

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

**List of outstanding items for discussion**

*(position as at 11 October 2010)*

**Proposed  
timing for  
discussion**

**1. Applicability of Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("HKSAR") laws to offices set up by the Central People's Government in HKSAR**

The item was discussed at a number of meetings of the Panel since 1998. When the item was last discussed by the Panel on 28 April 2008, the Administration advised the Panel on the following -

To be advised by  
Constitutional and  
Mainland Affairs  
Bureau

- (a) 15 Ordinances which expressly bind the Government but are silent on their applicability to the Central People's Government ("CPG") offices - amendments would be introduced to four Ordinances in the 2008-2009 legislative session. The Administration would discuss further with CPG on the remaining 11 Ordinances;
- (b) Personal Data Privacy Ordinance ("PDPO") - the Administration and CPG was studying whether and if so how PDPO should apply to CPG offices set up in Hong Kong; and
- (c) 35 Ordinances which contain express references to the "Crown" - six of these Ordinances required no further action (viz. three had already been adapted, and three had been repealed). The Administration would continue to examine how the remaining 29 Ordinances should be adapted.

On behalf of the Panel, the Chairman wrote a letter to the Secretary for Justice ("SJ") in May 2008 conveying members' discontent with the little work progress achieved by the Administration after a lapse of 10 years and concerns about the applicability of PDPO to CPG offices in Hong Kong. SJ advised in July 2008 that more time was needed by the Administration.

In respect of (a) above, the Adaptation of Laws Ordinance was passed by the Legislative Council ("LegCo") in April 2009 and commenced operation on 8 May 2009. The Ordinance has extended the applicability of four Ordinances, namely the Legislative Council Commission Ordinance (Cap. 443), Plant Varieties Protection Ordinance (Cap. 490), Patents Ordinance (Cap. 514) and Registered Designs

Ordinance (Cap. 522), to the three offices set up by CPG in HKSAR. In addition, legislative amendments have been proposed in respect of the Arbitration Ordinance (Cap. 341). The Arbitration Bill, introduced into LegCo on 8 July 2009, provides that, aside from being applicable to the Government, the Ordinance will also apply to the offices set up by CPG in the HKSAR.

The Administration is working on the extension of the applicability of the other Ordinances in (a) above to CPG offices in HKSAR. The Administration will consider separately the issues in (b) and (c) above.

## **2. Five-yearly review of the criteria for assessing the financial eligibility of legal aid applicants**

The Administration reported to the Panel on its proposals arising from the recently completed five-yearly review at the meeting on 29 March 2010. Subsequently, the Panel further discussed the proposals with the Administration and relevant organizations at its meetings on 24 May, 21 July and 30 September 2010.

December 2010  
Home Affairs  
Bureau ("HAB")

When the subject was last discussed at the meeting on 30 September 2010, members urged the Administration to revert to the Panel as soon as possible on its consideration of the proposals put forward by the Hong Kong Bar Association in July 2010 for expansion of the scope of the Supplementary Legal Aid Scheme ("SLAS"). Members were advised that the study being conducted by the Legal Aid Services Council's ("LASC") Interest Group on Scope of Legal Aid ("Interest Group") on expansion of SLAS was expected to conclude by around end of November 2010 and the Interest Group was studying the Bar Association's proposals along with its own study. The Administration would come to its view on the issue after consideration of the report from LASC. Members had decided to recommend to the Panel in the 2010-2011 session that the issue should be re-visited at its meeting in December 2010 and LASC should be invited to the meeting to brief members on its deliberations on the recommendations of the Interest Group on expansion of SLAS.

## **3. Criminal legal aid fees system**

At the request of the two legal professions made in 2003, the Administration reviewed the criminal legal aid fees system and discussed the relevant issues with the Panel at six meetings held between December 2005 and June 2009. The Panel noted that while the Administration had reached broad consensus with the legal professional bodies on the proposed structure of the criminal legal aid fees system, the Administration was yet to resolve the divergence of views over the

To be advised by  
HAB

fee rates with the Law Society of Hong Kong. The Panel also noted the Bar Association's suggestion that in view of the lack of progress of the discussion between the two parties, implementation of the revised criminal legal aid fees system for barristers should be de-linked from that for solicitors should the Administration and the Law Society fail to reach agreement on the fee rates.

When the Panel received a report from the Administration on the latest progress of its discussion with the Law Society on fee rates for solicitors in June 2009, members noted that the Administration had put forth a revised proposal on fee rates for the Law Society's consideration, but the fundamental difference between the two parties on the basis for determining fee rates had yet to be resolved. Members noted the Law Society's view that the revised rates did not properly reflect the professional responsibilities of solicitors in criminal legal aid work and were still far below the civil party-to-party taxation rates for remunerating civil legal aid cases. The Panel urged the two parties to iron out their differences as far as practicable and requested the Administration to report to the Panel when they were able to come to an agreement on the matter.

In its letter to the President of the Law Society dated 11 February 2010 (LC Paper No. CB(2)973/09-10(01)), the Administration advised that it was making preparation for the legislative process to put in place the revised criminal legal aid fees structure and rates. On 7 October 2010, the Administration advised that it was preparing the draft amendment rules and aimed to submit the amendments to LegCo in 2010-2011 session.

#### **4. Professional Indemnity Scheme of the Law Society**

In its report to the House Committee on 26 October 2001, the former Subcommittee on Solicitors (Professional Indemnity) (Amendment) Rules 2001 recommended that this Panel should follow up the progress of the independent review of the insurance arrangement under the Professional Indemnity Scheme ("PIS") of the Law Society. Since then, the Panel has monitored the review of PIS and received progress reports from the Law Society.

To be decided  
by the Panel  
Law Society

In November 2004, members of the Law Society voted for a Qualifying Insurers Scheme ("QIS") to replace the existing scheme.

In May 2006, the Law Society informed the Panel that its members had voted by a large majority not to replace the existing PIS by a QIS at its Extraordinary General Meeting on 27 April 2006. The Law Society had set up a Professional Indemnity Scheme Review Working Party to identify any deficiencies in the existing scheme, consider how they

might be remedied, and make appropriate recommendations.

At the Panel meeting in February 2007, the Law Society gave a report on the progress of work of the Review Working Party. The Working Party would proceed to consider a number of outstanding issues and submit a report with recommendations to the Council of the Law Society in due course.

The Law Society's second and third reports on the progress of work of the Review Working Party were issued to the Panel on 25 April 2008 (LC Paper No. CB(2)1722/07-08(01)) and 20 October 2009 (LC Paper No. CB(2)148/09-10(01)) respectively. According to the third progress report, the reinsurance contract had been extended from 1 October 2009 for a period of four years, with an option to terminate after two years should PIS be replaced by an alternative form of indemnity arrangement.

The Law Society advised in October 2009 that it had commissioned actuaries and brokers respectively to review the formula for calculating the contributions payable under PIS and to compare the costs of insurance to law firms under a Master Policy Scheme and PIS, and that it would be better able to advise on an appropriate time for discussion of the review of PIS when these findings are available.

**5. Implementation of Civil Justice Reform ("CJR")**

The Panel has been monitoring the progress on the implementation of CJR. The Panel noted that the Chief Justice ("CJ") had established a Committee to monitor the working of the reformed civil justice system and to make suggestions to ensure its effective operation. The Panel requested the Judiciary Administration ("JA") to brief members on the effectiveness of the reformed system at an appropriate juncture after the implementation of CJR.

End of 2010  
JA

**6. Inclusion of the statutory Independent Police Complaints Council ("IPCC") under the purview of The Ombudsman**

During the discussion on the subject of "Review of jurisdiction of the Office of The Ombudsman" at the Panel meeting on 27 April 2009, members raised the issue of whether the statutory IPCC to be established on 1 June 2009 should be subject to The Ombudsman's jurisdiction. Members noted that the issue had been considered during the scrutiny of the IPCC Bill, and the Administration's view then was that the statutory IPCC should not be brought under The Ombudsman's ambit for the time being. Members agreed to bring up the issue for discussion after the statutory IPCC had been in operation for some time.

To be decided by  
the Panel  
Admin Wing

The Administration Wing of the Chief Secretary for Administration's Office ("Admin Wing") advised in September 2010 that the work of the statutory IPCC was last discussed by the Panel on Security at its meeting on 21 July 2010, and the subject would continue to be followed up at the forum of the Panel on Security.

**7. The role of the Judiciary in the adjudication system under the Control of Obscene and Indecent Articles Ordinance ("COIAO")**

The Commerce and Economic Development Bureau ("CEDB") has embarked on a review of COIAO with two rounds of public consultation. During the first round of public consultation conducted from 3 October 2008 to 31 January 2009, the Judiciary and some members of the legal profession proposed to remove the administrative classification function (i.e. making an interim classification and, upon appeal, a final classification on a submitted article) from the Obscene Articles Tribunal, leaving it to deal with judicial determinations only (i.e. determining whether an article is obscene or indecent upon referral by a court or a magistrate arising from a civil or criminal proceeding). According to CEDB, there was little deliberation of this issue among the public. It would discuss within the Government and with the relevant stakeholders and look for possible improvement measures in the second round of public consultation to be commenced in the end of 2009. During the Panel's visit to the Judiciary on 13 July 2009, participating Members noted the strong view of the Judiciary about this issue and agreed that the Panel should follow it up at a future meeting.

To be advised by  
JA/CEDB

CEDB advised in September 2010 upon the enquiry of the Secretariat that the timing for discussion of the item was yet to be decided and it would keep the Panel posted when there was new development.

**8. Law Reform Commission Report on Hearsay in Criminal Proceedings**

The Report on Hearsay in Criminal Proceedings was published by the Law Reform Commission in November 2009. At the meeting on 15 December 2009, the Panel agreed to discuss relevant issues at a future meeting.

To be decided by  
the Panel  
Department of  
Justice ("DoJ")

**9. Implementation of the scheme for granting higher rights of audience to solicitors**

This item was referred to the Panel by the Bills Committee on Legal Practitioners (Amendment) Bill 2009.

To be decided by  
the Panel  
DoJ

The Bills Committee considered it necessary to review the scheme for

granting higher rights of audience to solicitors at an appropriate junction, say around two years after its implementation, and had referred the issue to the Panel for follow-up.

The Bill was passed by LegCo on 20 January 2010.

**10. Consultation Paper on Double Jeopardy published by the Double Jeopardy Subcommittee of the Law Reform Commission**

The Law Reform Commission's Double Jeopardy Subcommittee has published the above Consultation Paper for public consultation until 31 May 2010. The Panel agreed to discuss the Consultation Paper at a future meeting.

To be decided by the Panel  
Law Reform Commission

**11. Drafting of Chinese text of legislation**

During the discussions on the proposed changes to the document design of Hong Kong legislation at the Panel meeting on 26 April 2010, some members had expressed concern about the readability of Chinese text of legislation. Members noted that following the Panel's discussion on law drafting at the meeting in December 2009, the Legal Service Division of the LegCo Secretariat and the Law Drafting Division had held regular working meetings to discuss views expressed by Members on law drafting in the course of examination of bills. Members agreed that the issue of readability of Chinese text of legislation be discussed at a future Panel meeting with reference to concrete examples raised during the scrutiny of bills.

January 2011  
DoJ

**12. Membership of SJ in the Judicial Officers Recommendation Commission**

The item was referred to the Panel by the former Subcommittee on Proposed Senior Judicial Appointments.

Second quarter of 2011  
DoJ/JA

During the deliberations of the Subcommittee, some members expressed reservation about the membership of SJ, being a Principal Official under the Political Appointment System, on the Judicial Officers Recommendation Commission. The Subcommittee agreed to refer the issue to the Panel for follow-up.

**13. Appointment of serving Justices of Appeal as non-permanent judges of the Court of Final Appeal ("CFA") and judicial manpower situation in CFA and other levels of courts**

The item was referred to the Panel by the former Subcommittee on Proposed Senior Judicial Appointments.

Second quarter of 2011

JA

During the deliberations of the Subcommittee, some members expressed grave concern that serving Justices of Appeal to the Court of Appeal of the High Court were being made non-permanent judges of CFA. They considered that the arrangement of allowing the same pool of judges to sit in both courts could give the public the impression that they were denied a real appeal in CFA and would erode public confidence in the administration of justice even though these non-permanent Hong Kong judges would not hear appeals from cases in which they had sat. Members were of the view that the crux of the problem was the relatively small number of permanent judges in CFA, and more resources should be provided to the Judiciary to allow more judges to be appointed.

The Subcommittee had referred the policy issues of appointing serving Justices of Appeal as non-permanent judges of CFA and of judicial manpower situation in CFA and other levels of courts to the Panel for follow up.

The item of "Appointment of Temporary/Deputy Judges and Judicial Officers" was originally scheduled for discussion in June 2010. However, as the former Subcommittee on Proposed Senior Judicial Appointments had referred to the Panel for follow up the issue of judicial manpower situation at CFA and other levels of court, JA suggested that the information intended to be provided under the item of "Appointment of Temporary/Deputy Judges and Judicial Officers" be covered in an overall paper on judicial manpower situation, covering both the substantive and temporary/deputy judicial manpower situation at all levels of court. Members agreed to JA's suggestion. To allow sufficient time for JA to prepare the paper, members also agreed to defer the discussion of the item to a future meeting.

**14. Framework Agreement on Hong Kong/Guangdong Co-operation relating to co-operation on legal matters**

At the meeting on 24 May 2010, the Panel agreed to include the item in the Panel's list of outstanding items for discussion.

May 2011  
DoJ

**15. Procedural matters of appeal boards**

The item was referred to the Panel by the Bills Committee on Building Energy Efficiency Bill.

To be advised by  
DoJ

During the scrutiny work of the Bills Committee, issues relating to the treatment of appeal board procedure, and definition and coverage of "cost of appeal proceedings" have been raised. It is noted that there is

no universal treatment across the board regarding procedural matters of appeal boards. At present, the procedure is either provided in the principal ordinance, in subsidiary legislation as authorized in the principal ordinance, or is left to the appeal boards to decide if the procedure is not provided in the laws. The Bills Committee also notes that there is no uniform definition for "costs of appeal proceedings". The Panel has been requested to follow up these issues. An information paper will be provided by DoJ.

**16. The trend of legislative proposals being put forward by the Administration in the form of subsidiary legislation**

At the meeting of the Committee on Rules of Procedure on 2 November 2009, some members expressed concern about the trend of legislative proposals being put forward by the Administration in the form of subsidiary legislation and not bills. There was concern that given their importance and far reaching implications, some of the legislative proposals should be put forward in the form of bills or subsidiary legislation subject to the positive vetting procedure, rather than subsidiary legislative subject to the negative vetting procedure, so as to allow sufficient time for LegCo to scrutinize the proposals. The issue has been referred to the Panel for consideration.

April 2011  
DoJ

**17. Proposed construction of the West Kowloon Law Courts Building**

JA consulted the Panel on the construction of the West Kowloon Law Courts Buildings at its meeting on 26 April 2010. According to the Judiciary's paper (LC Paper No. CB(2)1349/09-10(04)) provided for the meeting, the next consultation with the Panel is scheduled for the second quarter of 2011.

June 2011  
JA

**18. Proposed creation of a new rank of Assistant Principal Government Counsel (Directorate (Legal) 1) and creation of posts in DoJ**

This item is proposed by the Administration to seek Members' views on the proposals for implementing the recommendations in respect of the Government Counsel grade contained in *Report No. 43* of the Standing Commission on Civil Service Salaries and Conditions of Service. The purpose is to strengthen the support at the directorate level as required through upgrading identified Senior Government Counsel posts in recognition of their level of responsibilities.

November 2010  
DoJ

**19. Proposed amendment to the Enduring Powers of Attorney Ordinance (Cap. 501)**

The Law Reform Commission has recommended that the legislative

December 2010

requirement for a medical witness in relation to the execution of enduring powers of attorney should be dispensed with. The Administration intends to introduce a Bill to give effect to the recommendation. DoJ

**20. Reciprocal recognition/enforcement of arbitral awards with Macao**

To strengthen Hong Kong's status as a regional arbitration centre and to promote arbitration, the Administration proposes that Hong Kong should enter into an arrangement with Macao on reciprocal recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards based on the New York Convention and a similar arrangement concluded with the Mainland in 1999. DoJ  
January 2011

**21. Reciprocal recognition/enforcement of matrimonial judgments with the Mainland**

In view of the significant increase in cross-border marriages, the Administration proposes to enter into formal discussion with the Mainland on a possible arrangement for reciprocal recognition and enforcement of judgment in matrimonial matters. Such an arrangement will help to facilitate resolution of disputes arising from breakdown of cross-border marriages and enable parties on both sides to seek assistance in the enforcement of matrimonial judgments. DoJ  
April 2011