

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

Ref : CB2/PL/CA

LC Paper No. CB(2)981/13-14  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

**Panel on Constitutional Affairs**

**Minutes of meeting**  
**held on Monday, 16 December 2013, at 2:30 pm**  
**in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present** : Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP (Chairman)  
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan  
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan  
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP  
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP  
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP  
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, SBS, JP  
Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC  
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan  
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, JP  
Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai, SBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP  
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, BBS  
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yeet, GBS, JP  
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC  
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung  
Hon WONG Yuk-man  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP  
Hon NG Leung-sing, SBS, JP  
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin  
Hon YIU Si-wing  
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai  
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP  
Hon Charles Peter MOK  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok

Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, JP  
Hon Dennis KWOK  
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, JP  
Hon SIN Chung-kai, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Hon IP Kin-yuen  
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, JP  
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP  
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan  
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen

**Member attending** : Hon Claudia MO

**Members absent** : Dr Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP

**Public Officers attending** : Item III

Mr LAU Kong-wah  
Under Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs

Mr Gordon LEUNG Chung-tai  
Deputy Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs

Mrs Philomena LEUNG  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs

Centre for Comparative and Public Law, University of Hong Kong  
Professor Simon N M YOUNG

Item IV

Mr LAU Kong-wah  
Under Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs

Mr CHEUNG Doi-ching  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs

Mrs Millie NG KIANG Mei-nei  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Security

Mr Stephen SUI Wai-keung  
Commissioner for Rehabilitation  
Labour and Welfare Bureau

Mr Godfrey KAN Ka-fai  
Senior Assistant Solicitor General  
Department of Justice

Mr Michael YAU Lok-fung  
Assistant Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs

**Attendance by : Item IV  
invitation**

Civic Party

Mr Alvin YEUNG  
Executive Committee Member

Democratic Party

Mr OR Yiu-lam  
Member, Central Committee

Nu Tong Xue She

Mr CHUNG Chi-ho  
Officer

**Clerk in : Ms Joanne MAK  
attendance Chief Council Secretary (2) 3**

**Staff in : Mr Kelvin LEE  
attendance Assistant Legal Adviser 1**

Miss Cindy HO  
Senior Council Secretary (2) 3

Ms Wendy LO  
Council Secretary (2) 3

Mrs Fanny TSANG  
Legislative Assistant (2) 3

---

Action

**I. Information papers issued since the last meeting**

Members noted that no information paper had been issued since the last meeting.

**II. Items for discussion at the next meeting**

[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)471/13-14(01) and (02)]

2. Members agreed to discuss the following items proposed by the Administration at the next meeting on 20 January 2014 -

(a) briefing on the Chief Executive ("CE")'s 2014 Policy Address; and

(b) online system for checking voter registration particulars.

**III. Overseas experience in implementing anti-stalking legislation**

[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)471/13-14(03) and (04)]

3. Under Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs ("USCMA") said that the Administration had commissioned the Centre for Comparative and Public Law of the University of Hong Kong ("the Consultant") to conduct a study on the operation of anti-stalking legislation in six selected overseas jurisdictions. Professor Simon N M YOUNG of the Centre briefed members on the key findings and the recommendations as set out in paragraphs 5 to 25 of the Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(2)471/13-14(03)].

4. Members noted the updated background brief prepared by the Legislative Council ("LegCo") Secretariat [LC Paper No. CB(2)471/13-14(04)] as well as the submissions provided by the Hong Kong Journalists Association and the former Chairman of the Law Reform Commission ("LRC") Sub-committee on Privacy respectively [LC Paper No. CB(2)542/13-14(01) - (02)].

Discussion

5. Ms Claudia MO said that she did not accept the recommendations by the Consultant. She considered that anti-stalking legislation, if enacted,

Action

would certainly impact adversely on news-gathering activities and expressive activities related to public affairs. She considered it inappropriate to compare Hong Kong with the selected jurisdictions as Hong Kong did not enjoy genuine democracy and had no legislation to protect freedom of information like those jurisdictions. She also highlighted the Hong Kong Journalists Association's view as stated in its submission that there was no urgency in enacting anti-stalking legislation. She proposed that the Administration should, instead, consider amending the Money Lenders Ordinance (Cap. 163), the Domestic and Cohabitation Relationships Violence Ordinance (Cap. 189) and the Landlord and Tenant (Consolidation) Ordinance (Cap. 7) to deal with specific problems such as stalking behaviour relating to domestic violence and debt collection. Referring to the Consultant's recommendations on exemptions, Ms MO queried how Internet news media would be defined and whether it would be covered by the proposed exemptions. Noting the Consultant's view that the legal interpretation of "exemption" was the same as defence in criminal law as stated in footnote 16 of the Administration's paper, Ms MO considered that reporters and press organizations concerned alleged to have committed the stalking offence would still have to go to the court to defend and would face undue pressure. She asked how the Administration would take forward its proposal on stalking.

6. USCMA advised that the Administration would make reference to relevant overseas experience and have regard to the actual situation of Hong Kong in deciding on the way forward. He stressed that the Administration at this juncture had no preconceived view and would take into full consideration members' views.

7. Referring to paragraph 24 and footnote 16 of the Administration's paper, Mr Alan LEONG sought clarification on the proposed exemption for news gathering activities and whether it was the same as "defence" in criminal law.

8. Professor Simon N M YOUNG said that the Consultant had recommended using the term "exemption" because it served to exempt a category of conduct that was defined clearly and broadly. The Consultant had recommended that this should be a defence that imposed only an evidential burden, not a legal burden of proof on the defendant. He further explained that under the proposal, whether a charge should be brought against a reporter would depend on the test of whether there was reasonable ground to suspect that the elements of the offence including the exemptions were engaged. If there were reasonable grounds to suspect that any of the exemptions were engaged, then the Police could not lawfully arrest the person.

Action

9. Mr Paul TSE asked whether the Administration would consider defining what conducts would specifically be exempted under the anti-stalking legislation if it was to be introduced to enhance clarity of the coverage of the legislation. Professor Simon N M YOUNG said that there was detailed explanation on the scope of the proposed exemptions in the full report of the study for members' reference.

10. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan said that some employers of overseas domestic helpers had complained about nuisances caused by offensive phone calls from debt collectors because their domestic helpers had failed to repay debts. She asked whether employers would be afforded protection in the circumstances if anti-stalking legislation was enacted. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan, however, considered that the issue could be addressed by amending the Money Lenders Ordinance (Cap. 163) to deal with stalking problems relating to debt collection. Mr LEE and Mr SIN Chung-kai both considered that anti-stalking legislation, if enacted, would have the effect of hampering journalist activities and protest activities.

11. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan asked whether protestors would be charged of stalking for chasing CE or senior officials during their community visits to hand in a petitioner's letter after the legislation was enacted. USCMA advised that members' concerns on anti-stalking legislation would be fully taken into account in mapping out the way forward. As to the suggestion of amending existing relevant legislation to address specific types of stalking behaviour, USCMA said that there were views that to legislate against stalking in a specific context would not address entirely the problem and certain stalking behaviour could not be dealt with under such an approach.

12. Mr IP Kwok-him said that the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong considered that the enactment of anti-stalking legislation was necessary to respond to the calls in the community for better protection of victims of stalking. Noting the concerns of the media sector on the impact of the legislation on press freedom, Mr IP asked how the Administration would strike a balance between affording protection to victims of stalking and ensuring that legitimate news-gathering activities would not be adversely affected. USCMA advised that the Administration was fully aware of the concerns over press freedom and freedom of expression/demonstration, and it would handle the relevant proposals with care. He assured members that the Administration would carefully consider the views of all relevant stakeholders in deciding on the way forward.

Action

13. Referring to paragraph 21 of the Administration's paper on the proposed four categories of prohibited acts, Mr SIN Chung-kai opined that the acts in categories (b) and (c) (i.e. contacting a person, e.g. by telephone, mail, fax, electronic mail; and sending letters and electronic mail to a person) seemed not serious enough to constitute stalking. Given that such acts (except sending letters) were already regulated by the Unsolicited Electronic Messages Ordinance (Cap 593), Mr SIN queried the need to regulate them by enacting anti-stalking legislation. He also queried whether regularly sending emails to the electorate to maintain contacts would fall within the categories of (b) and (c).

14. Professor Simon N M YOUNG explained that it was proposed that the new offence of stalking should be based on the criminalization of a course of conduct consisting of at least two of the prohibited acts (either the same or different acts) which caused a person reasonably, in all circumstances, to fear for his safety or the safety of anyone known to him. He added that the new offence also required the mental element of "intending" to cause a person fear for safety or "being reckless" as to whether his conduct might cause such fear.

15. Mr Albert HO requested the Administration to give an account of the acts that the Administration intended to combat by introducing anti-stalking legislation. USCMA advised that in the absence of anti-stalking legislation, there were no statistics on stalking. He explained that in response to public concerns on stalking behaviour, such as harassment by ex-spouses, debt collectors and infringement of privacy by the media, LRC had recommended in 2000 that anti-stalking legislation should be introduced to criminalize stalking behaviour. Mr Albert HO said that given that existing laws were able to tackle some of the acts mentioned by USCMA, and that exemptions were also proposed to be granted under the legislation for news gathering activities, he did not see the need for introducing anti-stalking legislation. USCMA advised that there were views that none of the existing ordinances could provide comprehensive protection to victims of stalking and therefore calls for the enactment of anti-stalking legislation.

16. Referring to paragraph 25 of the Administration's paper, Mr Martin LIAO asked about the justifications of the proposal that specific exemptions should be provided for news and protest activities and activities carried out in the normal course of lawful employment. He requested the Consultant to explain how its proposals could strike for a balance. Considering that the Consultant's proposals seemed to differ quite significantly from those of LRC,

Action

Mr LIAO sought the Consultant's opinions on what problems had come up in the course of LRC's study. Referring to the Consultant's proposal on exemptions, Mr LIAO also asked whether the Consultant would provide a definition for "media organization" and whether it would cover Internet news media.

17. Professor Simon N M YOUNG advised that the "media organization" in paragraph 24(b) of the Administration's paper should be an established media organization. He explained that the Consultant's proposals were not inconsistent with the recommendations made by LRC but were built on those recommendations. He explained that in the study on the operation of anti-stalking legislation in the United Kingdom ("UK") on which the LRC's recommendations were modeled, judicial decisions showed that the UK legislation had interfered with the freedom of expression by the use of injunction to prohibit protest activities. Having examined the experience of other overseas jurisdictions, the Consultant proposed to include a clear and narrow definition of stalking activities in the form of an exhaustive list of acts done in relation to other person to enhance legal certainty; adopt a subjective mental element for stalking offences (i.e. an intention of causing a person fear for safety or the safety of anyone known to him, or while reckless as to whether his conduct might cause such fear for safety. Furthermore, recklessness should be understood as either (i) an awareness of an unreasonable risk of causing fear for safety, or (ii) not caring about the risk of causing fear for safety); and provide exemptions in the proposed anti-stalking legislation to allay concerns of the media.

18. Mr Michael TIEN expressed support for enacting anti-stalking legislation which in his view was needed to tackle certain stalking behaviour. He asked how the Administration could prevent abuses of the proposed exemptions for news activities, and whether a reporter working for an established media organization would be given blanket exemption from the stalking offence, even though the reporter did engage in stalking activities in the course of gathering news which actually did not carry much public interest.

19. USCMA replied that details of the legislative provisions would need to be further worked out if the Government decided to introduce anti-stalking legislation. Professor Simon N M YOUNG said that news gathering activities were legitimate and the threshold for prosecuting reporters therefore should be higher. Unless they had breached existing laws, e.g. having committed the use of violence, the threat of violence, or resorted to intimidation or other unlawful means, they should be exempted.



Action

20. Ms Starry LEE also expressed concern about whether there might be stalking in the guise of news gathering which would be granted exemption under the current proposal. She asked why it was proposed that "at least two of the acts" in paragraph 21(a) to (d) would be required to constitute the offence of stalking. She considered that the prohibited acts in paragraph 21(a) were not clear and questioned whether the duration of those acts (e.g. one week) would also need to be specified.

21. Professor Simon N M YOUNG explained that as set out in paragraph 1179 of the report, the Consultant recommended that there must be at least two occasions of prohibited conduct to constitute a "course of conduct". This approach was adopted in Canada, New Zealand and California and also followed the LRC's position in that the element of persistence be included in the *actus reus*. Although a timeframe was not specified for the prohibited acts, the offence would require such acts be persistently done to the extent of causing a person to "fear for his safety". USCMA supplemented that the Consultant recommended that a "course of conduct" should consist of at least two acts (either the same or different acts) in the list (in paragraph 21 of the Administration's paper) which caused a person to fear for his safety or the safety of anyone known to him. He explained that a person who engaged in, say, any of the acts in category (a) twice, or any of the acts in category (a) once plus any of the acts in category (b) once, would be caught by the offence of stalking.

22. As regards concern about if there might be stalking in the guise of news gathering, Professor Simon N M YOUNG said that the exemption in paragraph 24(b) only exempted news gathering activities conducted pursuant to a contractual arrangement with an established media organization. There was a presumption that the people contracted to work for these established media organizations would act for the legitimate purpose of journalistic activities. As to the exemption in paragraph 24(d), it was specified that the activities had to be "carried out for the sole purpose of discussing or communicating matters that concern public affairs". He reiterated that should there be use of violence, the threat of violence, or intimidation or other unlawful means involved in the course of the activities, it would be dealt with in accordance with the existing laws.

23. Mr CHAN Kin-por expressed support for the early enactment of anti-stalking legislation having considered that the study report had specified the coverage of the offence of stalking and proposed specific exemptions for news-gathering activities to safeguard press freedom.

Action

24. Ms Cyd HO said that she did not support enacting anti-stalking legislation given the inadequate safeguards in Hong Kong to press freedom and freedom of expression and CE's disrespect for such freedoms as revealed in some of his acts. She pointed out that many women's groups also considered that anti-stalking legislation might have adverse impacts on press freedom, and they had suggested that the Administration might consider amending the Domestic and Cohabitation Relationships Violence Ordinance (Cap. 189) to prohibit stalking behaviour by ex-spouses or cohabitants. Dr Helena WONG asked why the Administration did not consider introducing separate legislative measures to deal with specific problems, such as stalking behaviour relating to domestic violence and debt collection.

25. USCMA replied that the Administration recognized the public concerns over the impact of anti-stalking legislation on press freedom and freedom of expression. He noted members' views that while one of the options was to enact a single piece of anti-stalking legislation, the other approach was to amend existing laws to target only stalking in the context of certain kinds of relationship. The Administration, however, considered that to legislate against stalking in a specific context would not address entirely the problems because many stalkers bore no relation to the victims and such cases could not be tackled under existing ordinances. He pointed out that all the jurisdictions studied (except South Africa), in fact, had criminal and civil laws against stalking, whereas the South African legislation only provided a civil remedy.

26. In response to the view that Hong Kong did not enjoy genuine democracy and had no legislation to protect freedom of information, Mr Paul TSE pointed out that freedom of the press, of expression and of demonstration was well safeguarded under Article 27 of the Basic Law. Noting the recommendation (in paragraph 52 of the executive summary) that more research of the problem of stalking in Hong Kong should be promoted to enhance evidence-based policy making in this area, Mr TSE asked whether the Consultant also considered that it was not the suitable time to enact anti-stalking legislation in Hong Kong. Professor Simon N M YOUNG explained that while some overseas jurisdictions had conducted systematic surveys on the issue of stalking, evidence of the phenomenon of stalking in Hong Kong was mostly anecdotal. Hence, the Consultant had come up with that recommendation.

27. Mr Paul TSE asked why only certain states in the United States ("US") and Australia (i.e. Nevada, California, Queensland and Victoria) were covered

Action

in the study, but not other places (e.g. New York/Boston in US and New South Wales in Australia) that were known to be more liberal in law reform. Professor Simon N M YOUNG explained that as it was not practical to cover all the states in US and Australia, the Consultant had chosen to study the four states that had provided specific defences/exemptions for news gathering activities in the relevant legislation.

28. Mr MA Fung-kwok said that the movie sector welcomed enacting anti-stalking legislation to protect artistes from stalking. He asked whether consideration could be given to a suggestion that a person would be regarded to have committed the stalking offence if he continued to harass the victim after the latter had expressly requested him to stop. He also asked whether it was possible for the Administration to provide guidelines to help differentiate between news reporting activities and stalking behaviour. USCMA replied that the continuous harassment or stalking behavior could not be effectively deterred in the absence of anti-stalking legislation to provide for the new stalking offence.

**IV. The second review of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("HKSAR") by the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review of the United Nations ("UN") Human Rights Council**  
[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)471/13-14(05) and (06)]

29. Members noted the updated background brief prepared by the LegCo Secretariat [LC Paper No. CB(2)471/13-14(06)].

Presentation of views by deputations/individuals

*Democratic Party*

[LC Paper No. CB(2)542/13-14(04)]

30. Mr OR Yiu-lam presented the views of the Democratic Party as detailed in its submission. On constitutional development, he considered that Mr LI Fei's recent visit to Hong Kong, prior to the launching of the public consultation exercise, was to lay down the framework or precondition for the model of constitutional reform, with the adoption of a screening mechanism to prevent contenders with views different from the Government from running for CE candidacy. Mr OR requested the Government to be more open to different views. Furthermore, he considered that District Councils ("DCs") should be delegated with substantive power and that the size of DC constituencies should be enlarged so that DC members would be answerable to electors of larger constituencies.

Action

*Civic Party*

[LC Paper No. CB(2)542/13-14(03)]

31. Mr Alvin YEUNG took the view that in formulating the method for selecting CE in 2017, Hong Kong should make reference to Article 25 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights ("ICCPR"), which provided that every citizen would have the right and the opportunity to vote and to be elected at genuine periodic elections which would have to be by universal and equal suffrage. He objected to the adoption of any screening mechanism and considered that the requirement that CE had to be one who "loves the country and Hong Kong" clearly contravened Article 25 of ICCPR.

*Nu Tong Xue She*

32. Mr CHUNG Chi-ho expressed concerns about the protection of the rights of the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender ("LGBT") groups. He said that the UN Human Rights Committee ("HRC") had repeatedly urged the HKSAR Government to eliminate discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity by enacting legislation. The public education and publicity measures taken by the Administration so far could not resolve the discrimination problems faced by LGBT groups. He pointed out that the public opinion poll conducted in October 2013 had indicated that 65.8% of the respondents supported introducing such legislation. He called on the Administration to enact legislation to protect people of different sexual orientations against discrimination.

33. Members noted that two submissions were provided by organizations/individuals not attending the meeting [LC Paper Nos. CB(2)542/13-14(05) - (06)].

Discussion

*Selection of CE by universal suffrage in 2017*

34. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung said that the ultimate aim of the selection of CE by universal suffrage was to return the power to the people. As such, he considered that the implementation of universal suffrage in Hong Kong should conform with the principles of universal and equal suffrage stipulated in Article 25 of ICCPR, and that every citizen should have the right and opportunity to vote and to be elected at genuine periodic elections.

Action

Mr LEE Cheuk-yan pointed out that the application of ICCPR to Hong Kong was guaranteed under Article 39 of the Basic Law. In his view, the restrictions imposed by the Decision of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress ("NPCSC's Decision") in 2007 on the composition of the nomination committee and the nomination of candidates for the selection of CE in 2017 were in contravention of Article 25 of ICCPR. He considered that the HKSAR Government had an international obligation to ensure that the implementation of universal suffrage in Hong Kong conformed with the principles of universal and equal suffrage stipulated in Article 25 of ICCPR. He asked how the Administration would explain to the relevant UN committee for the HKSAR Government's failure to fulfill its international obligation in this regard.

35. USCMA advised that the design and establishment of any political structure had to have regard to the historical background and local characteristics of the relevant place. Therefore, in taking forward the constitutional development of Hong Kong towards the ultimate aim of universal suffrage, it was necessary to comprehend the legal framework based on the Basic Law and the relevant Interpretation and Decisions of NPCSC. He stressed that the Administration would carefully listen to the different views received during the current public consultation exercise. In response to Mr LEE's further enquiry, USCMA advised that it was most important that the relevant election would not be subject to unreasonable restrictions and the Administration would strictly observe this principle in the implementation of universal suffrage in Hong Kong.

36. Mr Albert HO considered that should there be unreasonable restrictions imposed on the selection of CE in 2017, criticism would be drawn at the international level. He also noted that there were concerns in the community that the CE election in 2017 might not be the ultimate model for implementing universal suffrage. USCMA said that the Administration would strive to attain the ultimate aim of selecting CE by universal suffrage in 2017.

*Promoting equal opportunities for persons of different sexual orientations*

37. Referring to paragraph 19 of the HKSAR's Report (Annex A to the Administration's paper), Ms Cyd HO enquired about the measures to be taken by the Administration with a view to fostering in the community a culture of mutual understanding, tolerance and respect. She considered that the Administration should not postpone public consultation on prohibiting discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation by legislation, highlighting that a survey commissioned by her in November 2012 had indicated that

Action

two-third of the respondents supported enacting such legislation. Regarding the Advisory Group on Eliminating Discrimination against Sexual Minorities ("Advisory Group") established in June 2013, Ms HO said that she was not optimistic that the Advisory Group would be able to reach a consensus on the way forward of addressing the issue of discrimination faced by sexual minorities.

38. USCMA advised that a focused study on discrimination experienced by sexual minorities in Hong Kong was commissioned, and that the findings of the study could form a basis for the Advisory Group to further consider how to take forward its work. A consultant had been appointed for the study which was expected to be completed in 2014. USCMA advised that a new Announcement of Public Interest ("API") to promote non-discrimination against people of different sexual orientations and transgenders would also be broadcast shortly. In response to Ms HO's enquiry, USCMA said that the relevant study planned by the Equal Opportunities Commission in this area had yet to commence.

39. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen asked what measures, other than the API and the study, were being considered to address the issue of discrimination faced by sexual minorities. Referring to paragraph 20 of the HKSAR's Report which stated that in dealing with controversial issues including the protection of the rights of sexual minorities, the "HKSAR Government will protect and promote the rights of different groups through legal and administrative means", Mr CHAN asked about the legal means to be employed in addressing the issue of discrimination faced by sexual minorities. Considering that the relevant issues, such as the Court of Final Appeal's decision in relation to the marriage of transsexual persons under the Marriage Ordinance in *W v Registrar of Marriages*, the Court of Appeal's judgment that certain provisions of the Crimes Ordinance were unconstitutional, and the collection of statistics on sexual minority population in Hong Kong, etc. actually straddled across different policy areas, he asked how the Administration would take forward the relevant issues.

40. USCMA informed members that while the Security Bureau would be the lead bureau in taking forward the necessary legislative amendments to the Marriage Ordinance, the relevant policy bureaux and departments would also collaborate to address problems facing transsexuals. USCMA added that the study commissioned was very important as the findings would form an objective basis for formulating the way forward including the need or otherwise for any legislative proposal.

Action

**V. Any other business**

41. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:40 pm.

Council Business Division 2  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
3 March 2014