

立法會

Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(4)1359/16-17

Ref. : CB4/BC/3/16

Report of the Bills Committee on Apology Bill

Purpose

This paper reports on the deliberations of the Bills Committee on Apology Bill ("the Bill").

Background

2. Apology legislation has been enacted in many other jurisdictions, including the United States, Canada, Australia and Scotland, to facilitate resolution of disputes by promoting and encouraging the making of apologies.

3. In the absence of clear legislation in Hong Kong, parties to civil disputes may be reluctant to make apologies, expressions of regret or other similar expressions because of concerns about the potential legal implications, such as an apology being admitted as evidence to determine fault or liability in legal proceedings, extending limitation periods, adversely affecting insurance cover where an insurance contract contains clauses prohibiting the admission of fault by an insured without the insurer's consent.

4. The Secretary for Justice ("SJ") established the Steering Committee on Mediation¹ ("Steering Committee") in November 2012 to further foster the development of mediation in Hong Kong. Its Regulatory Framework Sub-Committee was tasked to consider whether it is desirable to introduce apology legislation in Hong Kong for the purpose of providing certainty on the legal implications of making an apology in a civil dispute. If such legislation is passed by the Legislative Council ("LegCo"), Hong Kong would become the first jurisdiction in Asia to have apology legislation enacted, and this would help to further enhance Hong Kong's status as a centre for dispute resolution, especially in the context of mediation.

¹ The Steering Committee was chaired by SJ and comprised representatives from different sectors including legal professionals, mediation experts, medical practitioners, academics, administrators, social workers and insurers.

5. The Steering Committee launched two rounds of six-week public consultation in June 2015 and February 2016 to seek views on the proposal to enact apology legislation in Hong Kong. The majority of the responses received were in favour of the proposed legislation. There was also support for the legislation to protect statements of fact conveyed in an apology, although views differed as to whether the court should retain a discretion to admit such statements as evidence against the apology maker in appropriate circumstances.

6. Having considered the responses received in the two rounds of consultation, the Steering Committee published its final report in November 2016, recommending new legislation to make evidence of a person's apology inadmissible for determining fault or liability in all civil proceedings, subject to certain exceptions.

The Bill

7. The Bill seeks to promote and encourage the making of apologies in order to prevent the escalation of disputes and facilitate their amicable settlement by clarifying the legal consequences of making an apology.

8. The Bill, if passed, would come into operation on a day to be appointed by SJ by notice published in the Gazette.

The Bills Committee

9. At the House Committee meeting held on 10 February 2017, members agreed to form a Bills Committee to study the Bill. The membership list of the Bills Committee is in **Appendix I**.

10. Under the chairmanship of Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding, the Bills Committee held six meetings with the Administration and received views from 20 deputations at one of these meetings. A list of deputations which have submitted views to the Bills Committee is in **Appendix II**.

Deliberations of the Bills Committee

Object of the Bill

11. Bills Committee members and deputations generally support the policy intent of the Bill to promote a culture of making apologies for reaching

settlement. However, a member is worried that the Bill may encourage insincere and strategic apologies as apology makers clearly know there will be statutory protection for their apologies and accompanying statements of fact, which may in turn reduce the chance of fact-finding. The Administration has stressed that the Bill does not affect parties' obligations to disclose or produce documents in discovery or other similar procedures to facilitate fact-finding. This is expressly provided in clause 11(a) of the Bill.

Meaning of apology (Clause 4)

12. Clause 4 defines an apology as an expression (whether oral, written or by conduct) of regret, sympathy or benevolence made by or on behalf of a person, including any part of the expression which is an express or implied admission of fault or liability or a statement of fact in connection with the matter in respect of which the apology is made ("Relevant Matter").

13. According to the Administration, "apology" is widely defined to ensure the objective of the Bill, which is to encourage the making of apologies for preventing the escalation of disputes and facilitating early settlement of disputes, can be achieved.

14. On the suggestion of defining what would constitute a sincere apology, the Administration has advised that "apology" carries a wide meaning under clause 4 to give sufficient flexibility to an apology-maker in deciding on a suitable expression of apology. Whether an apology made is sincere would depend on the circumstances of each case, including the manner and context in which the expression is made. In addition, no respondents requested a definition of sincere apology during the two rounds of consultation. The Administration, therefore, does not see the need to define sincere apology under the Bill.

Scope of application (Clauses 5 and 13)

15. The Administration has drawn members' attention to the fact that the Bill does not have retrospective effect in respect of apologies made before the commencement date of the Bill if enacted as an Ordinance. Clause 5(1) makes it clear that the Bill only applies to an apology made on or after the commencement date of the enacted Ordinance, regardless of when the Relevant Matter arose or when the relevant proceedings began, so as to achieve the Bill's objective of encouraging the making of apologies.

16. Moreover, clause 5(2) provides that the Bill does not apply to an apology made by a person in certain documents or oral statements in applicable

proceedings, or an apology adduced as evidence in those proceedings by or with the consent of the person who made the apology. According to the Administration, an apology must not be taken into account in applicable proceedings to the prejudice of the apology maker under clause 7. But there may be circumstances where a party chooses to make an apology in court documents, such as pleadings and witness statements, or in testimonies or oral submissions given at the hearing, intending the apology to be taken into account in the proceedings. Clause 5(2)(a) and (b) disapplies the Bill to such an apology so that it may be taken into account in the proceedings if the apology maker so intends. Clause 5(2)(c) deals with evidence of apologies made outside the proceedings, for example, an apology made shortly after the relevant incident takes place. Evidence of such an apology is generally inadmissible in applicable proceedings by virtue of clause 8. But there may also be circumstances in which the apology maker agrees to or seeks its admission as evidence. The exception made by clause 5(2)(a), (b) and (c) is consistent with the policy objective of facilitating amicable resolution of disputes. Without this exception, there would be an absurdity that an apology cannot be considered or admitted as evidence despite the apology maker's intent or consent for it to be taken into account within applicable proceedings.

17. Some members consider the meaning of clause 5 rather technical and not easy to understand. The Administration notes members' views but considers that the clause accurately reflects the policy intent.

18. Clause 13 provides that the enacted Ordinance would apply to the Government. In response to a concern that the public may misinterpret the wording in clause 13 to mean that the Bill would only apply to the Government, the Administration has advised that the wording of clause 13 is the current standard formulation of application clauses. Its meaning and effect is sufficiently clear and certain to readers. Therefore, it is considered not necessary to amend the clause. The Legal Adviser to the Bills Committee supplemented that some older ordinances (for example, Personal Data (Privacy) Ordinance (Cap. 486), the Sex Discrimination Ordinance (Cap. 480), etc.) which apply to the Government provide that "This Ordinance binds the Government", but that the wording used in the past in the older ordinances appears to have a similar effect in applying the relevant Ordinance to the Government.

19. To assist the public to better understand the Bill, the Bills Committee has suggested the Administration to consider drawing up guidelines with reference to examples or real life scenarios for interpreting and giving effect to the Bill. The Administration notes members' views and has pointed out that the Bill is accompanied by an explanatory memorandum which explains the

contents of the Bill in non-technical language.

Applicable proceedings and exceptions (Clauses 6 and 12, and the Schedule)

20. Clause 6 enumerates applicable proceedings for the purposes of the Bill. They are judicial, arbitral, administrative, disciplinary and regulatory proceedings (whether or not conducted under an enactment²) as well as other proceedings conducted under an enactment. However, applicable proceedings do not include criminal proceedings or proceedings specified in the Schedule, namely, those conducted under the Commissions of Inquiry Ordinance (Cap. 86), the Control of Obscene and Indecent Articles Ordinance (Cap. 390) and the Coroners Ordinance (Cap. 504). Clause 12 empowers the Chief Executive ("CE") in Council to amend the Schedule by notice published in the Gazette. In response to an enquiry by the Legal Adviser to the Bills Committee, the Administration has confirmed that before amending the Schedule, CE in Council would take into consideration all relevant factors including the policy justifications for the proposed amendments, implications on the objective of the apology law and stakeholders' feedback etc., and that any amendment notice is subject to scrutiny by LegCo under the negative vetting procedure pursuant to section 34 of the Interpretation and General Clauses Ordinance (Cap. 1).³

21. The Bills Committee notes that "administrative proceedings" include the proceedings of the Administrative Appeals Board⁴. "Disciplinary proceedings" include the proceedings of professional institutes or statutory bodies established under different ordinances, such as inquiries at the Medical Council of Hong Kong, Hospital Authority's medical review panel, Estate Agents Authority, Registered Contractors' Disciplinary Board, etc. Disciplinary proceedings by way of non-statutory self-regulation by industry bodies such as the Travel Industry Council are also applicable proceedings.

22. On the suggestion of providing definitions of "judicial, arbitral, administrative, disciplinary and regulatory proceedings" under clause 6(1), the Administration considered that these terms are self-explanatory and it is not necessary to give definitions in the Bill.

23. Members have examined the need for listing out the proceedings of all the organizations to be covered under clause 6(1) for easy reference of the

² "Enactment" is not defined in the Bill, but under section 3 of the Interpretation and General Clauses Ordinance (Cap. 1), it has the same meaning as Ordinance which includes any Ordinance enacted by LegCo and any subsidiary legislation made under any such Ordinance.

³ See LC Paper No. CB(4)669/16-17(01), items (s) and (t).

⁴ The Administrative Appeals Board is established under section 5 of the Administrative Appeals Board Ordinance (Cap. 442) to hear and determine any appeal duly made to the Board against a decision made in respect of an appellant and which falls under its jurisdiction.

public. In view of the large number of organizations to be covered, the Administration considers it neither practical nor desirable to list out all the organizations because there may be unintentional omission. In addition, in order to keep such a list up-to-date, if a listed approach is adopted, legislative amendments would need to be introduced from time to time as and when new organizations are established to conduct applicable proceedings.

24. Some members have enquired about the considerations to be taken into account in preparing the Schedule. The Administration has explained that the non-applicable proceedings specified in the Schedule are fact-finding in nature and do not involve any determination of liability. The Legal Adviser to the Bills Committee has enquired whether proceedings under the Hong Kong Civil Aviation (Investigation of Accidents) Regulations (Cap. 448B), especially commissions of inquiry appointed by CE to inquire into the circumstances and causes of a civil aviation accident pursuant to Regulation 17, should also be excluded from the application of the Bill, considering that the fundamental purpose of investigating accidents under Cap. 448B is not to apportion blame or liability, but to determine the circumstances and causes of the accident with a view to the preservation of life and the avoidance of accidents in the future. In response, the Administration has advised that apart from the proceedings under the three Ordinances already set out in the Schedule, no other proceedings have been suggested by relevant government bureaux or departments (including the Civil Aviation Department) for exclusion from the application of the Bill during consultation.

25. The Legal Adviser to the Bills Committee has also enquired whether the proceedings of LegCo are applicable proceedings for the purposes of the Bill. The Administration has clarified that in its review of apology legislation in over 50 overseas jurisdictions, it does not note any express provision extending the application of the apology legislation to parliamentary proceedings. While the Administration considers the Bill does not apply to LegCo proceedings, given the broad definition of "applicable proceedings" under the Bill and the possible doubts as to whether proceedings of LegCo and its committees, panels and subcommittees would fall within that definition, the Administration has agreed to propose, for the avoidance of doubt, a Committee stage amendment ("CSA") to the Schedule to exclude specifically LegCo proceedings from the application of the Bill. All Members were informed of the proposed arrangement⁵ and no objection has been received from Members.

26. The proposed CSA seeks to exclude proceedings of LegCo, including proceedings of a committee, panel or subcommittee established or mandated by LegCo to discharge a function or exercise a power of LegCo. The Legal

⁵ See LC Paper No. CB(4)1225/16-17.

Service Division ("LSD") is of the view that the proposed CSA, if passed, would have the effect of excluding from the application of the Bill:

- (a) proceedings of LegCo and its various committees (including select committees and investigation committees), panels and subcommittees conducted under the Rules of Procedure ("RoP"), whether any powers under section 9 of the Legislative Council (Powers and Privileges) Ordinance (Cap. 382) are exercised or not; and
- (b) the impeachment of CE (including proceedings of the independent investigation committee chaired by the Chief Justice under a mandate given by LegCo) under Article 73(9) of the Basic Law ("BL").

LSD further opines that disapplication of the Bill to LegCo proceedings would mean that subject to RoP, Members would continue to be able to refer to a person's apology, and take such apology into account, in making speeches, asking questions, moving and debating motions, and writing reports for the purposes of LegCo proceedings. Further, the proposed CSA does not specifically refer to the receipt and handling of complaints pursuant to BL 73(8), which is an informal part of the operation of LegCo⁶ and not conducted by any committee, panel or subcommittee under RoP. However, the Administration considers, and LSD agrees, that the handling of complaints does not constitute any of the proceedings described in clause 6(1) of the Bill⁷. As such, it is quite clear that the Bill would not apply to the receipt and handling of complaints under BL 73(8). Accordingly, there is no need for the proposed CSA to exclude the receipt and handling of complaints from the application of the Bill. The Bills Committee considers the proposed CSA acceptable.

Effect of apology in applicable proceedings (Clauses 7 and 8)

27. Clause 7 precludes an apology made by or on behalf of a person from constituting an admission of fault or liability, and from being taken into account in determining fault, liability or any other issue to the prejudice of the apology maker, for the purposes of applicable proceedings.

28. Clause 8(1) makes evidence of an apology generally inadmissible for determining fault, liability or any other issue to the prejudice of the apology maker in applicable proceedings. Nevertheless, clause 8(2) provides that if in

⁶ Paragraph 15.19 of *A Companion to the history, rules and practice of the Legislative Council of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region*.

⁷ See LC Paper No. CB(4)1086/16-17(01), item (f).

particular applicable proceedings there is an exceptional case (for example, where there is no other evidence available for determining an issue), a statement of fact contained in an apology may be admitted as evidence at the discretion of the decision maker (whether a court, tribunal, arbitrator or any other body or individual having the authority to hear, receive and examine evidence in the proceedings), but only if the decision maker is satisfied that it is just and equitable to do so, having regard to all the relevant circumstances.

29. While Bills Committee members and deputations support the protection of statements of fact contained in an apology, they have two major concerns, namely, on (a) the uncertainties that may arise from the admission of statements of fact as evidence in exceptional cases at the decision maker's discretion, which may discourage people from making apologies and thus defeat the purpose of the Bill, and (b) the competence of decision makers who are not judges or legally trained persons to exercise the discretion under clause 8(2).

Decision maker's discretion to admit statements of fact as evidence

30. Regarding the first concern, some members have requested the Administration to consider providing for an absolute protection of statements of fact (i.e. omitting clause 8(2) altogether), while others suggested confining the exercise of discretion to only one situation, that is, where there is no other evidence available for determining an issue, or spelling out all possible exceptional circumstances where discretion could be exercised under clause 8(2).

31. The Administration has pointed out that absolute protection of statements of fact without exception and without giving the decision maker any discretion to disapply such protection or mitigate its effect in appropriate circumstances may unduly affect a claimant's right to a fair hearing contrary to Article 10 of the Hong Kong Bill of Rights and BL 39, and, as such, may be struck down by the Court. Certain provisions of the Bankruptcy Ordinance (Cap. 6) were struck down by the Court of Final Appeal twice for this reason.⁸ Such blanket protection is also contrary to the policy intent of the Bill to facilitate settlement of disputes. The alternative of confining the exercise of discretion to only one situation would go some way towards mitigating the unintended consequences of injustice, but does not go far enough to ensure that a statement of fact in an apology will be admissible in exceptional circumstances where the court finds it just and equitable to do so. As regards other possible exceptional circumstances where discretion could be exercised,

⁸ See e.g. the decisions of the Court of Final Appeal in *Official Receiver v Zhi Charles, formerly known as Chang Hyun Chi and another* (2015) 18 HKCFAR 467 and *Officer Receiver & Trustee in Bankruptcy of Chan Wing Hing v Chan Wing Hing & Secretary For Justice* (2006) 9 HKCFAR 545.

as it was expected clause 8(2) would rarely be invoked, at this stage, the Administration does not have further examples to illustrate what would constitute "an exceptional case", apart from that already given in clause 8(2), that is, where there is no other evidence available for determining fault, liability or any other issue.

32. The Administration takes the view that clause 8(2) has struck a right balance between achieving the policy intent of the Bill and preserving the claimants' right to a fair hearing. It is not uncommon for the courts or other tribunals to be conferred such a discretionary power to ensure that the claimants have access to justice. The Mediation Ordinance (Cap. 620) is such an example. In addition, the notion "just and equitable" is not a novel legal concept and is commonly found in existing legislation and case law (whether in Hong Kong or other common law jurisdictions).

33. Some members are not convinced by the Administration's explanation. To alleviate members' concerns and after taking into account their views, the Administration has agreed to propose a CSA to clause 8(2) to provide that the discretion may be exercised by the decision maker when there is an exceptional case (for example, where there is no other evidence available for determining an issue), but only if the decision maker is satisfied that it is just and equitable to do so, having regard to the public interest or the interests of the administration of justice. The Bills Committee has no objection to the proposed CSA to clause 8(2).

Whether decision makers can properly exercise the discretion

34. On members' second concern as to whether decision makers can properly exercise the discretion under clause 8(2), the Administration has explained that the discretion would only be invoked in exceptional circumstances as it is rare that there is no evidence available for determining an issue other than the statements of fact contained in an apology. Non-judicial proceedings where there could be serious consequences are usually chaired by legally qualified persons or attended by legal advisers to the tribunals. Any party who is aggrieved by the exercise of the discretion may further challenge the matter in courts or appeal tribunals so there is sufficient safeguard. The Administration considers the alternative of conferring the discretion solely on the Court would have costs and time implication as the question of whether the discretion should be exercised would have to be separately litigated in the Court notwithstanding that the underlying applicable proceedings are brought before other decision makers. The Administration considers that decision makers of the applicable proceedings (including those without legal training) should be competent to decide when and how to exercise the discretion. Further, the

Administration will monitor and review the operation of clause 8(2) in the light of any relevant Court decision.

Effect on insurance contracts (Clause 10)

35. It is the policy intent of the Bill to encourage apologies by removing legal disincentives to apologize. The fear that making apologies would adversely affect the apology maker's insurance cover has been identified as a real and significant barrier to offers of apology. Clause 10(1) provides that an apology made by a person does not void or otherwise affect any insurance cover, compensation or other form of benefit for any person in connection with the Relevant Matter under a contract of insurance or indemnity.

36. A concern has been raised as to whether the safeguard in clause 10(1) would be affected if a decision maker exercises the discretion under clause 8(2) to admit a statement of fact in an apology as evidence in applicable proceedings. The Administration has assured members that the exercise of discretion to admit statements of fact as evidence in applicable proceedings does not affect the legal position that the statement of fact would still be part of the "apology" as defined under clause 4 of the Bill to which the protection as regards insurance cover under clause 10(1) applies. In other words, whether a statement of fact is ultimately admitted as evidence in applicable proceedings is irrelevant and the exercise of discretion has no effect on the protection of contracts of insurance or indemnity under clause 10. Further, under clause 10(3), clause 10 would apply "despite anything to the contrary in any rule of law or agreement" to achieve the policy intent that clause 10 is to override any contrary rule of law or agreement.

37. Some members have raised concerns as to whether the insurance cover would be affected if the governing law of a contract of insurance or indemnity is a foreign law (for example, English or Californian law), and if so, whether the parties involved would deliberately choose a foreign governing law in order to evade the operation of the Bill. The Administration has advised that if Hong Kong is the seat of arbitration or the place of litigation, the procedural law governing the conduct of arbitral or judicial proceedings would be Hong Kong law. Accordingly, the procedural law aspects of the Bill (including clause 8 regarding the admissibility of evidence) would apply to applicable proceedings conducted in Hong Kong,⁹ even though the substantive law governing the underlying contract of insurance or indemnity is foreign law. Hence, generally, an apology may not be admitted as evidence in arbitration or judicial proceedings to which Hong Kong procedural law applies. Moreover, if the parties choose a foreign law as the governing law of the insurance contract, the

⁹ This is also the case regardless of whether the apology is made within or outside Hong Kong: see LC Paper No. CB(4)1086/16-17(01), item (d).

parties have the freedom to do so and should be aware of their rights and obligations under the foreign law. It is advisable for parties to carefully consider the implications of choosing the foreign law before deciding if and which foreign law is to be chosen. In fact, it is not the Administration's policy intent to interfere with the freedom of the parties to an insurance or indemnity contract to choose a foreign law as the contract's substantive governing law or to give the Bill extra-territorial effect so as to affect the substantive law of other jurisdictions.

38. In this regard, members appeal to the Administration to launch adequate publicity so that the general public would be aware of the effect of the Bill, if enacted. A deputation also stressed the need to promote the Bill, if enacted, to ethnic minorities. The Administration has assured members that a series of education and publicity activities will be launched before the commencement of the enacted Ordinance to enhance public awareness on the Ordinance, including its objectives, coverage, application and implications.

Effect on other matters (Clause 11)

39. Clause 11 stipulates that the Bill would not affect discovery or a similar procedure for the disclosure or production of documents in applicable proceedings; the operation of the provisions involving apologies in the Defamation Ordinance (Cap. 21); and the operation of the Mediation Ordinance (Cap. 620), which provides, inter alia, that a mediation communication (which may contain an apology) may be disclosed for certain purposes, or admitted in evidence in proceedings, only with leave of a specified court or tribunal.

40. The Bills Committee notes that the meaning of "document" under clause 11(a) is governed by the rules of discovery or other similar procedural rules followed in the applicable proceedings in question. In other words, while the statements of fact conveyed in apologies are protected by the Bill, a plaintiff may still separately obtain evidence related to those facts by other independent means, for example, during discovery or by administering interrogatory or during cross-examination in the civil proceedings, to prove liability independently of an excluded apology. According to the Administration, however, clause 11(a) relating to "discovery, or a similar procedure" does not apply to situations where an apology maker is summoned by the relevant authority or tribunal¹⁰ in regulatory or disciplinary proceedings to produce a letter of apology. In such cases, the party being summoned to produce the letter would have the right to object to such production based on the apology legislation.¹¹

¹⁰ See, for example, section 37(1)(b)(iii) of the Property Management Services Ordinance (Cap. 626).

¹¹ See LC Paper No. CB(4)1086/16-17(01), item (e).

Committee stage amendments

41. As mentioned in paragraphs 26 and 33 above, the Administration proposes moving the CSAs in **Appendix III**, which are agreed by the Bills Committee. As advised by LSD, no difficulties have been identified in relation to the legal and drafting aspects of the proposed CSAs. The Bills Committee will not move any CSAs in its name.

Resumption of the Second Reading debate

42. The Bills Committee supports the Administration's proposal to resume the Second Reading debate on the Bill at the Council meeting of 12 July 2017.

Consultation with the House Committee

43. The Bills Committee reported its deliberations to the House Committee on 23 June 2017.

Council Business Division 4
Legislative Council Secretariat
5 July 2017

Bills Committee on Apology Bill

Membership list

Chairman Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding

Members Hon James TO Kun-sun
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon Claudia MO
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon Kenneth LEUNG
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP
Hon Dennis KWOK Wing-hang (*since 15 March 2017*)
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP
Hon YUNG Hoi-yan
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP
Dr Hon YIU Chung-yim

(Total : 17 members)

Clerk Ms Angel WONG

Legal Adviser Mr Bonny LOO

Date 15 March 2017

Bills Committee on Apology Bill

**List of deputations and individuals
who have submitted views to the Bills Committee**

1. Hong Kong Mediation and Arbitration Centre
2. Mr Louis YEUNG Ka-fuk
3. Ms LAM Wing-kwan
4. Community Mediation Services Association
5. St. James' Settlement, Continued Education Centre
6. Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong
7. Rapport Action Community Development
8. The Civic Party
9. JC Professional Dispute Resolution Centre
10. Mr CHAN Wai-kit
11. Society for Community Organization, The Hong Kong Human Rights Commission and Hong Kong Patient's Rights Association
(*Joint submission*)
12. Hong Kong Mediation Centre
13. Greater China Institute of Property Management
14. Professor IU Ting-kwok
15. Dr Joseph LEUNG
16. The Patients and Healthcare Professionals Rights Association

17. Hong Kong Social Workers and Welfare Employees Union
18. Mr MA Kwok-ho
19. Mr Ryman WONG Tung-yau
20. Ms LUK Yee-ling
- *21. Centre for Health Education and Health Promotion, The Chinese University of Hong Kong
- *22. Dr TONG Kar-wai
- *23. 黃匡平先生
- *24. The Hong Kong Federation of Insurers

* submitted written views only

Apology Bill

Committee Stage

Amendments to be moved by the Secretary for Justice

Clause

Amendment Proposed

8(2) By deleting “all the relevant circumstances” and substituting “the public interest or the interests of the administration of justice”.

Schedule

By adding—

- “4. Proceedings of the Legislative Council, including proceedings of a committee, panel or subcommittee established or mandated by the Legislative Council to discharge a function or exercise a power of the Legislative Council.”.