立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(4)1162/14-15

Ref : CB4/PL/AJLS

Report of the Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services for submission to the Legislative Council

Purpose

This report gives an account of the major work of the Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services ("the Panel") during the 2014-2015 Legislative Council ("LegCo") session. It will be tabled at the Council meeting of 24 June 2015 in accordance with Rule 77(14) of the Rules of Procedure of the Council.

The Panel

2. The Panel was formed by a resolution passed by the Council on 8 July 1998 and as amended on 20 December 2000, 9 October 2002, 11 July 2007 and 2 July 2008 for the purpose of monitoring and examining policy matters relating to the administration of justice and legal services. The terms of reference of the Panel are in **Appendix I**.

3. The Panel comprises 23 members, with Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun and Hon Dennis KWOK elected as Chairman and Deputy Chairman respectively. The membership of the Panel is in **Appendix II**.

Major work

Manpower and other support for the Judiciary

4. The Panel continued to monitor the manpower and other support for the Judiciary during the current legislative session. Members and the two legal professional bodies in general expressed concern about the judicial manpower shortage which in turn had given rise to longer court waiting times at various levels of court.

5. At the Panel meeting on 18 May 2015, the Judiciary Administration ("JA") reported that as a result of nine open recruitment exercises conducted by the Judiciary for filling judicial vacancies at various levels of court in the past four years from 2011 to 2014, all judicial posts at various levels of court, except at the Court of First Instance ("CFI") level, were largely substantively filled. To facilitate more eligible candidates to apply for the CFI Judge post, the Judiciary had been conducting recruitment exercises for CFI Judges on a yearly basis instead of every three years since 2013, having regard to the fact that the timing for joining the bench was a crucial factor for senior legal practitioners. In view of the difficulties on the recruitment of CFI Judges and in order to address the long-term needs of the whole Judiciary, the Judiciary was conducting various reviews, including one review on the terms and conditions of service of judges and judicial officers ("JJOs") and another review on the statutory retirement ages of JJOs. The review on retirement ages of JJOs would take a longer time given the complexity of the issues involved. As regards the review on terms and conditions of service of JJOs, the review had now reached an advanced stage and the Judiciary hoped that it would be able to submit its findings and proposal to the Government within 2015-2016.

6. Although judicial remuneration might not be the major consideration for outside legal talents to join the bench as CFI Judges, members considered that lack of judicial support was a deterrent. JA advised that following a recent review on the Scheme on Judicial Assistants, the Judiciary had decided that starting from 2015, the Court of Final Appeal ("CFA") and the Court of Appeal of the High Court would have separate schemes for providing professional support to their judges and separate recruitment exercise would be conducted for such purposes. The Scheme on Judicial Assistants would continue to operate for the CFA but there would no longer be rotation for individual Judicial Assistants who would stay in the CFA throughout their engagement. It was expected that dedicated and structured legal and professional support would be enhanced for the CFA Judges as a result. Whilst the new scheme for providing legal and professional support to the High Court was mainly targeted at the Justices of Appeal, the scheme would cover the provision of the same support to CFI Judges where appropriate. In fact, individual Judicial Assistants had in the past provided legal and professional support to CFI Judges on a need basis.

7. To address the accommodation needs of the Judiciary in the short and medium terms, members were advised that the Government Property Agency had identified a net operating floor area of 3 600 m^2 at the Queensway Government Offices to relocate the High Court Library and those teams providing administrative support out of the High Court Building ("HCB") such that the space so vacated at the HCB could be converted into additional courtrooms and offices for the High Court. Regarding the accommodation

needs of the Judiciary at the High Court and District Court ("DC") levels in the long term, potential sites for such purpose had been identified by the Government. Preliminary technical information on the potential sites had recently been forwarded to the Judiciary for consideration. As to the shortage of courtrooms at the Wanchai Law Courts Building ("WLCB"), the Government agreed in principle not to pursue the original plan of relocating the Lands Tribunal, currently accommodated at 38 Gascoigne Road, to the space currently occupied by the Small Claims Tribunal ("SCT") in the WLCB, upon the latter's re-provisioning to the West Kowloon Law Courts Building in 2016. The space to be vacated by the SCT at the WLCB would be converted as additional courtrooms and supporting facilities for use by the DC and the Family Court.

8. On how the space to be vacated by the High Court Library and some offices providing backroom administrative support in the HCB would be used, members were advised that subject to the advice of the Architectural Services Department, the Judiciary hoped to construct six additional courtrooms and supporting facilities at the space so vacated in the HCB.

9. Members urged the Judiciary to further strengthen its judicial support to judges and adopt a proactive approach in recruitment of JJOs. The Panel would continue to follow up on manpower and other support for the Judiciary in the next legislative session.

Rule of law and prosecutions policy

10. Prosecutions policy in relation to the "Occupy Central" movement had been discussed at the meeting on 26 January 2015 to discuss the policy initiatives of the Department of Justice ("DoJ"). The Panel observed that rule of law was the paramount principle of Hong Kong. Some members were concerned whether the existing resources of the Prosecutions Division ("PD") of DoJ were sufficient to handle huge number of cases arising from the "Occupy Central" movement. They urged DoJ not to let go of persons arrested for participating in the "Occupy Central" movement lightly because of the large number of these persons involved and that some of them were famous personalities, legal practitioners and LegCo Members. As the Government needed to obtain the support of a two-thirds majority of all LegCo Members on the method for selecting the Chief Executive ("CE") by universal suffrage in 2017, concern was raised that DoJ would decide not to prosecute those LegCo Members who had participated in the "Occupy Central" movement.

11. The Administration advised that PD of DoJ would strictly comply with the Prosecution Code in its handling of cases arising from or related to the

"Occupy Central" movement. According to paragraph 5.3 of the Prosecution Code, when considering whether to prosecute, prosecutors must consider whether there was sufficient evidence. If so satisfied, prosecutors should next consider and balance all issues of public interest. A prosecution should not be commenced or continued unless there was a reasonable prospect of conviction.

12. The Administration assured members that securing the support of LegCo Members in endorsing the method for selecting CE by universal suffrage in 2017 would not be a consideration for PD of DoJ to decide whether to or not to prosecute those LegCo Members who had participated in the occupy movement. As the Secretary for Justice ("SJ") and the Director of Public Prosecutions had made clear on numerous occasions in the past, DoJ would treat all implicated parties equally and in accordance with the law, irrespective of their background, identity and social status. In considering whether or not to prosecute an alleged breach of criminal law during a public order event, DoJ would adopt the same principles as those adopted when handling other criminal cases, i.e. to consider whether there was sufficient evidence in support of the charge, and whether it was in the public interest to prosecute.

13. On the question as to when PD of DoJ would complete its work on deciding whether or not to initiate prosecution against any individuals who had been arrested for their involvement in the "Occupy Central" movement, DoJ advised that it had set up a small designated team of prosecutors within the PD to handle the large number of cases arising from or related to the "Occupy Central" movement, so that professional legal advice could be provided to the Police as expeditiously as possible to enable early referral of cases which merited prosecution to the courts for adjudication. PD of DoJ would engage, where operational needs so required, lawyers from the private sector to suitably manage its overall caseload in order that all cases could be dealt with efficiently and effectively.

14. A member pointed out that the great number of cases related to or arising from the "Occupy Central" movement would impose a heavy burden on the already heavy caseload of the Police and DoJ, not to mention that the hearing of such cases in courts would aggravate the problem of long court waiting times. In the light of this and in order to avoid further divisions in society that emerged from the movement, question was raised as to whether consideration could be given to granting amnesty to those persons who were not initiators of the "Occupy Central" movement or who had not taken part in any illegal activities related to or arising from the movement.

15. SJ advised that DoJ had considered the related laws for the granting of amnesty and concluded that the granting of such was not applicable to those

people arrested for participating in the "Occupy Central" movement. PD of DoJ would, as always, prosecute each and every case on the basis of law, admissible evidence and public interest consideration.

16. In view of the wide public concern that justice must be served in DoJ's handling of the cases related to or arising from the "Occupy Central" movement, members considered that SJ should explain to the public the prosecutions policy on the handling of these cases at a suitable time. SJ agreed to do so.

17. Members pointed out that rule of law was the paramount principle of Hong Kong. Some members urged the Government not a turn a blind eye to the law breaking activities and should prosecute all those who had breached the law, whilst some other members pointed out that some people in Hong Kong were concerned about the over-emphasis of the "obey the law" aspect of the rule of law by the Government as exemplified by SJ in his speech made at the Ceremonial Opening of the Legal Year on 12 January 2015.

18. SJ clarified that the reason why he said in his speech made at the Ceremonial Opening of the Legal Year on 12 January 2015 that "the law remains the law, and is there to be obeyed" was intended to address the recent "Occupy Central" movement and should not be taken to mean that his and the Government's view on rule of law only meant obeying the law. In fact, he had mentioned on numerous occasions in the past, including in his speech made at last year Ceremonial Opening of the Legal Year, that rule of law contained various important aspects such as upholding social justice and protecting the rights of individuals. As civil disobedience did not constitute any defence to a criminal charge, it was incumbent upon him as SJ to remind the public about the importance of obeying the law as acts of civil disobedience were potentially unlawful.

Legal education and training

19. Arising from the proposal of the Law Society of Hong Kong ("the Law Society") of providing a common entrance examination ("CEE") as an alternative route for law graduates to practise as solicitors in Hong Kong, the Panel held a public hearing on 27 April 2015 to listen to the views of the three law schools, a law students' association, a law alumni association, the Hong Kong Bar Association ("the Bar Association") and other interested parties on the provision of legal education and training in Hong Kong.

20. The three law schools considered that any changes made to the arrangements for law graduates to qualify as lawyers in Hong Kong should be considered in the context of the comprehensive study on legal education and

training in Hong Kong ("the Study") to be conducted by the Standing Committee on Legal Education and Training ("SCLET")[1]. To enhance access to their Postgraduate Certificate in Laws ("PCLL") programmes, the three law schools had/would set aside some PCLL spaces for borderline applicants and applications who had been unsuccessful the first time round.

21. Some other deputations, notably law students and law graduates, however considered that similar to other professions, a CEE should be introduced in Hong Kong to provide an alternative route for law graduates to qualify as lawyers in Hong Kong and no ceiling should be set on the number of times a law graduate could sit for the CEE until he/she passed the CEE. Although the law schools would now consider offering PCLL places to borderline applicants and applicants who had previously been unsuccessful through, amongst others, interviews, many law students and graduates considered such arrangement still lacking in objectivity and transparency, not to mention that the number of PCLL places set aside for these types of applicants was small. The fact that the number of lawyers sitting for the Overseas Lawyers Qualification Examination administered by the Law Society had increased from some 20 a year in the past to about 300 a year in recent years was a testament of the inadequacies of the present PCLL system in Hong Kong. Deputations observed that although students with means could go overseas to attain law degrees and become qualified lawyers there, it would take them some 10 years if they wished to return to Hong Kong to practise law.

22. In view of the various concerns over the existing PCLL system, such as the lack of PCLL places and the different standards of PCLL graduates at the three law schools, question was raised as to whether, and if so, what measures would be taken by the three law schools to improve the PCLL system.

23. Representatives from the three law schools responded that the quality of the students admitted into the PCLL programmes would be lowered should the PCLL places be significantly increased. In addition, the market for legal services might well be unable to absorb the additional PCLL graduates. As the SCLET would be conducting the Study to critically review the present system of legal education and training in Hong Kong, including its strengths and weaknesses, the three law schools considered it best to await the findings of the Study before deciding on the way forward in addressing any weakness of

---

[1] Established since 2004, the SCLET is empowered under section 74A(2)(a)(ii) of the Legal Practitioners Ordinance (Cap. 159) to, amongst other things, keep under review legal education and training in Hong Kong and make recommendations thereon. Members of the SCLET are appointed by CE upon the nomination of various stakeholders in the legal community. Members of the public are also represented on the SCLET.

the present PCLL system as identified. To address the concern about the inconsistent criteria adopted by the three law schools in selecting PCLL applicants for admission into the PCLL programmes, it was suggested that PCLL applications could be required to pass a common admission test set by the three law schools.

24. Members generally supported the introduction of a CEE as an alternative route for law graduates to qualify as lawyers in Hong Kong, so that law graduates who were denied admission to the PCLL programmes due to limited PCLL places could have another chance to become lawyers and to better meet the varying circumstances of law graduates, such as those law graduates who attained their law degrees some years after graduating with non-law degrees.

25. Whilst appreciating the merits of the CEE as an alternative route to the legal profession, the Bar Association was of the view that the CEE was not the solution. The CEE could only test the theoretical knowledge of the candidates and could not replace the training of the PCLL which also covered some very practical aspects in preparation for the students to enter into the profession. However, the Bar Association was in favour of widening the pool of students for admission to the PCLL such as asking the universities to consider admitting students to PCLL not merely on the basis of the scores of their degree examinations, but also to consider admitting those who had been working at law firms.

26. Members urged the Administration to convey to the SCLET that it should engage more stakeholders, such as law students and employers, in its Study. Members further urged the Administration to foot the bill should the costs of the Study exceed its $1.5 million contribution to the SCLET for the Study.

Access to justice

Expansion of the scope of the Supplementary Legal Aid Scheme

27. Members have all along called upon the Administration to improve legal aid services to improve access to justice. As the Supplementary Legal Aid Scheme ("SLAS") was a self-financing scheme and as a stringent approach was adopted by the Legal Aid Department ("LAD") in assessing the merits of an application under SLAS, such as whether the case had a reasonable chance of success and whether the likely benefit would be sufficient to cover the costs that might be incurred in the proceedings, members could not see why the scope of SLAS could not be further expanded to improve access to justice.

28. Although the Legal Aid Services Council ("LASC") had formed a Working Group some two years ago to further review whether there was any room to further expand the scope of SLAS which was last expanded in November 2012, the Working Group had yet to come up with any recommendations on the matter. The Administration advised that it should not take long for the Working Group to complete its review on the scope of SLAS, as the consultation work of the Working Group was drawing to a close. At the request of members, the Administration agreed to follow up with the Working Group on providing a progress report of its review to the Panel and to convey to the LASC that it should duly consider the views of or further consult the two legal professional bodies on the review of SLAS.

Assignments of lawyers to aided persons

29. On the suggestion of making the assignment system for lawyers more stringent, such as allowing LAD to have the final say on the assignments of lawyers to aided persons, the Administration advised that under section 13 of the Legal Aid Ordinance (Cap. 91), aided persons had the right to select any lawyers in private practice who were on the Legal Aid Panel if they so desired. In the assignments of legal aid cases, LAD adhered to the fundamental principle that the aided person's interest was of paramount importance. As long as the solicitor/counsel nominated by the aided person was legally qualified and did not have poor performance record, LAD would normally accede to and would not reject an aided person's choice of solicitor/counsel unless there were compelling reasons to do so. LAD was of the view that it was improper for the Department and would be a slur on the character and professional integrity of the nominated lawyer for LAD to enquire if the nomination was promoted by some kind of questionable conduct on the part of the lawyer concerned. In judicial review cases, any such enquiry might also be interpreted as an unnecessary and improper attempt to influence the outcome of legally aided proceedings when the lawyer nominated by the aided person was professionally qualified and had an untarnished professional record.

30. Noting that assignments of civil legal aid cases should not generally exceed 45 and 25 cases for solicitors and counsel respectively within the past 12 months, question was raised as to whether such limits were set too high, especially for solicitors who could be assigned up to 45 cases within the past 12 months.

31. The Administration explained that the existing limits on legal aid assignments were drawn up by LAD in consultation with LASC and the two legal professional bodies. It was not impossible for a solicitor to handle up to 45 civil legal aid cases within the past 12 months, as some of these cases were

straightforward ones without requiring a court hearing and the solicitor could assign some of his/her work to his/her fellow solicitor(s) in the law firm.

32. In view of the comments made by some members of the legal sector that legal aid work was often distributed to same solicitors and counsel on the Legal Aid Panel, the Administration agreed to review the existing limits on legal aid assignments LAD in consultation with LASC and the two legal professional bodies.

Measures to address touting or champerty activities in legal aid cases

33. Some members expressed concern about improper touting or champerty in legal aid cases. They pointed out that in recent years, aided persons of judicial review cases were often the same persons and the lawyers nominated by these aided persons were the lawyers who assisted them to apply for legal aid or had ties with these lawyers.

34. The Administration advised that to address the public's growing concern on improper touting or champerty activities in legal aid cases, a new declaration system was introduced in September 2013 after consultation with LASC and two branches of the legal profession. The objective of the new system was to ensure that the nominations of lawyers were made out of the aided person's own free will and they had not agreed to share any damages, property or costs which they might get or retain in the proceedings with any person(s) including the lawyers nominated, the lawyers' employee, agent or claims agent. The aided person was required to give a written declaration in support of his/her nomination. As for the nominated lawyer, the declaration was incorporated into the assignment letter as one of the conditions. The lawyer nominated was obliged to return the papers to the LAD if he/she could not fulfil this new condition.

35. The Administration further advised that to enhance the transparency and fairness in the assignments of lawyers, LAD and the Independent Commission Against Corruption ("ICAC") had formed a Corruption Prevention Group in mid-2013 to discuss issues relating to prevention of corruption and bribery. ICAC had recently completed their study on LAD's assignment system for lawyers and experts, and had submitted its report with recommendations to LAD in January 2015. LAD would carefully study ICAC's report and recommendations.

Impact of litigants in person on court proceedings

36. Members were of the view that the existing inadequate provision of legal aid had given rise to an ever increasing number of litigants in person

("LIPs") who had prolonged the already long court waiting time, particularly in the HC, and added to the already heavy workload of the courts, as judges needed to spend a lot of time to assist LIPs during court proceedings.

37. The Administration pointed out that the reasons why some people chose to represent themselves in courts were varied, such as they chose not to apply for legal aid and their legal aid applications failed to satisfy the merits test. However, in recognition of the challenges posed to civil service justice by an increasing number of LIPs, a "Two-year Pilot Scheme to Provide Legal Advice for Litigants in Person" ("the LIPs Scheme") was launched by the Home Affairs Bureau ("HAB") in March 2013 to provide legal advice on procedural matters for LIPs who had commenced or were parties to civil proceedings in the District Court or above and had not been granted legal aid. As at end February 2015, the LIPs Scheme had assisted 1 188 LIPs and conducted some 3 400 advice sessions. HAB staff had interviewed users of the LIPs Scheme, and over 90% of them were satisfied with the services provided by the Scheme. As the two-year pilot had recently been completed, HAB would shortly seek the advice of the Steering Committee on the Provision of Legal Advice for LIPs Scheme, chaired by a former HC Judge, on the future arrangements with regard to the provision of legal advice for LIPs in the light of the operational experience. Notwithstanding the aforesaid, LAD, through the Civil Service Reform Monitoring Committee, had been and would continue to closely liaise with the Judiciary to understand the situation of LIPs.

Re-positioning of LAD

38. Some members considered that it was not necessary to place the formulation and oversight of policy matters on legal aid under HAB, as LASC, established in 1999 under the LASC Ordinance (Cap. 489), was tasked to oversee the administration of legal aid services provided by LAD and to advise CE on legal aid policy.

39. On when LAD would be re-positioned and made directly accountable to the Chief Secretary for Administration's Office ("CSO"), which was the arrangement prior to the re-organization of the Government Secretariat in July 2007, the Administration advised that it accepted in principle the LASC's recommendation that reverting LAD from the policy charge of HAB to that of CSO could address the concern of some quarters in the community about the independence of LAD. However, no concrete timetable had been set for implementing such transfer in light of other competing priority policy areas of the current term Government.

Provision of screens for complainants in sexual offence cases during court proceedings

40. At the meeting on 26 January 2015, members were briefed by the Judiciary on its position with regard to the proposal to provide screens for complainants in sexual offence cases during court proceedings. Specifically, the Judiciary had considered the following options:

(a) whether the law should be changed to provide for automatic provision of screens for complainants in sexual offence cases upon the prosecution's applications;

(b) whether, within the existing framework, the current procedures could be improved for considering applications for use of screens for complainants in sexual offence cases by amending Practice Direction - 9.3 "Criminal Proceedings in the Court of First Instance" and Practice Direction - 9.4 "Criminal Proceedings in the District Court" to require, as a matter of standing procedure, the counsel to advise the presiding judge of the following during the Pre-trial Review of every sexual offence case:

(i) whether the complainant had requested a screen; and

(ii) whether the prosecution considered it appropriate to make such an application; and

(c) whether, within the existing framework, certain guidelines should be developed to set out in greater details the factors that should be taken unto account when the court considered applications for use of screens for complainants in sexual offence cases.

Having considered the three options, the Judiciary considered that option (b) should be adopted. Option (a) should be referred to the Administration for further examination, whilst option (c) should be rejected as to do so in a non-comprehensive manner would only affect adversely the unfettered exercise of judicial discretion.

41. The Judiciary explained that it could not alone take the view on the proposal to provide automatically screens for complainants of sexual offence cases upon application, as the adoption of such required legislation and the decision on whether or not to introduce a legislative proposal to effect such rested with the Administration. The Judiciary was expediting the work of revising Practice Direction - 9.3 and Practice Direction 9.4 for the early adoption of option (b).

42. Whilst agreeing that option (b) should be adopted first, members considered that option (a) should still be pursued by the Judiciary and the Administration. In adopting option (b), suggestion was made that it should be made clear in the revised Practice Direction 9.3 and Practice Direction 9.4 that the counsel should apprise complainants in sexual offence cases that they could request for the provision of a screen during court proceedings and the presiding judge should also ask the counsel to provide the reason(s) why the prosecution did not consider it appropriate to make an application for use of screen during court proceedings.

Other issues

43. During the session, the Panel also discussed the issues of the implementation of the Civil Justice Reform, progress of the review of the solicitors' hourly rates, the Law Reform Commission's Reports on "Adverse Possession" and on "Excepted Offences under Schedule 3 of the Criminal Procedure Ordinance (Cap. 221)", and the 2014-2015 Judicial Service Pay Adjustment. The Panel was also consulted on the following legislative and staffing proposals before their introduction into LegCo or submission to the Establishment Subcommittee and the Finance Committee of LegCo:

(a) proposed amendments to the Arbitration Ordinance (Cap. 609) which sought to remove some legal uncertainties relating to the opt-in mechanism provided for domestic arbitration under Part 11 of the Ordinance; and update, for the purposes of the Ordinance, the list of parties to the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards 1958 by (i) adding the new parties (namely, Bhutan, Burundi and Guyana); (ii) adding British Virgin Islands to the entry for the United Kingdom; and (iii) amending "Bolivia" to “Bolivia (Plurinational State of)” in the Schedule to the Arbitration (Parties To New York Convention) Order (Cap. 609 sub. leg. A);

(b) draft Live Television Link (Witnesses outside Hong Kong) Rules which sought to set out the procedures in respect of the giving of evidence by way of a live television link under the new Part IIIB of Cap. 221; and the Draft Rules of the High Court (Amendment) Rules which sought to provide for the procedures for giving assistance to a court or tribunal outside Hong Kong ("requesting court") by ordering examination of a witness via a live television link in Hong Kong for the purposes of legal proceedings in the requesting court;

(c) draft Court Procedural Rules for the Competition Tribunal which sought to provide procedural and fees rules for the Competition Tribunal;

(d) proposed amendment of the Legal Aid (Assessment of Resources and Contributions) Regulations (Cap. 91B) which sought to revise the bandwidths of assessed financial resources of aided persons in relation to the contribution payable under the Ordinary Legal Aid Scheme ("OLAS"), so that the bandwidths would be represented as percentages of the financial eligibility limit ("FEL") of the OLAS rather than the current absolute figures; and adjustment of the FELs of the OLAS and SLAS by an upward of 7.7% in accordance with changes of the Consumer Price Index (C) between July 2012 and July 2014 to maintain their respective real values;

(e) proposed creation of one permanent post of Deputy Principal Government Counsel in the Civil Division of DoJ for taking forward the work required in sustaining the promotion and development of the wider use of mediation in Hong Kong; and

(f) proposed creation of a supernumerary directorate post in JA to enhance administrative support in taking forward many initiatives in the Judiciary requiring legislative amendments.

Panel meetings held

44. From October 2014 to June 2015, the Panel held a total of nine meetings. The Panel has scheduled another meeting on 20 July 2015.

Council Business Division 4
Legislative Council Secretariat
16 June 2015

Appendix I

Legislative Council

Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services

Terms of Reference

1. To monitor and examine, consistent with maintaining the independence of the Judiciary and the rule of law, policy matters relating to the administration of justice and legal services, including the effectiveness of their implementation by relevant officials and departments.

2. To provide a forum for the exchange and dissemination of views on the above policy matters.

3. To receive briefings and to formulate views on any major legislative or financial proposals in respect of the above policy areas prior to their formal introduction to the Council or Finance Committee.

4. To monitor and examine, to the extent it considers necessary, the above policy matters referred to it by a member of the Panel or by the House Committee.

5. To make reports to the Council or to the House Committee as required by the Rules of Procedure.

Appendix II

Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services

Membership list for the 2014-2015 session

Chairman	Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Deputy Chairman	Hon Dennis KWOK
Members	Hon Albert HO Chun-yan Hon James TO Kun-sun Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, JP Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung Hon WONG Yuk-man Hon NG Leung-sing, SBS, JP Hon Steven HO Chun-yin Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, JP Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, SBS, JP Hon TANG Ka-piu, JP Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan (Total : 23 Members)
Clerk	Mary SO
Legal Adviser	Timothy TSO (up to 31 January 2015) KAU Kin-wah (since 1 February 2015)