

立法會  
*Legislative Council*

LC Paper No. CB(2)1394/99-00  
(These minutes have been  
seen by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/PL/CA

**Legislative Council  
Panel on Constitutional Affairs**

**Minutes of meeting  
held on Monday, 20 December 1999 at 2:30 pm  
in Conference Room A of the Legislative Council Building**

- Members Present** : Hon Andrew WONG Wang-fat, JP (Chairman)  
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong  
Hon Ambrose CHEUNG Wing-sum, JP  
Hon Gary CHENG Kai-nam  
Hon Howard YOUNG, JP  
Dr Hon YEUNG Sum  
Hon SZETO Wah
- Member Attending** : Hon NG Leung-sing
- Members Absent** : Hon Margaret NG  
Hon LEE Wing-tat  
Hon Ronald ARCULLI, JP  
Hon Jasper TSANG Yok-sing, JP  
Hon Ambrose LAU Hon-chuen, JP
- Public Officers Attending** : *Item IV*  
Ms Michelle LI  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Education and Manpower (1)  
Mr Patrick LI  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Education and Manpower (2)

Mr Jacky CHAN  
Deputy Secretary General  
University Grants Committee (1)

Mr M Y CHENG  
Assistant Director (Schools)  
Education Department

Miss Victoria TANG  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Health and Welfare

Mrs June SHERRY  
Assistant Director of Social Welfare

Dr Lawrence LAI  
Deputy Director, Hospital Authority

Item V

Mrs Carrie LAM  
Deputy Secretary for the Treasury

Mr Jonathan DAW  
Legal Adviser, Legislative Affairs,  
Department of Justice

Mr Peter WONG  
Senior Assistant Solicitor General  
Department of Justice

Mr Jacky LUM  
Assistant Director of Administration

Items VI - VIII

Mr Robin IP  
Deputy Secretary for Constitutional Affairs

Ms Doris HO  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Constitutional Affairs (4)

Mr Bassanio SO  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Constitutional Affairs (5)

Mr LI Wing  
Chief Electoral Officer of the Registration and Electoral  
Office

**Clerk in Attendance** : Mrs Justina LAM  
Assistant Secretary General 2

**Staff in Attendance** : Mr Jimmy MA  
Legal Adviser

Mrs Eleanor CHOW  
Senior Assistant Secretary (2)7

---

Action  
Column

**I. Confirmation of minutes of meetings**  
(LC Paper Nos. CB(2) 416, 487 and 626/99-00)

The minutes of the meetings held on 14 October 1999, 25 October 1999 and 15 November 1999 were confirmed.

**II. Information papers issued since the last meeting**  
(LC Paper Nos. CB(2) 472/99-00 and 620/99-00(01))

2. Members noted that the following papers had been issued -

- (a) Paper prepared by the Secretariat on designation of officials to attend LegCo meetings; and
- (b) Administration's reply on the issue of designation of Controlling Officers to attend LegCo meetings.

**III. Items for discussion at the next meeting on 17 January 2000**  
(LC Paper Nos. CB(2) 623/99-00(01) and (02))

3. Members agreed that the following items be discussed at the next meeting on 17 January 2000 -

Action  
Column

- (a) Mechanism for amending the Basic Law;
- (b) Review on the application of certain provisions of the Prevention of Bribery Ordinance (Cap. 210) to the Chief Executive and related issues; and
- (c) Systems of voting and voter registration for LegCo elections.

*(Post-meeting note: At the request of the Administration, item (b) was deferred to a future meeting.)*

4. Ms Emily LAU advised that she would move a motion on political reforms for debate at the Council meeting on 12 January 2000. The wording of the motion was tabled for members' information. She suggested that academics be invited to give views on "Ministerial system of government" and "Relationship between the Executive and the Legislature" at the Panel meeting in February. The Chairman said that he would consider preparing a paper on "Ministerial system of government" to facilitate discussion.

Chairman

**IV. Existing practices of employees of tertiary institutions funded by the University Grants Committee (UGC) and public-funded bodies taking up public offices**

(LC Paper Nos. CB(2) 168/99-00(02), 377/99-00(04) and (05))

5. The Chairman said that at the meeting on 25 October 1999, some members expressed the view that there should be standardized guidelines to ensure fairness in the arrangements made between public-funded bodies and their staff taking up public offices. The Administration had advised that to have a set of standardized guidelines applicable to the medical, education and welfare sectors across the board would be difficult to implement and unlikely to be feasible, given the different nature of the organizations, the job of the employees concerned and the public offices in question. In response to concerns raised by members, the Administration had provided further information for members' discussion at this meeting.

Practices in the welfare sector

(LC Paper No. CB(2) 377/99-00(04))

6. Mr Howard YOUNG asked why the complaint procedures were discussed in paragraph 6 of the paper. He believed that the public, being the tax payers, was more concerned that staff of non-government organizations should be doing what they were paid to do and not spending all their time in public service. He said that the public was also concerned about subvented non-government organizations adopting consistent practices in respect of their

staff taking up public offices. He suggested that the welfare sector should make reference to the guidelines promulgated by the institutions funded by the UGC.

7. Assistant Director of Social Welfare (AD/SW) explained that paragraph 6 was in response to the point raised by a member at the meeting on 25 October 1999. The member had expressed concern about the appeal mechanism in respect of complaints arising from individual employee whose application for taking up public office was not approved by his employer. She advised that a set of complaint procedures was in place as explained in paragraph 6.

8. Principal Assistant Secretary for Health and Welfare (PAS/HW) said that the Social Welfare Department (SWD) was agreeable to drawing up a set of guidelines and would make reference to the guidelines promulgated by the Hospital Authority (HA) and UGC-funded institutions. SWD intended that the guidelines to be drawn up would set out broad principles on which individual organizations would work out detailed arrangements to best suit their needs. One principle was that the extent to which the employee's normal duties would be affected would form the basis for adjusting salaries and benefits, if considered necessary. In addition, there should be a proper mechanism for the board of directors of a subvented organization and the employees concerned to work out the most practical arrangements between them.

#### Practices in HA

(LC Paper No. CB(2) 377/99-00(04))

9. Deputy Director of HA (DD/HA) said that HA had a set of standardized guidelines applicable to all HA staff taking up public offices. Adjustments in salary and benefits, if considered necessary, would depend on the proportion of normal working hours to be spent in taking up the public office. If an employee's engagement in public office was considered as substantially restraining him from fulfilling his roles and responsibilities, he might have to take no pay leave or change the nature of his appointment during the tenure of public office according to the guidelines set out in the Human Resources Policy Manual of HA.

#### Practices in the education sector

(LC Paper No. CB(2) 377/99-00(05))

10. Principal Assistant Secretary for Education and Manpower (1) (PAS/EM(1)) said that UGC-funded institutions had general guidelines to deal with engagement in outside practice by staff, including taking up public offices or consultancy services. Although there were no standardized guidelines for all UGC-funded institutions, some institutions were in fact adopting similar practices with adjustments made to suit their individual circumstances.

Details of the practices adopted by the eight UGC-funded institutions were set out in Annexes 1-8 to the paper. PAS/EM(1) added that as regards aided schools, they had the same practices based on the provisions of Code of Aid. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, PAS/EM(1) said that the Education and Manpower Bureau might consider the need to review the existing practices in conjunction with other sectors.

11. Dr YEUNG sum said that both he and Mr LAW Chi-kwong contributed 40% of their LegCo remuneration to the University of Hong Kong. The Chairman said that in his case, the salary he received from the Chinese University of Hong Kong was reduced by one-third. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said that he did not receive any salary or benefits from his school.

#### Non-remunerative public service

12. The Chairman asked whether the existing arrangement would apply to employees taking up non-remunerative public services such as honorarium-based posts or voluntary work.

13. DD/HA responded that the same set of rules applied to HA staff taking up remunerative or non-remunerative public services. Adjustment to salaries and benefits depended on the proportion of normal working hours to be spent in taking up public services. Irrespective of the nature of public services, a staff member was required to obtain agreement from the Hospital Chief Executive or the Chief Executive of HA as appropriate.

14. PAS/EM(1) said that although the arrangement differed among the tertiary institutions, the relevant policy would apply irrespective of whether the staff was taking up remunerative or non-remunerative public offices. While staff of universities were encouraged to contribute their knowledge and expertise to the community, it was imperative that they should fulfil their role and responsibilities in the universities.

15. AD/SW said that organizations in the welfare sector did not normally deduct the salaries and benefits of those employees taking up public offices. She pointed out that the sort of public service social workers for instance were mostly involved in was voluntary work without any remuneration.

16. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong cited the case of a professor of the Chinese University of Hong Kong serving as a consultant on the Hong Kong Examination Board in his own time. Albeit the honorarium of \$1,000 the professor received was only meant to cover his travelling expenses, the university still deducted a portion of his honorarium in accordance with the relevant regulations. Given that the professor was contributing his professional knowledge to the Board and the honorarium received was minimal, Mr

CHEUNG considered the arrangement unreasonable. He said that certain practices adopted by universities should be reviewed.

The way forward

17. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said that he was disappointed that the Administration had not assigned a specific bureau or office to co-ordinate the matter among the departments and bureaux concerned. In the absence of such a co-ordinator, members did not know to whom they should address their questions. He pointed out that the policies and practices of the medical, education and welfare sectors were not the same. In the welfare sector, subvented welfare organizations did not normally deduct the salaries and benefits of employees taking up public offices. In HA, the amount of salary to be deducted depended on the proportion of normal working hours an employee spent in taking up public office. Within the education sector, the practices in primary/secondary schools and the UGC-funded institutions were not consistent. The former had no specific guidelines while the latter's practices varied from institutions to institutions. He asked the Administration to consider formulating broad policies for the various sectors to follow. For instance, the adjustment of salaries and benefits of employees in the medical, education and welfare sectors taking up similar remunerative public offices should be similar.

18. The Chairman said that the matter could be co-ordinated by the Chief Secretary for Administration's office, the Treasury, the Education and Manpower Bureau or the Constitutional Affairs Bureau (CAB). The Chairman held the view that the matter could be taken up by CAB.

19. Ms Emily LAU said that since it was the policy of the Administration to encourage employers to adopt a positive attitude towards their staff taking up public services, there should be consistent policies for public-funded bodies to follow to ensure transparency and fairness. She found the situation in the welfare sector most unsatisfactory. For instance, in the case of Miss Rosanna WONG Yick-ming who was at the same time a Member of the Executive Council, the Chairman of the Housing Authority and the Executive Director of the Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups, no adjustment was made to her salaries and benefits. She suggested that the Chairman should write to the Chief Secretary for the Administration (CS) urging her to assign a specific bureau or office to take on the co-ordination role in drawing up standardized guidelines for public-funded bodies. Members agreed. Members also agreed to Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong's suggestion that the relevant extracts of the minutes of this meeting and the meeting on 25 October 1999 be provided to the relevant bureaux and departments.

*(Post-meeting note : Copies of the correspondence between the Chairman and CS were issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(2)1285/99-00(01) & (02))*

**V. Articles 50 and 51 of the Basic Law**

(LC Paper Nos. CB(2) 2558/98-99(03) and 623/99-00(03))

20. Deputy Secretary for Treasury (DST) explained that the Administration's interpretation of the term "budget" referred to in Articles 50 and 51 of the Basic Law had taken three main factors into consideration, namely, the context in which the term was used, the purpose of the provisions concerned and the established practice in seeking LegCo approval of expenditure and revenue proposals. The Administration maintained the view that the term "budget" in the context of Articles 50 and 51 referred to the expenditure side of the budget, i.e. the Appropriation Bill, but the term as appearing in other sections of the Basic Law might carry an ordinary and wider meaning of both revenue and expenditure.

21. DST assured members that there was no question of the Administration adopting an interpretation of the term "budget" with a view to limiting LegCo's power in monitoring Government's revenue proposal as suggested by some members. As she had explained at the last meeting, the established practice in seeking LegCo approval of expenditure and revenue proposals was different. Expenditure was voted on annually through the passage of the Appropriation Bill, and the non-passage of it warranted some transitional arrangements to enable the government service to continue to operate. However, similar transitional or contingency requirements were not required for the revenue aspect of the budget. Regardless of the outcome of the revenue bill(s), Government continued to have the legal power to tax or charge based on previously enacted legislation and this existing revenue base would normally account for the bulk of Government's income in the year.

22. DST further said that the Administration had taken a purposive approach to the interpretation of the Basic Law. In this regard, it was noted that the constitutional purpose of Article 50 was to protect the Legislature from arbitrary dissolution. Under Article 50, dissolution of LegCo could not be achieved except in very limited circumstance, i.e. LegCo twice passing a bill which the Chief Executive (CE) considered incompatible with Hong Kong's interests or LegCo defeating a budget or any other important Government bill. Even then dissolution of LegCo could not take place until consensus through consultations had been attempted by the Government and had failed. She said that the Administration's justification of its interpretation was elaborated in detail in paragraphs 4 to 12 of LC Paper No. CB(2) 623/99-00(03).

23. The Chairman asked whether “LegCo refuses to pass a budget” referred to in Article 50 covered the situation where the Appropriation Bill was passed with amendment proposed by Members. DST responded that each case would need to be examined on its merits. For instance, if a substantial part of an Appropriation Bill’s head(s) of expenditure were amended to the effect that a department or a subvented organization would not be able to continue to operate, then this could amount in substance to a refusal by the LegCo to pass a budget introduced by the Government.

24. Legal Adviser (Legislative Affairs) of the Department of Justice (LA/DJ) said that whether an amendment to the Appropriation Bill amounted to a refusal was a good pointer to the underlining purpose of Article 50. It was difficult for the Administration to give members a list of circumstances that would definitely trigger off a move towards dissolution of LegCo. The fundamental purpose of Article 50 was to ensure that LegCo would not be dissolved without just cause.

25. The Chairman said that the Administration’s reply appeared to imply that whether a bill fell under “any other important bill” referred to in Article 50 would only be determined after its rejection by LegCo, instead of beforehand.

26. LA/DJ said that whether a bill was important would vary with time. It would be wrong for the Administration to tie everybody’s hands by giving examples of what was an important bill.

27. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said that a mechanism for determining whether a bill was important should be carefully considered and put in place as early as possible otherwise, in the event that a bill was rejected by LegCo, it might give rise to a constitutional crisis.

28. LA/DJ said that in his view, Article 50 spoke to the duty of CE not to try to dissolve LegCo without just cause. The question of what was an important bill was for CE to justify. Even if an important bill was rejected, there was no requirement in the Basic Law for LegCo to be dissolved. Referring to the phrase “CE may dissolve LegCo”, in Article 50, LA/DJ further said that the word “may” was used deliberately as CE had to take a judgement and risk. If CE was wrong, it could lead to his resignation. It was not for CE to decide whether a bill was important in an arbitrary fashion. Article 50 was a part of a chain of very important constitutional provisions. Dissolution of LegCo could only be triggered off by CE and he took the risk in deciding to do so. The Chairman held the view that the word “may” in the context of Article 50 could mean that CE “is hereby authorized” or “is empowered” to dissolve LegCo.

29. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said that given the constitutional

implications of Article 50, there should be stringent procedures in defining what an "important" bill was to prevent abuse of power. He expressed concern that if the question was not dealt with immediately, any dispute arising from the interpretation of the term in future might give rise to social unrest similar to that brought about by the Administration in seeking an interpretation of the Basic Law from the National People's Congress on the right of abode issue.

30. LA/DJ explained that there was no academic definition of the word "important". The meaning of "important bill" was not an absolute thing. One example was that the bill had to be important enough to justify the dissolution of LegCo only once in CE's term of office. He agreed with members that the question of what was an "important bill" should be studied in more detail. He said that the Administration should be able to produce some guidelines to assist members in understanding how the Administration was approaching the question of an important bill. However, the Administration's hands could not be tied by listing out the circumstances under which a bill was regarded as important. LA/DJ undertook to prepare a paper for members' consideration.

Adm

31. Ms Emily LAU said that the Administration should clarify when a bill would be regarded as "important". The Chairman said that an "unimportant" bill could become an "important" one after certain clauses had been amended. He considered that there should be checks and balances between the Executive and the Legislature. Quoting France as an example, he said that when an important bill or motion was to be introduced, a motion of censure would be moved with the signature of one-tenth of the members of the National Assembly. If the motion of censure was rejected, the text was considered to be adopted and no amendment could be made. The ruling party had to step down if the motion was passed. He opined that a decision on whether a bill was important was a political one and should be made before its introduction. He said that Hong Kong could consider devising a procedure similar to that of France.

32. LA/DJ said that the issue of checks and balances between the Executive and the Legislature was covered in subparagraph 3 of Article 52. In this regard, CE must resign if the new LegCo still refused to pass the original bill.

33. As regards the way forward, Legal Adviser said that if members agreed to the Administration's interpretation of the word "budget", the Panel should make a report to the House Committee. If the recommendation of the Panel was endorsed by the House Committee, the Committee on Rules of Procedure would proceed to examine the procedural arrangements for implementing Articles 50 and 51. Legal Adviser further said that he agreed to the view of the Administration on the matter. He had in fact provided the same advice to the Committee on Rules of Procedure.

Clerk

34. Members agreed with the Administration's interpretation that the word "budget" in the context of Articles 50 and 51 referred to the Appropriation Bill. A report would be made to the House Committee. On the question of "an important bill" referred to in Article 50, the Panel would continue discussion at a future meeting.

*(Post-meeting note : A report was made to the House Committee on 11 February 2000)*

**VI. 2000 voter registration campaign**  
(LC Paper No. CB(2) 623/99-00(04))

35. Deputy Secretary for Constitutional Affairs (DSCA) said that a large scale voter registration campaign for the 2000 LegCo election would run from 17 January until 16 March 2000. The main features of the 2000 voter registration campaign included, inter alia, a comprehensive publicity programme to arouse community awareness, full scale door-to-door household visits and special campaigns that were targeted at eligible functional constituency electors or Elector Committee subsector voters, as well as young people. A mock up poster and a promotional leaflet were circulated for members' information at the meeting.

36. Dr YEUNG Sum expressed concern over the relatively low registration rate of young people between the age of 18 and 25. He asked about the measures to be taken by the Administration to improve the situation and the Administration's target rate of registration, if any.

37. DSCA responded that it was difficult to set a target rate of registration for young people because registration as electors was voluntary. As at December 1998, about 35% and 47% of the young people of age brackets 18-20 and 18-25 respectively had registered as electors. For the 2000 voter registration campaign, the Administration aimed to attract more young people to register as voters by placing appeal advertisements in university bulletins, popular youth magazines and on the Internet, and by setting up roving voter registration kiosks and counters in youth centres and shopping arcades frequented by young people. In response to Dr YEUNG's query about campaigns in the universities, DSCA said that roving voter registration kiosks would be set up near the library and other popular sites in universities. Home Affairs Department's temporary community organizers (TCOs) would also conduct dormitory visits during the campaign period.

38. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong expressed concern about the accuracy of the voter register, and the procedure leading to disqualification of an elector due to change of address. He opined that as disqualification of electors was a serious matter, there should be stringent vetting procedure prior to striking out an elector's name from the voter register.

39. Chief Electoral Officer (CEO) explained that in the event that a poll card sent to a registered elector was undelivered and returned to the Registration and Electoral Office (REO), the REO could make inquiry to the elector concerned in compiling the next provisional register. The purpose of the inquiry was to ascertain whether the address recorded in the existing final register against that person's name was no longer his principal residential address. The inquiry would be made in writing and sent by registered post addressed to the person concerned. If the letter was undelivered and returned to the REO, the REO would then have reason to believe that the person was no longer residing in the address recorded in the existing final register. The person's name would be put on an omissions list. The omissions list together with the provisional register would be published for public inspection. If no appeal was lodged by the person concerned by a specified date, his name would be omitted from the final register.

40. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said that it was not unusual for villagers in rural areas of the New Territories to use a common address. The poll card and registered mail from the REO might have never reached that particular person, as someone might have acknowledged receipt on his behalf. Under the circumstances, the person concerned would not know that his name had been deleted from the voter register until the election day.

41. The Chairman opined that eligible electors should not be disenfranchised lightly. He said that inquiries should be made in person rather than through correspondence. He also asked about the procedure adopted for dealing with electors allegedly involved in vote planting by using someone else's address. CEO responded that the procedure he described earlier (paragraph 39 refers) would apply to cases of undelivered poll cards. Suspected cases of vote planting would be referred to the ICAC.

Adm 42. DSCA said that the REO would provide a written response on the details of the vetting procedure. He further advised members that door-to-door visits to all the two million households in the territory would be conducted by TCOs. The purpose of the household visits was to help all the potential electors to get registered and to verify and, if necessary, update the records of registered electors on the existing electoral rolls.

Action  
Column

*(Post-meeting note : A paper setting out the procedures which REO adopts in conducting the vetting exercise for electoral records was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(2) 981/99-00(01) on 27 January 2000).*

Adm 43. In response to the Chairman, DSCA said that the review of the 1999 District Councils election would be completed within three months' time. The Administration would brief the Panel in due course.

## **VII. Election expense limits for 2000 LegCo election** (LC Paper No. CB(2) 623/99-00(05))

44. DSCA said that given that the arrangements for the 2000 LegCo elections in respect of geographical constituencies (GCs), functional constituencies (FCs) and the Election Committee (EC) remained largely unchanged and that the election expense limits worked well in the 1998 LegCo election, the Administration considered that there was no need to adjust the election expense limits for the respective constituencies in the 2000 LegCo election.

45. Ms Emily LAU said that the election expense limit for GC elections should be reduced taking account of deflation and the fact that candidates of the last election spent less than the prescribed limit. She said that setting the limit too high would discriminate against those who were less resourceful and would lead to money politics.

46. DSCA said that the Administration had reviewed the arrangement for the 1998 LegCo election. As far as election expenses for GCs were concerned, some candidates spent more and some spent less. The Administration held the view that the limit should not be set at a level that would restrict the way in which a candidate ran his campaign.

47. Ms Emily LAU disagreed with the Administration's view. She pointed out that the outcome of the 1998 LegCo election illustrated that candidates who spent less than the limit could still be successful in an election. In the circumstances, the Administration should opt for a lower limit to ensure that candidates could compete on a level playing field in an election.

48. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong agreed with Ms LAU and suggested that in setting the limit for the 2000 LegCo election, reference should be made to the average election expenses of the GC elections in 1998. He requested the Administration to provide relevant information for members' reference.

(*Post-meeting note* : Information on the actual election expenses of lists of candidates in the 1998 LegCo GC elections was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(2) 845/99-00(01) on 13 January 2000).

49. DSCA said that given that each GC had over one million population, the Administration considered that the proposed election expense limit which was equivalent to about \$1.50 per head was reasonable.

50. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said that printing of promotional leaflets accounted for a major portion of the election expenses. He asked whether it was technically feasible for leaflets to be distributed on a household basis, rather than on an elector basis, with the aim to reducing cost and saving paper.

51. DSCA said that candidates would be given a CD-ROM containing electors' personal particulars including names and addresses. It was a matter for candidates to decide whether to group electors of the same address together for the purpose of mailing election materials. CEO said that some candidates of the 1998 LegCo election had in fact done so.

52. Dr YEUNG Sum said that it would be preferable if the election expense limit for GC elections could be lowered. However, taking into consideration that the proposed limit for 2000 LegCo GC elections was set on the basis of a list of candidates and the total population of Hong Kong was estimated to have increased slightly, he had no strong objection to the Administration's proposal. While the Chairman echoed Dr YEUNG's view, he opined that the election expense limit set for the 1998 LegCo GC elections was too high and that it was unlikely for candidates of political parties to spend up to the maximum limit, not to mention the independent candidates. Ms Emily LAU said that she opposed to the proposed limit which would be advantageous to those financially better-off.

53. Pointing out that the GC seats would be increased in the 2004 LegCo election, Dr YEUNG urged the Administration to refrain from increasing the election expense limit as raising money to run an election had been a strenuous task for candidates. DSCA said that he noted members' concerns and would review the situation after the 2000 LegCo election.

**VIII. Subscribers and election deposit required for nomination for 2000 LegCo election**  
(LC Paper No. CB(2) 623/99-00(06))

Action  
Column

54. DSCA advised that the number of subscribers and the amount of election deposit required for nomination for the 2000 LegCo election would remain unchanged. Members did not raise any queries.

55. The meeting ended at 4:30 pm.

Legislative Council Secretariat

16 March 2000