

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)782/10-11
(The minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/BC/5/09

**Bills Committee on Adaptation of Laws
(Military References) Bill 2010**

**Minutes of the second meeting
held on Tuesday, 14 December 2010, at 4:30 pm
in Conference Room B of the Legislative Council Building**

Members present : Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Dr Hon Margaret NG
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon LAU Kong-wah, JP
Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, GBS, JP
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
Hon CHAN Hak-kan
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, BBS
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun

Public Officers attending : Agenda item II
Security Bureau

Ms Carol YIP, JP
Deputy Secretary for Security

Mr David LAU
Principal Assistant Secretary for Security

Department of Justice

Ms Francoise LAM
Senior Government Counsel

Clerk in attendance : Miss Odelia LEUNG
Chief Council Secretary (2)6

Staff in attendance : Mr Jimmy MA
Legal Adviser

Ms Clara TAM
Assistant Legal Adviser 9

Ms Catherina YU
Senior Council Secretary (2)7

Action

I. Confirmation of minutes

[LC Paper No. CB(2)499/10-11]

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 November 2010 were confirmed.

Invitation for views

2. The Chairman sought members' views on whether the Bills Committee should invite the Hong Kong Bar Association and the Law Society of Hong Kong to give views on the Bill. Members agreed that the two legal professional bodies should be invited to attend the next meeting and a notice should be posted onto the Legislative Council ("LegCo") website to invite views from members of the public.

II. Meeting with the Administration

[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)479/09-10(02), CB(2)479/10-11(03) and LS13/10-11]

3. The Bills Committee deliberated (index of proceedings attached at **Annex**).

4. The Chairman drew members' attention to a letter from Dr Margaret NG to the Bills Committee which contained an article entitled "Crown immunity without the Crown" in the November 2010 issue of the Hong Kong Lawyer and a note on discussions in LegCo on Crown immunity. Dr NG's letter was tabled at the meeting.

Action

5. Deputy Secretary for Security ("DS for S") briefed members on the Administration's response to the issues raised at the last meeting as detailed in its paper (LC Paper No. CB(2)479/10-11(02)).

6. At the invitation of the Chairman, Legal Adviser ("LA") took members through the issues relating to the scope of Adaptation of Laws Bills as set out in LC Paper No. LS13/10-11. LA highlighted that while the guiding principles for law adaptation programme as set out in LC Paper No. CB(2)479/10-11(03) provided useful reference for members, each adaptation proposal should still be examined in the context of the ordinances concerned and in the light of the Administration's explanation on the rationale for the proposal.

7. Referring to the note of Dr Margaret NG, LA said that section 66 (1) in the Interpretation and General Clauses (Cap. 1) provided for the saving of rights of Crown before the reunification. "Crown" was adapted to "State" after the handover, and the provision was adapted to read as *"No Ordinance (whether enacted before, on or after 1 July 1997) shall in any manner whatsoever affect the right of or be binding on the State unless it is therein expressly provided or unless it appears by necessary implication that the State is bound thereby."* As the legal and constitutional systems in the United Kingdom were very different from those of the People's Republic of China ("the PRC"), no expression was considered entirely equivalent to "Crown". After discussions, the Administration proposed that "Crown" be adapted to "State", and the definition of "State" had been included in Cap. 1 which included, among others, subordinate organs of the Central Authorities of the Central People Government ("CPG") that exercised executive functions for which the CPG had responsibility under the Basic Law and that did not exercise commercial functions.

8. Dr Margaret NG thanked LA and his team for compiling the very useful paper which highlighted the precedents in dealing with adaptation proposals. In her view, these precedents supplemented the guiding principles and guidelines as set out in LC Paper No. CB(2)479/10-11(03), and the Bills Committee should take note of and make reference to them, where appropriate.

9. Dr Margaret NG then briefed members on her note on discussions on Crown immunity in LegCo. She said that the note aimed at providing the Bills Committee with a fuller picture of the issues involved in Crown immunity and drawing members' attention to the pitfalls to guard against in the scrutiny of the Bill. She highlighted the HUA TIAN LONG (No. 3) case covered in the article entitled "Crown immunity without the Crown". She pointed out that the case touched on the issue of Crown immunity and the judgment had far reaching

Action

implications. The authors of the article considered that the interpretation of the court on Crown immunity in the case was erroneous. They questioned whether it was appropriate to transfer the right to immunity from the Crown to CPG and its instrumentalities after the handover of sovereignty in 1997. One of their key arguments in the article was that Crown immunity originated from the British monarchy system and the status of Hong Kong being a British colony before 1997. However, given the republic system of PRC and the status of Hong Kong as a Special Administrative Region ("SAR") of the PRC, it was highly questionable to simply adapt Crown immunity in Hong Kong laws to State immunity.

10. Dr Margaret NG said that she agreed with the guiding principles for adaptation of laws programme that the provisions when adapted should be consistent with the Basic Law and with Hong Kong's status as a SAR of the PRC. However, she queried whether it was appropriate for each of the adaptation proposals to be adhered to Cap. 1 strictly given that the adaptation of Cap. 1 was in itself imperfect. She considered it inappropriate to perpetuate the imperfection by adding further definition of expressions therein. Dr NG pointed out that unlike the interpretative principles promulgated by the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress which were binding and overriding, Cap. 1 was not conferred with such status. She stressed that in considering the adaptation proposals, members could make reference to but should not be dictated by Cap. 1. Should an anomaly be found in the application of Cap. 1 to a provision to be adapted, members should consider not only amendments to that adaptation proposal but also to the relevant provision in Cap. 1.

11. Dr Priscilla LEUNG pointed out that in addition to Article 22 of the Basic Law, Article 19 of the Basic Law which concerned jurisdiction of the Hong Kong court should also be referred to in the scrutiny of law adaptation proposals. These two articles aside, Articles 13 and 14 in the Law of People's Republic of China on the Garrisoning of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("the Garrison Law") were also important as the relationship between the SAR and the Hong Kong Garrison were covered. She considered it inappropriate to single out a specific article for reference without regard to the spirit of the Garrison Law.

12. The Chairman said that there had been lengthy discussions on the general principles of law adaptation at the last meeting. Members could seek clarification of the interpretation of the provisions in Cap. 1 in the context of examining individual adaptation proposals in the Bill. Mr LAU Kong-wah shared the Chairman's views and opined that section 2A(2)(c) of Cap. 1 and the principle that the adaptation of each provision should be considered in the

Action

context of the ordinance concerned and other related ordinances should serve as the guidelines for discussions. He considered that the Bills Committee could proceed to examination of the adaptation proposals covered in the Bill. He added that the views of academic on certain issues might not be correct.

13. Dr Margaret NG said that to facilitate discussion, the Administration should provide the full text of the Garrison Law and a paper covering the background information of the Hong Kong Garrison such as its number, composition, duration of stay, whether its members had the right of residence in Hong Kong, etc. Similar information on the British forces should also be included in the paper for comparison. Dr NG pointed out that such information was important for the consideration of the adaptations of the provisions concerning exemption from service as jurors in the Jury Ordinance (Cap. 3). She noted that under section 2(4)(a)(viii) of the Immigration Ordinance (Cap. 115), a member of the Hong Kong Garrison should not be treated as an ordinary resident of Hong Kong. Dr NG added that the term "members of the Hong Kong Garrison" appeared in many articles of the Garrison Law but such term was not defined in the Garrison Law. As such, it was necessary for the Administration to provide additional information on the Hong Kong Garrison to facilitate members' scrutiny of the Bill.

14. Ms Cyd HO echoed Dr Margaret NG's view on the need for the Administration to provide to the Bills Committee information on the Hong Kong Garrison vis-à-vis the former British forces stationed in Hong Kong including their status, rights and obligations.

15. Mr James TO also expressed support for the request for the requisite information. He pointed out that notwithstanding the saving provision of section 2(1) of Cap. 1 which read that "*Save where the contrary intention appears either from this Ordinance or from the context of any other Ordinance or instrument, the provisions of this Ordinance shall apply to this Ordinance and to any other Ordinances in force, whether such other Ordinance came or comes into operation before or after the commencement of this Ordinance, and to any instrument made or issued under or by virtue of any such Ordinance*", the proposed addition of the definition of the four terms in Cap. 1 would impact not only on the 88 Ordinances covered in the Bill but also on other ordinances which contained such terms. It was therefore necessary for the Administration to advise the Bills Committee of the number of the ordinances involved which might be enormous. He reiterated his call on the Administration to consider deleting the proposal to add those four terms in Cap. 1.

Action

16. DS for S said that the provisions in the Garrison Law which were relevant to the present adaptation exercise had been included in the Administration's paper. Nevertheless, she would provide members with the full text of the Garrison Law and general information relating to the Hong Kong Garrison as requested. DS for S added that the Administration might have difficulties in retrieving information on the former British forces stationed in Hong Kong but would provide any available information as far as possible.

17. Noting certain members' views, the Chairman requested the Administration to actively consider whether the proposed definition of the four terms should be added in Cap. 1. He suggested proceeding with the examination of the adaptation proposals in the Bill.

18. Mr James TO considered it important for members to have background information on the former British forces stationed in Hong Kong and the Hong Kong Garrison first in order to make sure that the proposed adaptations were appropriate. Dr Margaret NG said that Her Majesty's Forces pledged allegiance to Her Majesty and not to the British Government. For the purpose of considering how Her Majesty's Forces should be adapted, the Administration should provide information to whom the Chinese People's Liberation Army ("CPLA") should pledge allegiance and on the constitutional status of Her Majesty's Forces and the CPLA.

19. Mr James TO and Ms Cyd HO echoed Dr Margaret NG's view. Ms Cyd HO suggested going through the provisions relating to the role, rights and obligations of the Hong Kong Garrison as listed in Annex B to the Administration paper (LC Paper No. CB(2)479/10-11(02)) first before proceeding to the examination of the adaptation proposals. Mr James TO supplemented that it was essential for members to understand the roles and scope of power of both Her Majesty's Forces and the CPLA.

20. Mr LAU Kong-wah said that the Bills Committee should focus its discussion on the adaptation proposals and should not go into the details of the Garrison Law. Otherwise, it would misplace its focus. Instead of looking into the Garrison Law per se, he suggested that members should consider, where necessary, the relevant articles in the context of examining the adaptation proposals.

21. Mr Paul TSE shared Mr LAU Kong-wah's views. Mr TSE opined that since not all the articles of the Garrison Law would be relevant to the adaptation proposals, it was unnecessary for members to study each and every article of the Garrison Law before considering the adaptation proposals. In his

Action

view, it would be more pragmatic and efficient for members to make reference to the articles relevant to the proposed adaptations in the scrutiny process.

22. Mr James TO said that while he agreed that the Bills Committee should not examine the articles in the Garrison Law per se, the relevant articles and the background information on the Hong Kong Garrison would be useful reference during consideration of the proposed adaptations. To illustrate his viewpoint, Mr TO elaborated that Hong Kong Garrison meant the Hong Kong Garrison of CPLA as stipulated in Article 2 of the Garrison Law. However, as Article 2 provided no further details on the structure of the Hong Kong Garrison, it would be difficult to ascertain if certain expressions in the existing ordinances should be adapted to the Hong Kong Garrison. The Administration should therefore provide information on the Hong Kong Garrison which was relevant to the adaptation proposals.

23. Dr Margaret NG disagreed with Mr Paul TSE's view. She stressed that the enactment of laws must be based on solid information and not ignorance. Factual information on the former British Forces stationed in Hong Kong and Her Majesty Forces as against the Hong Kong Garrison and CPLA were necessary for members' consideration of the adaptation proposals. She had persuaded the Administration not to resort to the law adaptation approach to amend the existing ordinances to make them consistent with the Basic Law and Hong Kong's status as SAR of the PRC but to no avail. However, as the Administration refused to amend the ordinances by way of amendment Bills and had insisted on taking the law adaptation approach, factual information on the Hong Kong Garrison and CPLA would thus be required to facilitate the examination of the proposed adaptations. She reiterated that she did not intend to study the Garrison Law in detail, and information concerning the framework of the Hong Kong Garrison would be sufficient.

24. The Chairman said that members agreed in general on the need for some basic and factual information on the Hong Kong Garrison and CPLA and that it was not necessary for the Bills Committee to go into details of their structure or the Garrison Law for the purpose of scrutiny of the adaptation proposals. Where necessary, members could seek specific information in the context of examining the adaptation proposals in individual Ordinances.

25. Mr Paul TSE clarified that there should be no misunderstanding that he was perfunctory in the scrutiny of legislative proposals. He only queried the need to compare Her Majesty's Forces/former British Forces stationed in Hong Kong with the Hong Kong Garrison in order to assess whether a certain adaptation proposal was appropriate. Mr TSE further said that as far as he understood, law adaptation was not a generic legal term. He enquired about

Action

the criteria for law adaptation and whether all the criteria had to be fulfilled in order to be classified as law adaptation.

26. In response, LA said that law adaptation was not a technical legal term. In 1998, the Administration commenced the Adaptation of Laws Programme to amend the references in laws which were inconsistent with the Basic Law or with the status of Hong Kong as a SAR of the PRC so that the laws which were in force in Hong Kong before 1997 would continue to be in force after the Handover in accordance with Articles 8 and 160 of the Basic Law as decided by the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress in 1997. At the request of the Bills Committee on Adaptation of Laws Bill 1998 which was the first Bills Committee formed to study an Adaptation of Laws Bill, the Administration had provided a paper setting out the guiding principles to be applied in the adaptation exercise. The paper was re-circulated to the Bills Committee vide LC Paper No. CB(2)479/10-11(03).

27. LA added that the adaptation of laws bill should follow the enactment procedures as in the case of other bills. As provided in section 2A(2)(c) of Cap.1, provisions relating to the rights, exemptions and obligations of the military forces stationed in Hong Kong by the United Kingdom shall, subject to the provisions of the Basic Law and the Garrison Law, continue to have effect and apply to the military forces stationed in Hong Kong SAR by the CPG of the PRC. On this premise, some members considered it necessary to understand the Garrison Law with a view to ensuring the adherence of the adaptation proposals to the principles set out in section 2A(2)(c) of Cap. 1.

28. Mr Paul TSE acknowledged the merits of consistency in laws before and after adaptation. He enquired whether the expressions before and after adaptation had to be strictly equivalent and whether the adapted provision would become null and void should this stringent criterion not be adhered to. He also enquired if there was any room to amend the guiding principles for law adaptation.

29. LA responded that there should be no question on the validity of the laws so long as the enactment procedures were proper and they did not contravene the Basic Law. From the constitutional angle, the Administration, being the proposer of the Bill, had clearly stated in the long title of the Bill and the relevant information that the policy intent was law adaptation. It was therefore legitimate for the Legislature to expect the Administration to adhere to the stated policy intent as far as the content of the Bill was concerned.

30. DS for S pointed out that there had not been any contravention of the policy intent in past adaptation of laws exercises. The fundamental principle

Action

of law adaptations was that they should not contravene the Basic Law and the status of Hong Kong as a SAR of the PRC. Adaptation of laws should be considered in the context of the ordinances concerned and the legal effect of the ordinances concerned should not be changed after adaptation. She added that as in the past, the Administration would be open-minded in considering members' views should members consider that any proposed adaptations might alter the legal effect of the provisions concerned.

31. Dr Margaret NG said that since the First Legislative Council, 56 adaptation of laws bills had already been introduced. Precedents and the guiding principles would facilitate members in the scrutiny of the Bill. As the Bill concerned law adaptation proposals, there should be no change in legal effect or change in policy after the adaptations.

32. Ms Cyd HO was concerned about the relationship of Article 8 of the Garrison Law with the laws of Hong Kong. She requested the Administration to provide information in this regard in the paper to be provided to members for the next meeting.

33. The Chairman was of the view that members should focus on the adaptation proposals and seek clarification of certain articles of the Garrison Law in the context. He considered it inappropriate to single out a particular article of the Garrison Law for independent study.

34. Summarizing the discussions, the Chairman said that members requested the Administration to provide background information on the Hong Kong Garrison, CPLA and the British forces. Members could request additional information in relation to a specific adaptation proposal in the course of discussion. The Bills Committee would start to consider the adaptation proposals in the Bill after receiving the requisite information. Members agreed.

35. Ms Cyd HO suggested that the authors of the article entitled "Crown immunity without the Crown" should be invited to the next meeting. The Chairman said that as a notice would be posted onto the LegCo website to invite views on the Bill, any parties who were interested in presenting views to the Bills Committee could approach the Secretariat.

36. DS for S said that she noted members' concerns about the Crown Proceedings Ordinance (Cap. 300). The issues involved were complicated and the adaptation of that Ordinance might involve law reform. The relevant policy bureau and department were examining the matter.

Action

37. Dr Margaret NG said that Cap. 300 provided for immunity for the Crown but not its agent. She hoped that LA would draw to the attention of the Bills Committee if its discussion went beyond the scope of law adaptation at future meetings.

III. Any other business

Date of next meeting

38. Members agreed to hold the next meeting on 18 January 2011 at 4:30 pm.

39. The meeting ended at 6:30 pm.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
11 January 2010

**Proceedings of the second meeting of the
Bills Committee on Adaptation of Laws (Military References) Bill 2010
on Tuesday, 14 December 2010, at 4:30 pm
in Conference Room B of the Legislative Council Building**

Time marker	Speaker	Subject	Action required
000010 - 000529	Chairman	<p>The Chairman sought members' views on the need to invite views on the Bill from the Hong Kong Bar Association, the Law Society of Hong Kong and members of the public.</p> <p>The Chairman drew members' attention to a letter from Dr Margaret NG which contained an article entitled "Crown immunity without the Crown" in the November 2010 issue of the Hong Kong Lawyer and a note on discussions in LegCo on Crown immunity.</p>	
000530 - 001247	Admin	The Administration's response on the issues raised at the last meeting.	
001248 - 004420	LA	Briefing by LA on the issues relating to the scope of Adaptation of Laws Bills.	
004421 - 005516	Dr Margaret NG	<p>Briefing by Dr Margaret NG on the note and the article entitled "Crown immunity without the Crown".</p> <p>Dr Margaret NG queried whether it was appropriate for each of the adaptation proposals to be adhered to Cap. 1 strictly given that the adaptation of Cap. 1 was in itself imperfect. She considered it inappropriate to perpetuate the imperfection by adding further definition of expressions therein. Unlike the interpretative principles promulgated by the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress which were binding and overriding, Cap. 1 was not conferred with such status. In considering the adaptation proposals, members could make reference to but should not be dictated by Cap. 1.</p>	
005517 - 010013	Dr Priscilla LEUNG The Chairman Mr LAU Kong-wah	Dr Priscilla LEUNG's view that in addition to Article 22 of the Basic Law, Article 19 of the Basic Law which concerned jurisdiction of the Hong Kong court should also be referred to. Articles 13 and 14 in the Law of People's Republic of China on the Garrisoning of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("the Garrison Law") were also important as the relationship between the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Hong Kong Garrison were covered.	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject	Action required
		<p>The Chairman and Mr LAU Kong-wah's view that members could seek clarification of the interpretation of the provisions in Cap. 1 in the context of examining individual adaptation proposals in the Bill. Their suggestion to commence the examination of the adaptation provisions in the Bill.</p>	
010014 - 011359	Dr Margaret NG Ms Cyd HO Mr James TO	<p>Dr Margaret NG, Ms Cyd HO and Mr James TO's request for the full version of the Garrison Law and the background information on the Hong Kong Garrison and Her Majesty's Forces.</p> <p>Dr Margaret NG, Ms Cyd HO and Mr James TO's explanation of the reasons why a certain level of understanding of the Garrison Law and the Hong Kong Garrison was necessary for the scrutiny of law adaptation proposals.</p> <p>Mr James TO's concern that there might be a large number of Ordinances containing the four terms to be proposed to be added to Cap. 1 and the implication. He requested the Administration to reconsider deleting the proposed addition of the four terms in Cap. 1.</p>	Admin
011400 - 011653	Admin Chairman	<p>DS for S's response to members' request for information on the Garrison Law and the background information on the Hong Kong Garrison and Her Majesty's Forces.</p> <p>The Chairman's request for the Administration to actively consider certain members' views.</p>	
010654 - 012754	Dr Margaret NG Ms Cyd HO Mr James TO	<p>Dr Margaret NG's view on the need to compare the constitutional status of Her Majesty's Forces and that of the Chinese People's Liberation Army ("CPLA") and request for information in this regard.</p> <p>Ms Cyd HO's suggestion on going through the provisions relating to the role, rights and obligations of the Hong Kong Garrison as listed in Annex B to the Administration paper (LC Paper No. CB(2)479/10-11(02)) first before proceeding to the discussion of the adaptation proposals.</p> <p>Mr James TO's view on the need to understand the roles and scope of power of both Her Majesty's Forces and CPLA.</p>	Admin
012755 - 013035	Mr LAU Kong-wah Mr Paul TSE	<p>Mr LAU Kong-wah's views that the Bills Committee should focus its discussion on the law adaptation proposals and not the Garrison Law.</p> <p>Mr LAU Kong-wah's suggestion that the relevant articles in the Garrison Law could be explained in the context of examining the relevant adaptation proposals.</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject	Action required
		<p>Mr Paul TSE supported Mr LAU Kong-wah's suggestion and opined that it would be more pragmatic and efficient for members to refer only to the articles which were relevant to the proposed adaptations.</p>	
013036 – 014112	Mr James TO Dr Margaret NG	<p>Mr James TO's comment that the relevant articles in the Garrison Law should be looked at in conjunction with the justifications of the relevant proposed adaptations. His elaboration that Hong Kong Garrison meant the Hong Kong Garrison of CPLA as stipulated in Article 2 of the Garrison Law. However, as Article 2 provided no further details on the structure of the Hong Kong Garrison, it would be difficult to ascertain if certain expressions in the existing ordinances should be adapted to the Hong Kong Garrison. The Administration should therefore provide information on the Hong Kong Garrison which was relevant to the adaptation proposals.</p> <p>Dr Margaret NG's comment that information covering the framework of the Hong Kong Garrison would be sufficient to kick off the deliberation.</p>	Admin
014113 - 014909	Mr Paul TSE LA	<p>Mr Paul TSE's enquiry about the criteria for law adaptation and whether all the criteria had to be fulfilled in order to be classified as law adaptation.</p> <p>LA's explanation on the background for setting out the guiding principles to be applied for the adaptation exercise and the reasons why members considered it necessary to understand the Garrison Law in the context.</p> <p>Mr Paul TSE's enquiry about whether the expressions before and after adaptation had to be strictly equivalent and whether the relevant adapted provision would become null and void should this stringent criterion not be adhered to. He also enquired if there was any room to amend the guiding principles for law adaptation.</p> <p>LA's response that there should be no question on the validity of the laws so long as the enactment procedures were proper and they did not contravene the Basic Law. From the constitutional angle, the Administration, being the proposer of the Bill, had clearly stated in the long title of the Bill and the relevant information that the policy intent was law adaptation. It was therefore legitimate for the Legislature to expect the Administration to adhere to the stated policy intent as far as the content of the Bill was concerned.</p>	
014910 - 015601	Admin Dr Margaret NG Ms Cyd HO	<p>DS for S's view that there had not been any contravention of the policy intent in past adaptation of laws exercises.</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject	Action required
		<p>DS for S's explanation on the fundamental principles of law adaptations and the adaptation of laws should be considered in the context of the ordinances concerned.</p> <p>DS for S's remarks that the Administration would be open-minded in considering members' views should members consider that any proposed adaptations might alter the legal effect of the provisions concerned.</p> <p>Dr Margaret NG's comment that as the Bill concerned law adaptation proposals, there should be no change in legal effect or change in policy after the adaptations.</p> <p>Ms Cyd HO's concern about the relationship of Article 8 of the Garrison Law with the laws of Hong Kong. She requested the Administration to provide information in this regard in the paper to be provided to members for the next meeting.</p>	Admin
015602 - 015645	Chairman	<p>The Chairman's view that members should focus on the adaptation proposals and seek clarification of certain articles of the Garrison Law in the context. He considered it inappropriate to single out a particular article of the Garrison Law for independent study.</p> <p>The Chairman's conclusion that members requested the Administration to provide background information on the Hong Kong Garrison, CPLA and the British forces. Members could request for additional information in relation to a specific adaptation proposal in the course of discussion. The Bills Committee would start to consider the adaptation proposals in the Bill after receiving the requisite information.</p>	
015646 - 020224	Dr Margaret NG Ms Cyd HO Admin Chairman	<p>DS for S's comments that she noted members' concerns about the Crown Proceedings Ordinance (Cap. 300). The issues involved were complicated and the adaptation of that Ordinance might involve law reform. The relevant policy bureau and department were examining the matter.</p> <p>Dr Margaret NG's remarks that Cap. 300 provided for immunity for the Crown but not its agent. She hoped that LA would draw to the attention of the Bills Committee if its discussion went beyond the scope of law adaptation at future meetings.</p> <p>Date of next meeting.</p>	