other pre-trial preparation, and a “court hearing day fee” for each court hearing day.

### **(B) Rationalisation of fee items**

8. At present, where a conference has taken place among the assigned lawyers and the legally aided defendant, the counsel, but not the solicitor, is eligible for a “conference fee”. Under the proposed structure, conference fee will also be payable to solicitors.

9. Under the proposed system, there will also be transparent criteria for classification of cases where necessary and the applicable rates will be clearly set out. Also, the nomenclature of payment items will better reflect the different nature of work of counsel and solicitors.

(C) Enhanced transparency for the fee setting and re-determination basis

10. Under the current system, the fee payable to an assigned lawyer is assessed after the work is done and the case concluded. Under the proposed system, the classification of a particular case and hence the rates, as well as the required preparation time will be assessed beforehand and marked on the brief when making the assignment. Assigned lawyers will be allowed to view bundle before accepting assignments whenever circumstances permit, to facilitate their consideration. These measures will greatly enhance the transparency of the fee system.

11. At present, an increase in the fee payable is only allowed if the case is exceptionally lengthy or complex, in which case the assigned lawyer has to first apply to the court and be granted with certificates of exceptionalities after the trial. Under the proposed system, assigned lawyers may seek LAD's re-determination both during and at the end of the case. For transparency, the circumstances that may require re-determination will be set out. For instance, where there is voluminous amount of additional evidence provided by prosecution after the case is assigned; where research on special/peculiar legal issues that are not identified at the time of assignment is required, etc.

**Payment for individual cases**

12. The improvements mentioned in paragraphs 7 to 11 above will directly increase the payment for individual cases. The Administration reported to this Panel that based on the criminal legal aid fee expenditure in the financial year 2004-05 (about \$91 million), the estimated increase in criminal legal aid expenditure arising from the proposed change in the fee structure would be roughly \$30 million per annum, on the basis of current rates. In 2006-07, the criminal legal aid fee expenditure was about \$105 million. The expenditure in criminal legal aid fee is expected to increase by around 30% should we adopt the proposed fee structure. The actual extent of increase may be more and will vary among cases, largely depending on how much pre-trial work the assigned lawyers devoted to the case, and, in the case of solicitors, also the number of hours of conference taken place.

## **WAY FORWARD**

13. There is already a broad consensus with the two legal professional bodies on the fee structure. We wrote to the Law Society in July 2007 to invite its continual discussion with the Administration on the issue of rates. In December 2007, the Law Society wrote back reiterating its concern on the existing rates.

14. We will continue to discuss with the stakeholders on the proposed rates for the various items with a view to resolving differences. We are mindful that in working out an improved criminal legal aid fee system, we have to balance the need to provide reasonable and effective remuneration to assigned lawyers, and the duty to be prudent in public money spending.

15. As and when we have reached agreement with the two professional bodies, the Administration will revise the Rules and seek Finance Committee's approval for the additional financial provisions. Separately, the Rules will be submitted to the Criminal Procedure Rules Committee for endorsement and Legislative Council for approval through a positive resolution.

Home Affairs Bureau  
Legal Aid Department

February 2008

## Appendix III

### SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CHANGES IN FEE STRUCTURE

The proposed criminal legal aid fee structure will bring about the following major improvements – (a) proper recognition for preparation or pre-trial work; (b) rationalisation of fee items; and (c) enhanced transparency for the fee setting and re-determination basis. A comparison is set out below.

#### Fee Structure

	Types of fees payable	Existing Structure		Proposed Structure	
		Solicitor	Counsel and solicitor advocate	Solicitor	Counsel and solicitor advocate
1	Brief fee	= refresher fee for 2 days		Retitled as – - “Reading fee” payable on an hourly basis, to cover reading of bundle; and	Brief fee. To cover 1 <sup>st</sup> 8 hrs of preparation + 1 <sup>st</sup> day of court hearing
2	Additional preparation fee	x		- “Preparation fee”, to cover pre-trial preparation after reading <sup>1</sup> .	✓  (assessment: ½ day basis; re-determination : hourly basis)
3	Refresher fee	✓ (full day / half day / short)		Retitled as “court hearing day fee”. To cover 1 <sup>st</sup> day of court hearing and onward (full day basis)	Refresher fee. To cover 2 <sup>nd</sup> court hearing day and onward (full day basis)
4	Pre-trial review fee (per review)	✓		✓	
5	Mention hearing fee (per hearing)	✓		✓	
6	Conference fee (per hour)	x	✓	✓	✓
7	Uplift per defendant (10% increase to brief fee, refresher fee / court hearing day fee and other court attendance related fees for each additional aided client, up to a max of 50% where 6 or more aided clients are represented).	✓ (not for Magistrates Court)	✓ (not for Magistrates Court)	✓ (including Magistrates Court)	✓ (including Magistrates Court)

<sup>1</sup> To be paid for each stretch of hours to be specified.

**Operational: Assignment**

<b>Existing Structure</b>	<b>Proposed Structure</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Legal Aid Department (LAD) verbally advises basic particulars of case.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To facilitate lawyers' consideration and to enhance transparency, lawyers will be allowed to view bundle before accepting assignment, whenever circumstances permit. In any case, LAD will advise the lawyers particulars of the case verbally.</li> </ul>

**Operational: Re-determination**

<b>Existing Structure</b>	<b>Proposed Structure</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If the assigned lawyer considers that the case is of exceptional length or are exceptionally complex, they may, in accordance with the Legal Aid in Criminal Cases Rules, apply to court at the conclusion of the case and the court may so certify.</li> <li>- With the certificates, (LAD) may pay additional fees to the lawyers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No need to apply to court for certificates of exceptionality.</li> <li>- Re-determination allowed before the conclusion of the case.</li> <li>- For transparency, circumstances that may require re-determination will be spelt out in more detail. For instance, where there is voluminous amount of additional evidence provided by prosecution after case is assigned; where research on special / peculiar legal issues that are not identified at the time of assignment is required; where the legally aided defendant withdraws legal aid or requests for re-assignment of lawyers, etc.</li> </ul>

## Criminal legal aid fee system

## Relevant documents

<u>Meeting</u>	<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>Paper/Question</u>
Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services	27 October 2003	<p>Director of Administration's letter dated 20 October 2003 responding to the issues raised by the Panel at the meetings on 23 June and 29 July 2003 [LC Paper No. CB(2)159/03-04(03)]</p> <p>Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(2)387/03-04]</p>
Legislative Council	11 May 2005	<p>Official Record of Proceedings of the Council on an oral question raised by Hon Margaret NG on "Payment of fee to the defence counsel in criminal legal aid cases in respect of preparation work"</p>
Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services	--	<p>An Executive Summary and the submission on "Review of legal aid in criminal cases" from the Special Committee on Legal Aid Reform of the Hong Kong Bar Association to the Legal Aid Services Council [LC Paper No. CB(2)1588/04-05(01)] (English version only)</p> <p>Law Society of Hong Kong's letter dated 1 June 2005 and a position paper on "The System of Remuneration of Solicitors for Conducting Criminal Legal Aid Work" to the Director of Administration (Annex 7 to the position paper is confidential) [LC Paper No. CB(2)1793/04-05(01)] (English version only)</p> <p>Administration's letter dated 8 July 2005 to the Hong Kong Bar Association on "2004 Biennial Review of Criminal Legal Aid Fees, Prosecution Fees and Duty Lawyer Fees" [LC Paper No. CB(2)2268/04-05(01)] (English version only)</p>

<u>Meeting</u>	<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>Paper/Question</u>
		<p>Chairman of LASC's letter dated 26 October 2005 to the Director of Administration on "Review of criminal legal aid fees"  <a href="#">[LC Paper No. CB(2)260/05-06(01)]</a>  <i>(English version only)</i></p> <p>Panel Chairman's letter dated 27 October 2005 to the Director of Administration on "Review of criminal legal aid fees"  <a href="#">[LC Paper No. CB(2)260/05-06(02)]</a>  <i>(English version only)</i></p>
	15 December 2005	<p>An extract from the Official Record of Proceedings of the Council meeting on 11 May 2005 on an oral question raised by Hon Margaret NG on "Amendments to Legal Aid in Criminal Cases Rules"  <a href="#">[LC Paper No. CB(2)658/05-06(01)]</a></p> <p>Administration's paper on "Criminal legal aid fees system"  <a href="#">[LC Paper No. CB(2)658/05-06(02)]</a></p> <p>Minutes of meeting  <a href="#">[LC Paper No. CB(2)1198/05-06]</a></p>
	--	<p>Director of Administration's letter dated 15 May 2006 concerning the progress of the review of criminal legal aid fees system  <a href="#">[LC Paper No. CB(2)2058/05-06(01)]</a></p> <p>Administration's paper on "2006 Biennial Review of Criminal Legal Aid Fees, Prosecution Fees and Duty Lawyer Fees"  <a href="#">[LC Paper No. CB(2)563/06-07(01)]</a></p>
	26 February 2007	<p>Background brief prepared by the LegCo Secretariat on "Criminal legal aid fees system"  <a href="#">[LC Paper No. CB(2)1127/06-07(01)]</a></p>



<u>Meeting</u>	<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>Paper/Question</u>
		<p>Administration's paper on "Review of criminal legal fees system" [LC Paper No. CB(2)1127/06-07(02)]</p> <p>Law Society's paper on "Review of criminal legal aid fees" [LC Paper No. CB(2)1127/06-07(03)] <i>(English version only)</i></p> <p>Draft minutes provided by the Law Society of a meeting held between the Administration and the legal professional bodies on 21 December 2006 [LC Paper No. CB(2)1127/06-07(04)] <i>(English version only)</i></p> <p>Law Society's letter dated 16 February 2007 to the Administration [LC Paper No. CB(2)1127/06-07(05)] <i>(English version only)</i></p> <p>Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(2)1393/06-07]</p>
	25 June 2007	<p>Administration's paper on "Review of criminal legal aid fee system" [LC Paper No. CB(2)2221/06-07(05)]</p> <p>Law Society's submission on "Criminal legal aid fees system" [LC Paper No. CB(2)2264/06-07(01)] <i>(English version only)</i></p> <p>Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(2)2654/06-07]</p>
	25 February 2008	<p>Background Brief prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat on "Criminal legal aid fees system" [LC Paper No. CB(2)1143/07-08(01)]</p> <p>Administration's paper on "Criminal legal aid fees system" [LC Paper No. CB(2)1143/07-08(02)]</p>

<u>Meeting</u>	<u>Meeting Date</u>	<u>Paper/Question</u>
		<p>Society for Community Organization's submission [LC Paper No. CB(2)1143/07-08(03)] (Chinese version only)</p> <p>Law Society of Hong Kong's submission [LC Paper No. CB(2)1176/07-08(02)] (English version only)</p> <p>Hong Kong Human Rights Monitor's submission [LC Paper No. CB(2)1245/07-08(01)] (English version only)</p> <p>Law Society of Hong Kong's letter dated 22 February 2008 enclosing a letter from its President to the Secretary for Home Affairs concerning the criminal legal aid fees system [LC Paper No. CB(2)1247/07-08(01)] (English version only)</p> <p>Minutes of meeting [LC Paper No. CB(2)1697/07-08]</p>
	20 October 2008	<p>Paper provided by the Home Affairs Bureau [LC Paper No. CB(2)71/08-09(01)] (paragraphs 4 to 7)</p>