

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)2407/06-07

Ref. : CB2/PL/CA

**Report of the Panel on Constitutional Affairs
for submission to the Legislative Council**

PURPOSE

This report gives an account of the work of the Panel on Constitutional Affairs during the 2006-2007 Legislative Council (LegCo) session. It will be tabled at the Council meeting on 11 July 2007 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 and 9 October 2002 for the purpose of monitoring and examining Government policies and issues of public concern relating to constitutional affairs. The terms of reference of the Panel are in **Appendix I**.
3. The Panel comprises 40 members, with Dr Hon LUI Ming-wah and Hon TAM Yiu-chung elected as Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Panel respectively. The membership of the Panel is in **Appendix II**.

MAJOR WORK

Election of the third term Chief Executive

4. The Panel was briefed on the key electoral arrangements for the third term Chief Executive (CE) election which would be held on 25 March 2007.

Venue and polling hours

5. Members requested the Administration to explain its decision to conduct the CE election at the Asia World-Expo (AWE) near the Hong Kong International Airport at Chek Lap Kok which was very far from the city centre and not easily accessible by public transport, instead of at the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC). According to the Registration and Electoral Office (REO), it had started in July 2005 to seek a suitable venue in HKCEC for a period of six to seven days surrounding 25 March 2007, but venues at HKCEC were not available during the period. Having regard to the fact that the venue for the CE election should be large enough to accommodate a polling station, a counting station which comprised a

counting zone, resting and seating areas for Election Committee (EC) members, candidates and agents, a working area for the media, and a seating area for members of the public who wished to observe the counting of votes, REO came to the view in February 2006 that AWE was the only available and suitable venue.

6. In view of the Panel's concern that some EC members might not be familiar with the location of AWE and the time for the first round of voting from 9:00 am to 10:00 am was too short, the Electoral Affairs Commission (EAC) agreed to extend the time for the first round of voting in the case of a contested election, and the polling hours in the case of an uncontested election, from one to two hours, i.e. from 9:00 am to 11:00 am.

Election forums

7. Some members considered that the Administration should organize election forums to provide opportunities for members of the public to pose questions directly to candidates of the CE election and to be apprised of their platforms.

8. The Administration explained that as it was possible for the incumbent CE to run for re-election in a CE election, it was inappropriate for the Administration to host any election forum. However, organizations such as professional or trade organizations, academic institutions, media, etc, might organize election forums for the CE election, and the Administration would render assistance to the organizations concerned in respect of booking of venues for forums.

Electioneering activities conducted by the incumbent CE

9. Following a high-profile visit by the Honourable Donald TSANG Yam-kuen in his official car to his newly opened campaign office during office hours on 22 January 2007, some members criticized that the CE was taking an unfair advantage in using public resources to campaign for re-election. To avoid conflict of interest, they suggested that the CE should follow the practice of the CE of the Macau Special Administrative Region, who had taken leave before running for the second term. The Panel was advised that in accordance with the electoral guidelines issued by the EAC, CE candidates could not use public resources for election campaigns, except for certain types of services which he was entitled to use for his private purposes by virtue of his post or job. In accordance with the Basic Law, the incumbent CE might seek re-election once, and there was no requirement for him to take leave.

10. Regarding some members' concern whether the expenses incurred by the CE for such activities would be counted as election expenses, the Panel noted that a CE seeking re-election had to separate the resources spent on his duties as CE from his election expenses. It was a statutory requirement for candidates to submit an election return with the accounts of all election expenses and election donations to the Returning Officer after the election, including expenses incurred in connection with the preparatory work of an election.

Subscribers and political affiliation of CE

11. Some members requested the Administration to consider whether the subscription requirement for the CE election should be brought in line with that for other elections. They pointed out that unlike the LegCo and District Council (DC) elections, the names of the subscribers to candidates of the CE election were required to be published in the Gazette, and there was no cap on the number of subscribers. As regards the LegCo and DC elections, while the names of subscribers were made available for public inspection, there was no requirement for them to be published in the Gazette. In addition, a cap was imposed on the number of subscribers.

12. Some members reiterated that the Administration should review the existing statutory requirement for the CE-elect to relinquish his political affiliation with a view to promoting political party development. The Panel noted the Administration's advice that the requirement, which enabled a CE to go beyond partisan considerations and to take into account the views of LegCo Members, political parties and groups, and different sectors of the community when making important policy decisions, should be maintained.

Questionable ballot papers

13. Some members expressed concern about the use of an overhead projector in the process of determining the validity of questionable ballot papers at the CE election on 25 March 2007. They pointed out that the purpose of a secret ballot was to prevent illegal and corrupt conduct at an election. If it was the intention of an elector who had entered into a voting arrangement with a candidate to mark the ballot paper in such a way that he could be identified by the candidate, displaying the ballot paper by way of an overhead projector for public inspection would assist in furthering such illegal and corrupt conduct. They considered that ballot papers not marked properly should be regarded as invalid, and requested the Administration to address the concerns raised in the context of the review to be conducted on the CE election.

Constitutional development after 2007

14. Since 2005, the Commission on Strategic Development (CSD) had been tasked by the CE to study the possible models for electing the CE and forming the LegCo by universal suffrage. During the 2006-2007 session, the Panel continued to monitor the progress of the discussions of the CSD and discussed the relevant issues with the Administration at a number of meetings.

Role of CSD

15. Some members expressed dissatisfaction on a number of occasions that the Administration was sidelining the role of LegCo by entrusting the CSD to study models for implementing universal suffrage. In their view, the composition of the CSD was not representative as its members were appointed by the CE, and the operation of the CSD was not transparent as its discussions were held in closed sessions.

16. The Administration responded that members of the CSD were drawn from a wide spectrum of the community including LegCo Members, individuals with or without political background, professionals, businessmen, prominent labour and media personalities. The work carried out by CSD sought to build up consensus through collecting a wide spectrum of views on how universal suffrage should be attained, narrowing the differences in opinion through discussions, and striving to reach consensus on the relevant issues.

Public consultation and green paper on constitutional development

17. In October 2006, some members urged the Administration to conduct a public consultation on constitutional development before submitting a report on the discussions of the CSD to the Central Authorities. The CE undertook during his election campaign that a green paper on constitutional development (the Green Paper) would be published in mid-2007, after the third term Government had been formed in July. Following a three-month consultation period, the Administration would submit a report to the Central Authorities, which would reflect any mainstream views formed during the public consultation and other views expressed.

18. Some members requested the Administration to consider extending the three-month public consultation period as it would coincide with the summer recess of the Council and many members of the public would be away from Hong Kong in the summer. Some other members considered that a three-month public consultation period was in line with the usual practice and acceptable. A member considered it more practical for the public consultation exercise to be conducted in 2009, given that the composition of the LegCo would change after the 2008 election and public aspiration for universal suffrage might also change with time. The Administration explained that the CE had pledged to make the best endeavour to resolve the issue of universal suffrage within his next term of office. Given that universal suffrage was a complicated issue, it would be prudent to start the discussion early. The Green Paper public consultation was only a start. After the public consultation exercise, there would be further stages in which the question of universal suffrage would be further discussed.

19. The Panel noted that the Administration would set out in the Green Paper different views put forth by the CSD and the community on the models, roadmap and timetable for implementing universal suffrage, and present the relevant views as three types of options to facilitate public discussion. The proposals put forth by the 22 pan-democratic Members for electing the CE and forming LegCo by universal suffrage would be included in the Green Paper along with other proposals received in the past 20 months. The three types of options to be included in the Green Paper had to satisfy four criteria, i.e. they should be consistent with the Basic Law and should not require amendments to the main provisions of the articles of the Basic Law, they should attract majority support among the people of Hong Kong, they would stand a reasonable chance of securing two-thirds majority in the LegCo, and they would stand a good chance of being considered seriously by the Central Government.

20. Some members were concerned that the Administration would only set out all proposals received (including the proposal put forth by the 22 pan-democratic Members) in an annex to the Green Paper, and the three types of options included in the main text of the Green Paper would be formulated by mixing and matching the components of different proposals. They strongly objected to such an approach and considered that any proposals included in the Green Paper for public consultation should be presented in its entirety.

Models for electing CE and forming LegCo by universal suffrage

21. The Panel noted the possible models for electing the CE and forming the LegCo by universal suffrage from various organizations and individuals received by the Administration and the CSD, including the models proposed by some political parties and 22 pan-democratic Members. The Panel also received views from 21 organizations/individuals on the models, roadmap and timetable for electing the CE and forming the LegCo by universal suffrage at its meeting in May 2007.

22. On the possible models for electing the CE by universal suffrage, the Panel was informed that CSD members had agreed that after the nomination of candidates, the CE should be elected by universal suffrage on the basis of "one-person-one-vote". CSD members had discussed three key issues relating to possible models for electing the CE by universal suffrage, i.e. the composition and size of the nominating committee, the method of nomination and the method for selecting the CE by universal suffrage following nomination.

23. On nomination requirements, some members noted that the CSD had discussed proposals such as whether candidates should be required to secure a certain number of nominations in each sector of the nominating committee to ensure that the candidates had a certain level of support from different sectors and strata, and the CE elected would be acceptable to both the Central Authorities and the people of Hong Kong. These members expressed grave concern that candidates were required to go through a preliminary selection process whereby members of the nominating committee could have a power of veto. They requested the Administration to ensure that the model for selecting the CE by universal suffrage should comply with the democratic principles i.e. the nomination threshold should be set a low level to enable more candidates to take part in the election, and the nominating committee should be broadly representative.

24. Some members considered that the model for electing the CE should comply with Article 45 of the Basic Law which clearly stipulated the establishment of a broadly representative nominating committee, although its composition was open for discussion.

25. On possible models for forming the LegCo, some members expressed strong objection to the proposal of implementing a bicameral legislature as the Basic Law Drafting Committee had vetoed the proposal and the Basic Law did not provide for a bicameral system. In their view, the bicameral system which sought to retain the

functional constituencies (FCs) was against the principle of equal and universal suffrage.

26. The Panel noted that some CSD members had expressed the view that the implementation of a bicameral system would require amendments to the Basic Law, and queried whether it was worth the effort to do so if the bicameral system was meant to be a transitional arrangement. CSD members had subsequently decided to set aside for the time being any further discussions on a bicameral system as an option for implementing universal suffrage.

Roadmap and timetable for universal suffrage

27. Some Panel members agreed with the view of some CSD members that consideration should be given to the direction of "resolving the simple issues before the difficult ones" in taking forward constitutional development. As there were still significant differences among different sectors of the community on models for forming LegCo by universal suffrage, particularly on how FCs should evolve, these members considered that universal suffrage for the CE should be implemented first. However, these members had diverse views on whether universal suffrage for CE should be attained in 2012 or thereafter. Some other Panel members strongly objected to the proposal for universal suffrage for the CE to precede that for LegCo and considered that "dual universal suffrage" should be implemented in 2012.

28. On the universal suffrage model for the LegCo, some members maintained the view that the FCs should be abolished in entirety when universal suffrage was attained in 2012. Some other members considered that if universal suffrage for CE could be implemented in 2012, FC seats could be abolished by three stages in 2016, 2020 and 2024 so as to comply with the principle of "gradual and orderly progress".

Proposed re-organization of policy bureaux of the Government Secretariat

29. Following the announcement by the CE on 3 May 2007 to re-organize the policy bureaux of the Government Secretariat with effect from 1 July 2007, the Panel held five special meetings in May 2007 to discuss the distribution of responsibilities among the policy bureaux, the changes in the civil service organizational structure consequential to the proposed re-organization, and the nature of the legislative amendments to effect the transfer of statutory functions arising from the re-organization. As at 6 June 2007, the Panel received views from a total of 772 organizations/individuals on the proposed re-organization and related issues (including identical submissions from 734 individuals).

30. The Panel noted that the major impact on the structure of the Government Secretariat following the proposed re-organization was as follows -

- (a) a new bureau (i.e. the Labour and Welfare Bureau) would be created;

- (b) eight existing bureaux (and also the Administration Wing under the Chief Secretary for Administration's Office) would have their policy responsibilities re-organized; and
- (c) three existing bureaux (i.e. the Civil Service Bureau, the Financial Services and Treasury Bureau and the Security Bureau) would not be affected by the proposed re-organization. Their structures and names would remain unchanged.

The Panel also noted that the Administration had taken the opportunity to align the terms of employment of the post of the Director of Chief Executive's Office with those of a Director of Bureau.

31. Some members criticized the tight timetable proposed by the Administration and queried the need for the proposed re-organization to be implemented on 1 July 2007. These members pointed out that the 11 policy bureaux were established when the Accountability System for Principal Officials was implemented in 2002. It was logical and reasonable for the Administration to review the Accountability System before making any proposals to re-organize the existing policy bureaux. Some of these members considered that the Administration should consult the public on the proposed changes before implementation.

32. The Administration explained that the CE considered that the economic, social and other developments experienced by Hong Kong since the implementation of the Accountability System in 2002 had necessitated a review to ascertain if the current structure could enable Hong Kong to meet the challenges which the third term Government had to address. In addition, there was also a need to ensure an even distribution of work among policy bureaux. It was the intention of the Administration that the proposed re-organization should be implemented for the third term Government on 1 July 2007. The Administration advised that it would analyze the views received on the Consultation Document entitled "Further Development of the Political Appointment System" and announce its decision on the way forward in the latter half of 2007. The Administration would address any issues relating to the Accountability System, including whether the "no revolving door" requirement should apply to the position of the Secretary for the Civil Service, in the context of this consultation exercise.

33. Some members supported the proposed re-organization which aimed to rationalize the distribution of responsibilities between policy bureaux and facilitate the CE to implement the priority policy initiatives pledged during the CE election. Some members raised a number of issues pertaining to the proposed re-organization, including the grading and ranking of a few individual posts, the titles of a few bureaux, and the distribution of some policy portfolios among bureaux under the new set-up. Some members expressed grave concern that the proposal to transfer the legal aid portfolio from the Administration Wing of the Chief Secretary for Administration's Office to the Home Affairs Bureau, a policy bureau, would downgrade the status of the Legal Aid Department and undermine its independence.

In their view, the actual and perceived independence of the provision of legal aid was of paramount importance to the upholding of the rule of law in Hong Kong.

34. The Panel had considered whether it should discuss the draft legislative amendments to give effect to the proposed re-organization of policy bureaux. Some members considered that it was inappropriate for the Panel, which was tasked to discuss the policy aspect of the proposed re-organization, to do so. They were adamant that the established procedure for scrutinizing subsidiary legislation by a subcommittee formed under the House Committee should be respected and adhered to by the Administration. On 18 May 2007, the House Committee formed a subcommittee to study the relevant legislative amendments.

2007 District Council election

35. The 2007 DC election will be held on 18 November 2007. The Panel noted that in line with past practice during DC election years, the Administration would organize a voter registration campaign for 2007 which would last for six weeks, running from early June to 16 July 2007.

Ballot papers and financial assistance scheme

36. The Panel was consulted on the following proposals made by the EAC relating to the DC elections -

- (a) to extend the arrangement to allow the printing of names, emblems and photographs on ballot papers, adopted in the LegCo elections since 2004, to the DC elections; and
- (b) to introduce a financial assistance scheme for candidates of the DC election. Under the scheme, DC election candidates who were elected or who received 5% of valid votes or more were eligible for financial assistance. The subsidy rate was set at \$10 per vote, and the amount of financial assistance payable to each candidate was capped at 50% of the actual election expenses of the candidate.

37. The Panel noted that the financial assistance scheme would be basically the same as the existing scheme for candidates of the LegCo election, except that a DC election candidate would not be required to submit an auditor's report in his election return. Under the circumstances, some members urged the Administration to review whether the requirement of mandatory auditing should continue to be imposed on LegCo election candidates who applied for financial assistance.

38. The Administration explained that if the requirement of mandatory auditing was imposed on DC election candidates, the auditing fee would take up a significant proportion of the financial assistance payable to them. In order not to undermine the objective of the scheme, DC election candidates would not be required to submit auditor's reports on their accounts of election expenses. Nevertheless, they were

required to submit election returns to the REO for checking. In view of the large amount of election expenses involved in LegCo elections, the requirement to submit auditor's reports was necessary to ensure that a transparent and fair system was in place, to safeguard public expenditure.

Election expense limit

39. The Panel was consulted on the following two options regarding the election expense limit for the 2007 DC election -

- (a) "status quo" option : this option was based on the premise that the updated estimate of the election expenses incurred by a DC election candidate still stayed within the existing limit of \$45,000 and there had not been any specific demand for adjustment of the limit, either upwards or downwards, since the limit was last reviewed in 2003; and
- (b) "inflation adjustment" option : this option took into account the fact that the existing election expense limit of \$45,000 had not been revised since 1994. Applying the cumulative inflation rate of 8.2%, the election expense limit would be increased to \$48,000.

40. Some members supported the "status quo" option as there was no indication of any substantial increase in the costs of conducting electioneering activities since the last election and the median amount of election expenses incurred by the candidates in the 2003 DC election was \$26,764 only. Some other members supported the "inflation adjustment" option on the ground that candidates were free to spend as much or as little as they wished, provided that their election expenses stayed within the prescribed limit. The Administration subsequently decided to adopt the new election expense limit of \$48,000, in line with the second option.

Practical arrangements for the 2007 DC election

41. In June 2007, the Panel was briefed on the key electoral arrangements proposed by the EAC for the 2007 DC election. As candidates would be allowed to have certain specified particulars relating to them printed on the ballot papers, the size of the new ballot papers would be about 70% larger than that of the 2003 DC election. In the light of the problems concerning the ballot boxes on the polling day of the 2004 LegCo election, the Panel requested the REO to conduct careful and thorough testing on the ballot boxes for use in the 2007 DC election.

42. Some members reiterated their support for the introduction of "advance polling" and "no canvassing day". The Administration maintained the view that "advance polling" should not be introduced, in view of the implications of the release of exit poll results for advance polling before the close of polls on the polling day and the practical difficulties in legislating against the release of exit poll results by the media. As regards "no canvassing day", the Administration was of the view that prohibiting canvassing activities would have an adverse effect on the election atmosphere on the polling day.

Review of the role, functions and composition of DCs

43. In mid-October 2006, the Administration briefed the Panel on the outcome of the public consultation on the Consultation Document entitled "Review of the Role, Functions and Composition of District Councils" and the plan to implement a pilot scheme in four districts, namely Wan Chai, Wong Tai Sin, Sai Kung and Tuen Mun with effect from 1 January 2007. The Panel noted that having considered the views collected, the Administration made several minor revisions relating to the setting up of a District Facilities Management Committee under each DC and the new remuneration package for DC members. The pilot scheme served to test out protocols and working relationship amongst the various stakeholders in order to pave the way for a smooth and effective roll-out to all 18 districts from the next DC term in January 2008. A tertiary institution would be engaged as consultant to conduct an evaluation study on the implementation of the pilot scheme.

44. The Panel was advised that although the Consultation Document was the joint effort of the Home Affairs Bureau and the Constitutional Affairs Bureau, it was mainly the task of the former to implement the pilot scheme. Under the circumstances, the Panel agreed that the subject should be followed up by the Panel on Home Affairs in future.

Accountability System for Principal Officials

Further development of the Political Appointment System

45. The Consultation Document entitled "Further Development of the Political Development System" was published in July 2006 for public consultation until 30 November 2006. The proposals in the Consultation Document sought to create new positions within the Government, namely Deputy Directors of Bureau and Assistants to Directors of Bureau, with the aim of strengthening support for Principal Officials (POs) in carrying out political work.

46. The Panel noted that under the proposals, political appointees could come from political party, academic, professional, business, civil service and other backgrounds. The existing Code for Principal Officials under the Accountability System would, with necessary modifications, apply to the political appointees of the two new layers. To cater for candidates with different skills and experience, the remuneration for Deputy Directors of Bureau and Assistants to Directors of Bureau were proposed to be pitched, respectively, within a range equivalent to 65% to 75% and 35% to 50% of the remuneration package approved by the Finance Committee in 2002 for a Director of Bureau.

47. The Administration had responded to the following main concerns raised by members on the proposals in the Consultation Document -

- (a) whether the proposals were conducive to democratic development in Hong Kong which should be predicated on a multi-party system and the development of political parties;
- (b) how the proposals could achieve the objectives of improving governance, providing better service to the community, providing a more comprehensive career path for political talents and enhancing the relationship between the executive and the legislature;
- (c) how the appointment of political appointees, who were not drawn from political parties/groups, could strengthen the Administration's capability in securing support from the LegCo on its policy initiatives;
- (d) how to ensure a clear delineation of role and responsibilities between the political tier and the civil service; and
- (e) how to guard against conflict of interest of political appointees during office and after their stepping down from office.

48. The Panel noted that the implementation of the proposals set out in the Consultation Document would not take place before the third term CE assumed office. The actual timing and pace of implementation would be subject to, among others, the availability of resources and individuals of the right calibre to fill the new positions.

Prevention of conflict of interest under the Code for Principal Officials under the Accountability system

49. Arising from an incident where Mr SUEN Ming-yeung, Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands, had jointly bought a race horse with, among others, the President of the Real Estate Developers' Association of Hong Kong, the Panel discussed issues concerning prevention of conflict of interest by POs. The Administration had explained the principles and requirements which POs should follow in the performance of their duties, including measures which aimed at preventing conflict of interest.

50. Noting the Administration's advice that it had studied the case of Mr SUEN and concluded that the joint investment did not constitute a conflict of interest between his investment and his official duties, some members did not agree with the stance of the Administration. They pointed out that the general public expected that POs would keep a distance from the sectors that had a close connection with their policy portfolios and avoid putting themselves in a position where their acts could be construed as a conflict of interest. While the investment made by Mr SUEN might not have constituted a conflict of interest, the public perception was that his close relationship with real estate developers would influence his judgment in the performance of his duties. According to the Code for Principal Officials, POs should avoid putting themselves in a position where they might arouse any suspicion of dishonesty, unfairness or conflict of interest, and should refrain from handling

cases with actual or potential conflict of interest. These members considered that the concern raised was not about the case per se, but the effectiveness of the existing system of declaration of investments and interests by POs and how the system could be improved to avoid future recurrence. They pointed out that under the existing system, if a PO chose not to report his investments to the CE, there was no way for the CE to assess whether his investments constituted a conflict of interest. They considered that the Administration should adopt objective benchmarks to assess whether there was a conflict of interest in a particular case.

51. The Administration advised the Panel that the Code for Principal Officials, with any necessary modifications, would be adapted to apply to the new political positions under the further development of the Political Appointment System. The Administration would take the opportunity to review the Code in the context of that exercise.

PANEL MEETINGS

52. From October 2006 to June 2007, the Panel held a total of 15 meetings.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
6 July 2007

Appendix I

Panel on Constitutional Affairs

Terms of Reference

1. To monitor and examine Government policies and issues of public concern relating to implementation of the Joint Declaration and the Basic Law, relations between the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region Government and the Central People's Government and other Mainland authorities, electoral matters and district organizations.
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 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 Constitutional Affairs

Membership list for 2006-2007 session

Chairman	Dr Hon LUI Ming-wah, SBS, JP
Deputy Chairman	Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Members	Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP Hon Albert HO Chun-yan Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, SBS, S.B.St.J., JP Hon LEE Cheuk-yan Hon Martin LEE Chu-ming, SC, JP Hon Margaret NG Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-yee, GBS, JP Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP Hon Bernard CHAN, GBS, JP Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, GBS, JP Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong, GBS Hon WONG Yung-kan, SBS, JP Hon Jasper TSANG Yok-sing, GBS, JP Hon Howard YOUNG, SBS, JP Dr Hon YEUNG Sum, JP Hon LAU Kong-wah, JP Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, SBS, JP Hon LI Fung-ying, BBS, JP Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH Hon LEE Wing-tat Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, SBS, JP Hon MA Lik, GBS, JP Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki

Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, BBS
Hon TONG Ka-wah, SC
Hon CHIM Pui-chung
Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP
Hon KWONG Chi-kin

(Total : 40 members)

Clerk Mrs Percy MA

Legal Adviser Mr Arthur CHEUNG

Date 3 July 2007