

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)1134/12-13(04)

Ref : CB2/PL/CA

Panel on Constitutional Affairs

**Updated background brief prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat
for the meeting on 20 May 2013**

**Third Report of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region
in the light of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights**

Purpose

This paper gives an account of the discussions of the Panel on Home Affairs ("the HA Panel") on the concluding observations issued by the United Nations ("UN") Human Rights Committee ("HRC") after consideration of the second report of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("HKSAR") in the light of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights ("ICCPR"), and the discussions of the Panel on Constitutional Affairs¹ ("the CA Panel") in respect of the third report of HKSAR.

Background

2. The Government of the United Kingdom ("UK") extended ICCPR to Hong Kong in 1976. Article 39 of the Basic Law ("BL") provides that the provisions of ICCPR as applied to Hong Kong shall remain in force. On 22 November 1997, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Beijing announced that in order to fully realize the "One Country, Two Systems" principle, separate reports on the implementation of ICCPR and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights ("ICESCR") in HKSAR would be submitted to the UN treaty monitoring bodies. The Government of the People's Republic of China ("PRC") ratified ICESCR in 2001. The Government of PRC has signed but has not yet ratified ICCPR.

3. Formerly, reports in the light of ICCPR were required every five years. The first report of HKSAR in the light of ICCPR was submitted to UN in early 1999 and was heard by HRC in November 1999. Since 1999, HRC has changed to specify the date for the submission of the next report of HKSAR in the

¹ With effect from the 2008-2009 legislative session, issues relating to human rights have been placed under the purview of the Panel on Constitutional Affairs.

concluding observations issued after consideration of a report submitted by HKSAR.

4. The second report of HKSAR in the light of ICCPR was submitted to HRC in January 2005. After consideration of the second report of HKSAR at its hearing held on 20 and 21 March 2006, HRC issued its concluding observations on 30 March 2006, a copy of which was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(2)1653/05-06(01) on 4 April 2006. The Administration's report on its follow-up to the concluding observations was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(2)369/07-08(01) on 16 November 2007.

Major issues raised by the HA Panel on the concluding observations issued by HRC after consideration of the second report of HKSAR

5. The HA Panel discussed the concluding observations issued by HRC after consideration of the second report of HKSAR and the Administration's initial response to the concluding observations with deputations at its meeting on 9 June 2006. The Panel further discussed the Administration's follow-up to the concluding observations at its meeting on 11 January 2008. The major concerns raised by members at these meetings are summarized in paragraphs 6 to 14.

Reservation in relation to Article 25 of ICCPR and establishment of an elected legislature

6. Some members queried the applicability of the reservation in relation to Article 25 of ICCPR² to HKSAR. They pointed out that the court had already expressed the view that the justification given by the Government for maintaining the reservation was not legally sound. Moreover, HRC had repeatedly pointed out that once an elected LegCo was established, its election had to conform to Article 25 of ICCPR.

7. The Administration maintained its view that the reservation in relation to Article 25 of ICCPR did apply to Hong Kong and there was no obligation under ICCPR as applied to HKSAR to introduce universal suffrage at the present stage. The Administration considered that its submissions made to HRC in respect of the interpretation were based upon principles stated in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, e.g. Articles 31 and 32, and the Government's approach to the interpretation of the reservation was firmly based on international law principles.

² "Every citizen shall have the right and the opportunity, without any of the distinctions mentioned in Article 2 of ICCPR and without unreasonable restrictions: (a) to take part in the conduct of public affairs, directly or through freely chosen representatives; (b) to vote and to be elected at genuine periodic elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret ballot, guaranteeing the free expression of the will of the electors; and (c) to have access, on general terms of equality, to public service in his country." (Article 25 of ICCPR)

8. Members may wish to note that in *Lee Miu Ling v Attorney General* (1995) 5 HKPLR 181, Keith J made an obiter dictum in his judgment that section 13 of the Hong Kong Bill of Rights Ordinance (Cap. 383) ("HKBORO") (which mirrored the reservation made against Article 25(b) of ICCPR) was, to the extent that it related to LegCo, a dead letter, after the Letters Patent were amended to provide for a wholly elected LegCo in 1995. In *Chan Yu Nam v Secretary for Justice* (HCAL32/2009 and HCAL55/2009), Andrew Cheung J considered that the reservation of British Government relating to Article 25(b) of ICCPR had the effect of permitting elections for functional constituencies ("FCs") in general and corporate voting in particular to be practiced in Hong Kong. Andrew Cheung J also considered Keith J's obiter dictum that the reservation in relation to Article 25(b) of ICCPR was spent in his judgment. Andrew Cheung J was of the view that Keith J was addressing the position in Hong Kong in 1995 when the Letters Patent had been amended to provide for a wholly elected legislature and his view did not affect the position back in 1990 when BL was promulgated and the application of ICCPR to Hong Kong was still subject to the British reservation and thus there was no question of the reservation having become spent at that time even under Keith J's reasoning.

9. For a historical account of development on the issue of the reservation made in respect of Article 25(b) of ICCPR, members may refer to the information paper prepared by the LegCo Secretariat [LC Paper No. CB(2)1652/09-10(02)] which is available at http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr09-10/english/hc/sub_com/hs52/papers/hs520531cb2-1652-2-e.pdf.

Non-implementation of HRC's recommendations and setting up of a human rights commission

10. Some members queried the justification for the Administration's view that the recommendations made by the UN treaty monitoring bodies were not legally-binding. They considered that the Administration was not sincere and lacked commitment in implementing HRC's recommendations and in responding to their concerns. The Administration explained to the HA Panel that a recommendation made by HRC was accepted by the Administration to be binding insofar as it reflected obligations imposed on the HKSAR Government under ICCPR. However, the Administration was not obliged to follow a recommendation which, in its view, did not arise from any obligation under ICCPR, such as the recommendation of setting up a human rights commission in HKSAR.

11. In response to the enquiry on whether the Administration would consider setting up a task force joined by representatives of non-governmental

organizations ("NGOs") to work out concrete proposals for taking forward the recommendation of establishing the human rights commission, the Administration advised that currently it had no plan or timetable for setting up such an institution but welcomed the participation of NGOs in the work of protecting human rights and the opportunity to exchange views on the matter with representatives of NGOs at meetings of the Human Rights Forum.

Procedures by which an interpretation of BL provisions could be made

12. Some members held the view that the issues subject to interpretation should be made known under the procedures of interpretation of BL, so that the Administration could give the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of PRC ("NPCSC") advice on the human rights implications arising from the interpretation.

13. The Administration responded that there were three ways in which NPCSC could give an interpretation of the provisions of BL -

- (a) the Court of Final Appeal ("CFA") could make a reference and, in this case, the Court would determine the documents to be submitted to NPCSC;
- (b) CE could make a request and, in this situation, the Administration should be able to consider sending submissions on human right matters; and
- (c) NPCSC could make an interpretation on its own initiative. In this situation, it was not clear whether the Administration had any avenue to forward submissions on human right matters.

14. The Administration further pointed out that, if NPCSC were to make any further interpretation of BL provisions in the future, it would have to take into account the obligation which existed under BL39, i.e. to ensure that the provisions of ICCPR, among other things, would continue to remain in force and to be implemented in HKSAR, and no law could contravene that obligation. Any interpretation of BL provisions, whether by HKSAR courts or by NPCSC, would have to take into account that obligation.

15. Members may wish to refer to the background briefs (LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1291/05-06(02) and CB(2)746/07-08(02)) prepared by the Legislative Council ("LegCo") Secretariat for the past discussions of the HA Panel on the first and the second reports of HKSAR in the light of ICCPR.

Discussions of the CA Panel on the third report of HKSAR

16. In June 2010, the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau issued the outline of topics to be included in the third report of HKSAR for public consultation. The CA Panel discussed the outline of topics with deputations and the Administration at its meeting on 21 June 2010. The HKSAR's third report was submitted to UN in 2011. The CA Panel discussed the third report with the Administration on 21 November 2011. In November 2012, HRC published a list of issues to be taken up in connection with the consideration of the HKSAR's third report. The Administration's written response to the list of issues raised by HRC was circulated vide LC Paper No. CB(2)882/12-13(01) on 27 March 2013.

17. Prior to the UN hearing on HKSAR's third report held in mid-March 2013, the CA Panel further discussed the third report with deputations and the Administration at its meeting on 18 February 2013. The major issues raised by members at these meetings are summarized in paragraphs 18 to 32 below.

Development of democracy

18. At the CA Panel meeting on 21 June 2010, some members expressed concern that the Administration's constitutional reform package for electing the Chief Executive ("CE") and for forming LegCo in 2012 and the Democratic Party's proposal on "one-person-two-votes" for returning the five new District Council FC seats in 2012 did not conform to Article 25 of ICCPR. They reiterated that HRC had repeatedly pointed out that once an elected LegCo was established, its election had to conform to Article 25 of ICCPR. They considered that the Administration's reliance on the reservation made in respect of Article 25(b) to justify the non-compliance of the electoral system for the formation of LegCo with that provision was not legally sound. In addition, the provisions of ICCPR including Article 25 had been incorporated in the laws of Hong Kong by way of HKBORO. They requested the Administration to explain in the third report of HKSAR as to whether its definition of the principles of universality and equality was different from that held by HRC.

19. The Administration explained that the Central People's Government notified the UN Secretary General in June 1997 that the provisions of ICCPR as applied to Hong Kong would remain in force beginning from 1 July 1997. In other words, those provisions which did not apply to Hong Kong (including Article 25(b) of ICCPR for which a reservation had been made by the UK Government when extending ICCPR to Hong Kong in 1976) would also not be applied to HKSAR. In the case of *Chan Yu Nam v Secretary for Justice* in 2009, the High Court was of the view that such reservation continued to apply to the HKSAR. The Administration also advised that Article 21 of Hong Kong Bill of Rights mirrored Article 25 of ICCPR and the reservation made in respect of Article 25(b) was specifically provided for in section 13 of HKBORO.

20. At the CA Panel meeting on 21 November 2011, some members reiterated their concerns about the legislative arrangement for implementing universal suffrage for selecting CE in 2017 and for forming LegCo in 2020. The Administration advised that universal suffrage was the ultimate aim of Hong Kong's constitutional development and NPCSC made a decision on 29 December 2007 on issues relating to universal suffrage. The Administration stressed that Hong Kong would have universal suffrage because of BL and not ICCPR and there was no provision in ICCPR regarding the model for the implementation of universal suffrage to be adopted by parties which ratified ICCPR.

Setting up of a human rights institution

21. Some members reiterated that the Administration should set up an independent human rights institution, as repeatedly recommended by HRC, to investigate and monitor human rights violations in HKSAR. The Administration reiterated its stance that given a comprehensive framework for the protection and promotion of human rights was in place in HKSAR, the Administration did not see the need to establish another human rights institution to duplicate the functions of the existing mechanism. While the Administration respected the recommendations of HRC, such recommendations were not legally binding. The Administration advised that ICCPR allowed each State Party to implement appropriate measures, taking account of its own situation, to discharge its obligations under ICCPR.

Support measures for non-Chinese speaking students

22. Some members urged the Administration to provide more support measures for non-Chinese speaking children and enhance the employment opportunities of ethnic minorities. They expressed concern that the number of ethnic minorities students attaining higher level of education was disproportionately low as compared with the majority of local students who were ethnic Chinese due to lack of a policy support to cater for their needs. Besides, many ethnic minorities had experienced difficulties in securing Government jobs due to their failure to meet the Chinese language proficiency requirement.

23. The Administration advised that the Education Bureau had implemented a series of measures to provide education support for non-Chinese speaking students since 2006-2007 academic year and it would take time to evaluate the effectiveness of these support measures. In 2011, 17 out of a total of 64 non-Chinese speaking students applying for admission to post-secondary institutions were admitted, representing a success rate of 27%. The Administration added that individual Government Departments would have regard to their respective operational needs and job requirements whilst stipulating the language requirement for their job vacancies.

Investigation of complaints against the Police

24. Some members reiterated that an independent mechanism for the investigation of complaints against Police should be set up and the recommendations made after an investigation should be made legally binding on relevant authorities. The Administration advised that the Independent Police Complaints Council ("IPCC") was made a statutory and independent body since the commencement of the IPCC Ordinance (Cap. 604) on 1 June 2009. The Administration considered that the operation of IPCC, which comprised 24 non-official members from a wide spectrum of the community, had been effective since its inception. The Administration pledged to provide the necessary resources for IPCC to ensure effective performance of its role.

Torture claims

25. Some members expressed concern on whether the handling of torture claims by the Administration had complied with the UN Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The Administration advised that it had briefed the Panel on Security at its meeting held in December 2009 on the enhanced mechanism for screening torture claims and the pilot scheme to provide publicly-funded legal assistance to torture claimants who met the requirements. The Administration was of the view that Hong Kong's relative economic prosperity in the region and its liberal visa regime would make the territory vulnerable to possible abuses if the UN 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees ("CSR") was applied to Hong Kong. The Administration had a firm policy of not granting asylum and its established position on CSR remained unchanged.

Press freedom and freedom of information

26. In response to the concern about incidents of restrictions on media news coverage by the Police, the Administration explained that the Police would liaise with the event organizers with a view to reaching a consensus on the arrangements for news reporting activities taking into account the time, location, number of participants of a public activity. The major considerations of the Police included striking a balance among public safety, public order and the disruption caused to the nearby area and traffic arrangement, so as to ensure that the activity would be conducted in a safe and orderly manner. As long as Police operations would not be affected, media news coverage would be facilitated as far as practicable.

27. At the CA Panel meeting on 18 February 2013, some members expressed concern that Hong Kong's ranking for press freedom had fallen to a five-year low of 58th in the world. These members stressed the importance of safeguarding freedom of information and press freedom to the development and progress of the society. Some members further called on the Administration to enact an

archives law and a law on freedom of information to ensure freedom of public access to Government information.

28. The Administration advised that The Ombudsman was conducting a direct investigation into the access to information regime in Hong Kong. Besides, the Law Reform Commission had set up two subcommittees to review in detail the topic of access to information and embark on a comprehensive study of the relevant laws in overseas jurisdictions with a view to making recommendations. Pending the outcome of the investigation and study, the Administration would take necessary action to follow up the recommendations. The Administration advised that since the introduction of the Code on Access to Information ("the Code") in 1995, about 98% of the requests for information held by bureaux and departments were met in full or in part. The Administration would continue to monitor compliance with the Code by the Government.

Freedom of procession and assembly

29. Some members considered that there had been retrogression in freedom of procession and assembly since the Reunification, and more and more participants of public processions and demonstrations were prosecuted under the Public Order Ordinance (Cap. 245). Some other members, however considered that, while freedom of procession and assembly should be respected, the majority of Hong Kong people would not support unlawful activities that would seriously affect public order. Some members pointed out that the 2012-2013 Rule of Law Index Report released by the World Justice Project showed that Hong Kong was falling in ranking to 31st for protection of the fundamental rights while its ranking for order and security was the second highest in the world. These members considered that the Administration should attach the same importance to safeguarding order and security and to protecting fundamental human rights. The Administration advised that the Police respected the rights of members of the public to conduct peaceful assemblies and processions. However, the participants should observe the law and the Police would act resolutely against persons who breached the law.

Discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation

30. Some members pointed out that HRC had expressed concerns back in 1999 in its concluding observations on the HKSAR's initial report about the absence of legislative remedies to individuals in respect of discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation and HRC had recommended enactment of necessary legislation. These members considered that the Administration should not postpone conducting public consultation on whether legislation should be enacted to prohibit discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation, and urged the Administration to note that –

- (a) the findings of the survey³ sponsored by Hon Cyd HO in November 2012 showed that 63.8% of the respondents supported enacting legislation to protect people of different sexual orientations against discrimination, whereas only about 14% of the respondents were against it; and
- (b) although the motion on "Equal right for people of different sexual orientations" was negated at the Council meeting of 7 November 2012 because of failure to secure majority support of the Members returned by functional constituencies, 31 Members had voted for the motion.

31. Some members pointed out that some people of the society had the misunderstanding that enacting a law to protect people of different sexual orientations against discrimination was the same as legalization of same-sex marriage or might result in "reverse discrimination". These members requested the Administration to address such misunderstanding and suggested that the legislation, if enacted, might model on the existing anti-discrimination laws in the scope of protection.

32. The Administration explained that while the Government had no plan at present to conduct public consultation on whether legislation should be enacted to prohibit discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation given the controversial nature of the issue, the Administration would make sustained efforts in the promotion of equal opportunities for people of different sexual orientations and transgendered persons through public education and publicity. The Administration would increase provision for this area of work. Also, the Administration would study the relevant legislative and administrative measures adopted by overseas jurisdictions, and was planning to establish a new platform to exchange views with different stakeholders on this issue.

Recent development

33. HRC considered the third report of HKSAR at its hearing held on 12 and 13 March 2013 in Geneva. On 26 March 2013, HRC issued its concluding observations, a copy of which was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(2)906/12-13(01). The CA Panel will discuss the hearing of HRC on the third report of HKSAR in the light of ICCPR at the next meeting on 20 May 2013.

³ Hon Cyd HO sponsored a survey by the Public Opinion Programme of The University of Hong Kong in November 2012 with a view to gauging public views on whether legislation protecting people of different sexual orientations against discrimination should be enacted.

Relevant motions/questions and papers

34. At the Council meeting of 20 March 2013, Hon Emily LAU raised an oral question on "Government's response to the issues raised by UNHRC". The question raised and the Administration's reply are in **Appendix I**. Details of other questions and motions relating to ICCPR raised/moved at Council meetings since the First LegCo as well as relevant papers available on the LegCo website (<http://www.legco.gov.hk>) are in **Appendix II**.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
15 May 2013

Appendix I

Press Releases

繁體版 | 簡體版 | Email this article | www.info.gov.hk

LCQ1: Government's response to the issues raised by the United Nations Human Rights Committee

Following is a question by the Hon Emily Lau and a reply by the Acting Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs, Mr Lau Kong-wah, in the Legislative Council today (March 20):

Question:

In April 2011, the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) Government submitted, through the Central People's Government, its third report in the light of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (Covenant) to the United Nations Human Rights Committee (Committee). The Committee adopted a "List of issues to be taken up in connection with the consideration of the third periodic report of Hong Kong, China" (List of Issues) in November 2012, and conducted a hearing on that report in Geneva, Switzerland on the 12th and 13th of this month. In this connection, will the Executive Authorities inform this Council:

(a) given that paragraph 3 of the List of Issues requested the HKSAR Government to "indicate what further steps have been taken to ensure that the next Chief Executive and Legislative Council elections take place by universal suffrage in compliance with the Covenant", of the details of HKSAR Government's response to the Committee in this respect; and

(b) given that paragraph 3 of the List of Issues requested the HKSAR Government to describe "the conditions for nomination, e.g. age limits, and any other qualifications or restrictions" for the candidates for the next Chief Executive election, of the details of HKSAR Government's response to the Committee in this respect; and given the recent comment of the spokesman of the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference that he believed that Hong Kong people would elect a person who loved the country and Hong Kong to be the Chief Executive, whether the authorities will set "loving the country and Hong Kong" as one of the conditions for candidacy for the next Chief Executive election?

Reply:

Mr President,

Our reply to the questions raised by Hon Lau is as follows:

(a) The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) has made it clear in the "Third Report of the HKSAR of the People's Republic of China in the light of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights" and in its response to a written question raised by the United Nations Human Rights Committee (UNHRC) that, HKSAR is committed to attaining the ultimate aim of selecting the Chief Executive (CE) and electing all the members of the Legislative Council (LegCo) by universal suffrage in accordance with the Basic Law and the "Decision on Issues Relating to the Methods for Selecting the CE of the HKSAR and for Forming the LegCo of the HKSAR in the Year 2012 and on Issues Relating to Universal Suffrage" adopted by the Standing

Committee of the National People's Congress in December 2007 (the NPCSC's Decision).

(b) The Government of the HKSAR has made it clear in its response to a written question raised by the UNHRC that, Article 44 of the Basic Law provides that, "the CE of the HKSAR shall be a Chinese citizen of not less than 40 years of age who is a permanent resident of the Region with no right of abode in any foreign country and has ordinarily resided in Hong Kong for a continuous period of not less than 20 years".

As set out in the NPCSC's Decision, "in selecting the CE of the HKSAR by the method of universal suffrage, a broadly representative nominating committee shall be formed. The nominating committee may be formed with reference to the current provisions regarding the Election Committee in Annex I to the Hong Kong Basic Law. The nominating committee shall in accordance with democratic procedures nominate a certain number of candidates for the office of the CE, who is to be elected through universal suffrage by all registered electors of the HKSAR, and to be appointed by the Central People's Government".

As for the arrangements for implementing universal suffrage for the CE, the HKSAR Government will conduct extensive consultation with various sectors of the community in the process of formulating the method for electing the CE in 2017.


We would also like to reiterate that, since the reunification of the HKSAR with the Mainland China, the CE elections have been conducted strictly in accordance with the Basic Law and the Chief Executive Election Ordinance (Cap 569), and other relevant requirements and regulations.

The Basic Law and the Chief Executive Election Ordinance have set out clearly the basic qualification criteria for becoming the CE and the eligibility criteria for being a candidate for the CE election.

Any person who meets those qualification and eligibility criteria can stand as a candidate in the CE election. The HKSAR Government will act strictly in accordance with the law to ensure that the CE elections are held in an open, fair and honest manner.

Ends/Wednesday, March 20, 2013
Issued at HKT 13:05

NNNN

 [Print this page](#)

[News Archives](#) | [Yesterday's News](#)

**Relevant documents on Third Report
of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region
in the light of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights**

Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
Legislative Council	14 October 1998	Official Record of Proceedings (Written question raised by Hon Christine LOH)
	2 December 1998	Official Record of Proceedings (Oral question raised by Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung)
	9 June 1999	Official Record of Proceedings (Oral question raised by Hon Ambrose CHEUNG)
	24 November 1999	Official Record of Proceedings Pages 16 - 25 (Oral question raised by Hon YEUNG Sum)
	8 December 1999	Official Record of Proceedings Pages 50 - 60 (Oral question raised by Hon Emily LAU)
	29 March 2000	Official Record of Proceedings Pages 13 - 16 (Written question raised by Hon Cyd HO)
	21 February 2001	Official Record of Proceedings Pages 57 - 61 (Written question raised by Hon Cyd HO)
	12 December 2001	Official Record of Proceedings Pages 37 - 46 (Oral question raised by Hon James TO)
	18 December 2002	Official Record of Proceedings Pages 54 - 62 (Written question raised by Hon LEE Cheuk-yan)

Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
Legislative Council	9 April 2003	Official Record of Proceedings Pages 7 - 8 (Written question raised by Hon Cyd HO)
	20 October 2004	Official Record of Proceedings Pages 93 - 95 (Written question raised by Hon Fred LI)
	1 March 2006	Official Record of Proceedings Pages 39 - 48 (Oral question raised by Hon Emily LAU)
	1 March 2006	Official Record of Proceedings Pages 170 - 248 (Motion moved by Hon Emily LAU)
Panel on Home Affairs	9 June 2006 (Item III)	Agenda Minutes
Legislative Council	25 April 2007	Official Record of Proceedings Pages 7 - 17 (Oral question raised by Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung)
Panel on Home Affairs	11 January 2008 (Item IV)	Agenda Minutes
Legislative Council	2 July 2008	Official Record of Proceedings Pages 69 - 77 (Oral question raised by Hon Emily LAU)
	7 January 2009	Official Record of Proceedings Pages 216 - 326 (Motion moved by Hon Margaret NG)
Panel on Security	1 December 2009 (Item IV)	Agenda Minutes
Legislative Council	28 April 2010	Official Record of Proceedings Pages 70 - 81 (Oral question raised by Hon Albert HO)

Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
Panel on Constitutional Affairs	21 June 2010 (Item III)	Agenda Minutes
Legislative Council	23 June 2010	Official Record of Proceedings Pages 11 - 22 (Oral question raised by Hon Alan LEONG)
	14 July 2010	Official Record of Proceedings Pages 79 - 90 (Oral question raised by Hon LEE Wing-tat)
	18 May 2011	Official Record of Proceedings Pages 72 - 83 (Oral question raised by Hon Albert HO)
Panel on Constitutional Affairs	21 November 2011 (Item V)	Agenda Minutes
Legislative Council	30 May 2012	Official Record of Proceedings Pages 14 - 25 (Oral question raised by Hon Cyd HO)
Panel on Constitutional Affairs	18 February 2013 (Item IV)	Agenda
Legislative Council	20 March 2013	Official Record of Proceedings Pages 7 - 19 (Oral question raised by Hon Emily LAU)