

# 立法會 *Legislative Council*

LC Paper No. CB(2)2000/02-03(03)

Ref : CB2/BC/9/02

## **Bills Committee on Betting Duty (Amendment) Bill 2003**

### **Background brief prepared by Legislative Council Secretariat on**

### **Betting Duty (Amendment) Bill 2003**

#### **Purpose**

This brief gives an account of the past discussions on football betting held by Legislative Council (LegCo) Members.

#### **Background**

##### The gambling policy

2. It is the Government's policy to restrict gambling opportunities to a limited number of authorized outlets only. Horse racing organized by the Hong Kong Jockey Club (HKJC) and the Mark Six Lottery organized by the Hong Kong Lotteries Board are the main examples of such authorized outlets. According to the Administration, the rationale of this policy is two-fold -

- (a) unregulated gambling can give rise to various social problems and provide a lucrative source of income for triad and criminal activities; and
- (b) the number of authorized gambling outlets should be limited to satisfy demand for gambling by certain sectors of the public who would otherwise turn to unauthorized operators.

##### Legal framework regulating gambling activities

3. The two main pieces of gambling-related legislation in Hong Kong are the Gambling Ordinance (Cap. 148) and the Betting Duty Ordinance (Cap. 108). The Gambling Ordinance, which was first drafted in the 1970s, is the primary legislation setting out what is legal and illegal as far as gambling is concerned.

4. Under the Gambling Ordinance, all gambling activities are illegal except those expressly authorized by the Government under the Betting Duty Ordinance (i.e. the HKJC horse racing and Mark Six Lottery), those exempted under section 3 of the Gambling Ordinance (mainly social gambling), and those licensed by the Commissioner for Television and Entertainment Licensing (e.g. mahjong parlours). Under section 3(7) of the Gambling Ordinance, betting is lawful if the bet is made between persons none of whom is thereby committing the offence of bookmaking under section 7. Under section 7(1) of the Ordinance, any person who engages in bookmaking, or solicits, receives, negotiates or settles bets by way of trade or business commits an offence. It is also illegal under section 7(1A) if a person engages in bookmaking by receiving, negotiating or settling outside Hong Kong a bet which is placed from Hong Kong or by a person who is in Hong Kong when the bet is placed. Under section 8 of the Ordinance, it is an offence for a person in Hong Kong to bet with a bookmaker irrespective of whether the bet is received within or outside Hong Kong. An extract of sections 7 and 8 of the Gambling Ordinance is in **Appendix I**.

5. The Betting Duty Ordinance, which was also drafted in the 1970s, is the primary vehicle for the Government to authorize betting on horse racing and lotteries and to tax their turnovers. The Ordinance also specifies how the betting turnovers on authorized activities should be distributed. All proceeds derived from authorized gambling activities are to cater for public causes, and betting duty now accounts for about 5% of Government's total revenue.

### **Football betting in Hong Kong**

6. According to the Administration, football betting starts to become prevalent during the World Cup in 1998 and is gaining popularity rapidly. Gamblers normally place their bet on football matches with local bookmakers through a network of agents, or with offshore bookmakers through the use of long-distance calls and the Internet. The year 2000 saw a nearly eight-fold increase in the amount of money and betting slips seized by the Police over that in 1999, with a dramatic increase in those on football betting, from \$1.6 million in 1999 to \$269 million in 2000. The amount dropped to \$20 million in 2001, but rose again to \$52.1 million for the first six months of 2002. The sharp rise in betting amount in 2000 and 2002 reflected the effect of important football events in those two years.

7. A survey commissioned by the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) in May 2001 revealed that about 2.4% of the people aged between 15 and 64 (representing around 120 000 people) bet with a local or offshore bookmaker on football matches in 2000. This participation rate rose to 4.2% (representing 206 300 people) as revealed by another similar survey commissioned in October 2001, and further to 7.5% (representing 364 000

people) in July 2002. The Administration has pointed out that a conservative estimate of the annual turnover of football betting in Hong Kong is approximately \$20 billion.

8. At the Council meeting on 24 November 1999, Hon CHOY So-yuk raised a written question relating to betting on results of football matches. Besides the number of cases involving unlawful gambling on the results of football matches cracked down by the Police, Miss CHOY asked whether the Government would enact legislation to regulate the publication of information regarding the avenues for participating in and the odds of gambling activities on the results of football matches. The Administration replied that the Government had no intention to do so.

9. At the Council meeting on 15 December 1999, Hon YEUNG Yiu-chung moved the motion "That this Council opposes the legalization of gambling on football matches, and urges the Government to step up enforcement actions and enhance public education, so as to effectively combat illegal gambling on football matches". Hon CHOY So-yuk moved an amendment to his motion urging Government to consult the public and conduct opinion surveys before deciding on this issue, instead of opposing to legalization.

10. During the motion debate, some Members expressed the view that legalizing gambling would not help eradicate illegal gambling activities, and might increase them on the contrary. It would lead to more criminal activities (including match-fixing), give rise to additional family and social problems, and have a negative impact on the development of young people, hence incur heavy social costs.

11. Some other Members, however, suggested that the Council should adopt a neutral and open-minded attitude towards legalizing gambling on football matches since the Government was going to conduct a review to encourage the public to discuss the issue. They considered that legalization of football betting could ensure that related activities would be put under proper regulation and curb illegal betting, protect gamblers, and increase tax and charitable donations.

12. Irrespective of their stance on this issue, most Members who spoke at the debate considered that the Administration should step up efforts in police enforcement and education to combat football betting, and also conduct in-depth research into the social costs of legalization of football betting.

13. In response, Secretary for Home Affairs (SHA) informed Members that due to the complicated and controversial nature of the issue, the Government considered that any decision on this issue should not be made hastily. It would conduct public consultation to study and consider public opinion before making a decision.

14. Both the amendment moved by Miss CHOY and the original motion moved by Mr YEUNG were negatived.

### **Government's action in respect of football betting**

#### Gambling (Amendment) Bill 2000

15. According to the Administration, before the enactment of the Gambling (Amendment) Bill 2000, unauthorized cross-border gambling activities were not unlawful. To plug the loopholes, the Administration introduced the Gambling (Amendment) Bill 2000 into LegCo on 22 November 2000. The Bill sought to criminalize unauthorized cross-border gambling activities, and activities in Hong Kong which promote or facilitate cross-border gambling activities. A Bills Committee was formed to scrutinize the Bill and it reported to the House Committee on 10 May 2002. The Bill was passed at the Council meeting on 22 May 2002 and enacted on 30 May 2002.

16. With the enactment of the Gambling (Amendment) Bill 2000, it is an offence for a person in Hong Kong to place a bet on results of football matches with an offshore bookmaker even though that bookmaker may be licensed in the jurisdiction concerned. According to the Administration, enactment of the Bill could combat unauthorized cross-border gambling activities because local banks would stop providing banking services to offshore bookmakers, and credit card-issuing institutions would not allow cardholders to use their cards in cross-border gambling.

#### Gambling review

##### *Consultation paper in 2001*

17. The Government released a consultation paper on the Gambling Review to invite public views on, among other things, whether the Government should regulate football betting through authorized outlets, and if yes, whether the licence for authorized football betting should be granted to HKJC, another non-profit-oriented entity, or one or more commercial entities (including some existing offshore bookmakers). The consultation paper also set out a possible operational framework for authorized football betting, should it be provided.

18. The public consultation period ended on 5 October 2001, during which 7 169 written submissions and 83 645 signatures were received. The Administration also consulted the 18 District Councils, and the Panel on Home Affairs at its meeting on 28 June 2001.

*Meeting of the Panel on Home Affairs on 28 June 2001*

19. When the consultation paper was discussed at the meeting of the Panel on Home Affairs on 28 June 2001, some members expressed concern about the proposition of authorizing football betting, including viability of implementing control on football betting, possibility of match-fixing and possibility of encouraging gambling activities. Another member, however, indicated that the sports sector in general was supportive of the proposition with the hope that part of the tax revenue generated would be used to subsidize sports development.

20. Members of the Panel urged the Administration to conduct in-depth studies on whether Chinese people had a tendency to indulge in gambling, whether authorization would be an effective way to stamp out illegal football betting activities, the possible social costs incurred by gambling, and the impact of legalization of football betting on the community given the popularity of football and people's attitude towards gambling. These members considered that the Government should provide detailed information on the results of these studies to the public so that they could make informed decision.

21. SHA had explained to the Panel that the consultation paper acknowledged the fact that unauthorized football betting had become increasingly widespread and, on that basis, suggested regulating football betting through authorized outlets as a possible option, in addition to amending the Gambling Ordinance and strengthening enforcement against illegal operations. In addition, the Administration would take steps to educate the youth and minimize the negative impact of gambling. SHA also stressed that the Government had no preconceived views on the way forward which would be determined, to a large extent, by the outcome of public consultation. The Administration would conduct and support gambling-related researches on a regular basis.

*Results of consultation*

22. The Administration released the results of the consultation on the Gambling Review in a consultation report on 22 March 2002. According to the consultation results, an overwhelming majority of the submissions, signatures and views received were against the proposition of providing authorized outlets for football betting. In the report, the Administration stated that it would take into account the views and suggestions collected in deciding the way forward.

*Meeting of the Panel on Home Affairs on 25 September 2002*

23. When the Panel on Home Affairs received a briefing from SHA at its meeting on 25 September 2002 on the major policy areas within the portfolio of the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB), members again raised the issue of the Gambling Review.

24. A member belonging to the Democratic Party urged the Government to conduct detailed research on the impact of regulation of football betting on society and tax revenue, and to evaluate the administrative and social costs involved to assess whether it was worthwhile to regulate football betting. He indicated that the Democratic Party would not support the proposition without this supporting information.

25. Another member reckoned that given the low frequency of soccer matches, pathological gambling behaviour would unlikely develop even if football betting was regulated. He also considered that tax revenue generated should not be the major concern for regulation of football betting. He indicated that he would support the proposition only if HKJC was licensed to run football betting.

26. In response, SHA explained that the Government's policy was to prevent the proliferation of illegal gambling activities and restrict commercial gambling opportunities to a limited number of authorized outlets only. He assured members that the Government would conduct more research studies on pathological gamblers and collect views of the public on the Gambling Review, before finalizing its recommendations on the regulation of football betting.

Proposition of authorization of football betting

27. On 26 November 2002, the Chief Executive (CE) in Council decided that an authorized and regulated outlet for football betting should be provided as a means of tackling the problem of illegal football gambling in Hong Kong, and that HKJC should be licensed to operate football betting in Hong Kong for an initial period of five years. According to the Administration, there is sufficiently strong and persistent demand for football betting which is being satisfied by illegal channels associated with other criminal activities, despite enforcement efforts against illegal football gambling. Moreover, the results of opinion surveys conducted during the period from March 2002 to July 2002 indicated public support for the proposition.

28. The Panel on Home Affairs received a briefing from the Administration at its meeting on 26 November 2002 on the proposed operational and regulatory framework. The Administration subsequently briefed the Panel at its meeting on 10 January 2003 on the progress of its discussion with HKJC in respect of the details of the operational and regulatory framework for

authorized football betting, such as the rate of betting duty and the amount of contribution from HKJC towards a dedicated fund. The matter was also raised when SHA briefed the Panel on CE's Policy Address 2003 at its meeting on 15 January 2003. The discussions held by the Panel at the meetings on 26 November 2002, and 10 and 15 January 2003 are summarized in paragraphs 29 to 40 below.

29. At these meeting, members belonging to the Democratic Party indicated that the Party was opposed to authorization of football betting. They expressed concern as football was popular among young people and with more publicity work on football betting after authorization, young people would easily be attracted to football betting and would resort to placing bets with illegal bookmakers, hence resulting in an increase in triad activities in schools. These members also considered that authorization of football betting would lead to an increase in pathological gamblers, in view of the prevalent passion for gambling among the Chinese people. Since the Administration had not provided the relevant data, they were not convinced that the revenue generated would be able to offset the social costs incurred.

30. A member belonging to the Liberal Party indicated the Party was supportive of authorization of football betting. He opined that according to the experience drawn from the case of horse racing betting, authorization of football betting might not necessarily result in an increase in triad activities in school.

31. A member pointed out that since the licensee might not be able to identify underage punters who placed bets through telecommunications, the measures proposed by the Administration would not be effective in preventing underage betting.

32. Some members expressed concern that authorization of football betting might not be effective in combating illegal gambling activities. One of these members also expressed reservations about the experience and competence of HKJC in operating football betting. He opined that Government should issue the licence to an experienced operator or through open tender instead of to HKJC. Another member was worried that the number of gamblers might increase as more people would find authorization as an excuse for engaging in football betting.

33. A member considered that the Government should issue more than one licence on football betting so that the variety of betting options offered by different operators could match those offered by their illegal counterparts, and hence maintain the competitiveness of authorized football betting. He also queried why betting on horse racing would not also be put within the purview of the proposed Gaming Commission.

34. Some members expressed concern that HKJC's contribution towards the dedicated fund might not be sufficient for conducting projects and programmes to minimize the possible adverse effect of football betting. A member suggested that the dedicated fund should support the promotion of cultural and sports activities. Another member considered that the fund should sponsor programmes and activities for young people so as to promote positive principles and ideals toward life and inculcate correct values among them.

35. A member suggested that the Government should review its policy on football betting if the results of research on gambling revealed that authorization of football betting had adverse effect on families and the society. Another member suggested that in assessing authorization of football betting, the Government should adopt more objective criteria, such as the success in meeting the target betting duty derived from authorized football betting and the changes in the level and intensity of illegal gambling activities and social problems.

36. Responding to members' concerns, the Administration explained that authorization would restrict football betting to a few authorized outlets only. Authorization of football betting would also reduce illegal football betting activities and hence the associated triad activities. Moreover, effective measures such as prohibition of credit and underage betting and restriction on promotion and advertising, etc. would be introduced after authorization of football betting to help minimize the adverse effect on young people. The Administration also clarified that persons aged below 18 would be prohibited from opening betting accounts with HKJC and would therefore not be able to place bets through telecommunication means. The Administration added that the number of gamblers might increase after authorization of football betting. However, authorization of football betting did not necessarily lead to an increase in pathological gamblers according to the experience in other countries. Research also indicated that gambling activities which were "non-stop" in nature like casino gambling, and not football betting, were more conducive to pathological gambling.

37. The Administration informed members that to maintain its competitiveness against illegal bookmakers, HKJC would be allowed some flexibility in determining the types of fixed-odd games and non-Hong Kong matches, and the number of football matches available for betting so that a variety of betting options would be offered to meet the needs of punters. It further clarified that to maintain the non-commercial and charitable nature of Hong Kong's legal gambling regime which had been well accepted by the community in general, the Government would license HKJC to operate football betting. The Administration assured members that with its pool of experienced personnel and long years of experience in risk management, HKJC was competent in operating football betting.



38. The Administration added that it saw no imminent need to subsume horse racing under the purview of the proposed Gaming Commission since HKJC had been operating horse racing and allocating the surplus proceeds to charities for about 30 years without any major problems. It also explained that the Government had proposed only one organization as the operator of football betting, because licensing more than one operator would inevitably bring about a substantial increase in gambling opportunities and gambling outlets, hence stimulating more demand for gambling.

39. The Administration further informed the Panel that as approved by CE in Council on 26 November 2002, the dedicated fund was to set up for the purpose of conducting research and public education on problem and pathological gambling, as well as providing treatment and counselling services for problem and pathological gamblers. However, funding for other related purposes could be considered by the Executive Council in future.

40. As regards the assessment criteria for authorization of football betting, the Administration responded that it might not be appropriate to adopt quantitative criteria as it was necessary to strike a balance between increasing tax revenue and maintaining the competitiveness of the licence holder in order to combat illegal football betting.

#### Legislative and administrative proposals on authorization of football betting

41. At its meeting on 14 March 2003, the Panel on Home Affairs received a briefing on the Administration's proposals to amend the Betting Duty Ordinance to give effect to the authorization of football betting in Hong Kong, as well as the major conditions in the licence for conducting football betting.

42. A member criticized that it was unfair that HKJC would be appointed as the sole operator of football betting in Hong Kong without any tendering process and the Government had tried to protect the interest of HKJC in doing so. She also considered it unfair that HKJC would be exempted from the offence of betting with an unauthorized bookmaker under section 8 of the Gambling Ordinance and allowed to lay off football bets with overseas bookmakers.

43. A member who was in support of authorization of football betting pointed out that there would be role conflict for HKJC as the operator of authorized football betting to implement the preventive measures against gambling-related problems proposed by the Administration. He suggested that it would be more desirable for Government or a non-government organization to undertake such a responsibility.

44. Another member expressed concern that the \$24 million contribution from HKJC to the dedicated fund might not be sufficient for the implementation of projects related to problem and pathological gambling. She suggested that HKJC should be required to make additional contribution.

45. Some members expressed concern that as the licensing conditions for football betting would be stipulated by administrative arrangements, the Administration was seeking to bypass LegCo's scrutiny of the licensing conditions, particularly the controversial ones such as the types of football bets and age restriction. These members requested that the licensing conditions should be stipulated by way of subsidiary legislation subject to positive vetting by LegCo.

46. Responding to members' concerns, the Administration explained that the Government had decided to only licence HKJC to operate football betting mainly because the majority of the public who were in support of authorizing football betting were in favour of HKJC as the operator. Moreover, HKJC's experience and reputation in running gambling business in Hong Kong would command public confidence in authorized football betting. The Administration stressed that under the proposed legislation, the Government had the right to issue more than one licence so that there was no question of monopoly by HKJC. It further clarified that hedging was a common practice amongst licensed bookmakers in the world as a risk management, and was not illegal in overseas countries.

47. The Administration also considered it appropriate for the licensee to implement the proposed preventive measures against problem and pathological gambling, the arrangement of which was similar to the requirement for tobacco companies to print warnings against smoking on the cigarette packs.

48. As regards HKJC's contribution towards the dedicated fund, the Administration assured members that the contribution of \$24 million for the first two years, and \$12 million to \$15 million annually thereafter would be sufficient for implementing the programmes planned for the first five years after the commencement of authorized football betting in mid 2003. It added that a review would be conducted in due course to see whether additional funding was required.

49. In response to members' concerns that the licensing conditions would not be subject to LegCo's scrutiny, the Administration explained that smooth implementation of authorized football betting would require flexibility and the Administration needed to be given some discretion in regulating football betting. The Administration therefore considered it more desirable to stipulate the licensing conditions by administrative means rather than in statutory provisions.

### **Relevant papers**

50. A list of relevant papers is in **Appendix II** for Members' easy reference. These papers/documents can be retrieved from the Research and Library Information System and the LegCo website.

Council Business Division 2  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
7 May 2003

## 7. 收受賭注

- (1) 任何人如—— (由 1981 年第 53 號第 4 條修訂)
- (a) 一次或多次從事收受賭注；或 (由 2002 年第 12 號第 4 條修訂)
  - (b) 以任何方式認作以生意或業務的形式，招攬、收取、商議或結清賭注， (由 2002 年第 12 號第 4 條修訂)
  - (c) (由 2002 年第 12 號第 4 條廢除)

即屬犯罪，可處以下刑罰——

- (i) 循簡易程序定罪後，可處罰款 \$5,000,000 及監禁 2 年；或
- (ii) 循公訴程序定罪後，可處罰款 \$5,000,000 及監禁 7 年。

(1A) 任何人如藉在香港境外收取、商議或結清符合以下說明的賭注——

- (a) 賭注是從香港境內作出的；或
- (b) 由在作出該賭注的時間是在香港境內的人所作出的，

而一次或多次從事收受賭注，即屬犯罪——

- (c) 一經循簡易程序定罪，可處罰款 \$5,000,000 及監禁 2 年；或
- (d) 一經循公訴程序定罪，可處罰款 \$5,000,000 及監禁 7 年。 (由 2002 年第 12 號第 4 條增補)

(2) (由 2002 年第 12 號第 4 條廢除)

(由 1990 年第 42 號第 5 條修訂)

## 8. 向收受賭注者投注

任何人向收受賭注者投注 (不論有關賭注是在香港境內或境外收取)，即屬犯罪，可處以下刑罰—— (由 2002 年第 12 號第 5 條修訂)

- (a) 如首次定罪，可處罰款 \$10,000 及監禁 3 個月；
- (b) 如第 2 次定罪，可處罰款 \$20,000 及監禁 6 個月；
- (c) 如第 3 次或其後再定罪，可處罰款 \$30,000 及監禁 9 個月。

(由 1990 年第 42 號第 6 條修訂)

## 7. Bookmaking

(1) Any person who— (*Amended 53 of 1981 s. 4*)

- (a) engages in bookmaking, whether on one occasion or more than one occasion; or (*Amended 12 of 2002 s. 4*)
- (b) holds out in any manner that he solicits, receives, negotiates or settles bets by way of trade or business, (*Amended 12 of 2002 s. 4*)
- (c) (*Repealed 12 of 2002 s. 4*)

commits an offence and is liable—

- (i) on summary conviction to a fine of \$5,000,000 and to imprisonment for 2 years; or
- (ii) on conviction on indictment to a fine of \$5,000,000 and to imprisonment for 7 years.

(1A) Any person who engages in bookmaking, whether on one occasion or more than one occasion, by receiving, negotiating or settling outside Hong Kong a bet—

- (a) which is placed from Hong Kong; or
- (b) placed by a person who is in Hong Kong when the bet is placed,

commits an offence and is liable—

- (c) on summary conviction to a fine of \$5,000,000 and to imprisonment for 2 years; or
- (d) on conviction on indictment to a fine of \$5,000,000 and to imprisonment for 7 years. (*Added 12 of 2002 s. 4*)

(2) (*Repealed 12 of 2002 s. 4*)

(*Amended 42 of 1990 s. 5*)

## 8. Betting with a bookmaker

Any person who bets with a bookmaker commits an offence and is liable—

- (a) on first conviction to a fine of \$10,000 and to imprisonment for 3 months;
- (b) on second conviction to a fine of \$20,000 and to imprisonment for 6 months;
- (c) on third or subsequent conviction to a fine of \$30,000 and to imprisonment for 9 months,

whether the bet is received within or outside Hong Kong.

(*Amended 42 of 1990 s. 6; 12 of 2002 s. 5*)

**Bills Committee on  
Betting Duty (Amendment) Bill 2003**

**List of relevant papers**

Papers provided by the Administration

- (a) File Ref : S/F(2) to HAB CR 1/17/93 Pt. 2 -- Legislative Council Brief on  
(issued on 22 June 2001 by Home Affairs Bureau) "Gambling review- A consultation paper"  
  
(<http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/ha/papers/lcbrief-e-gmb.pdf>)
- (b) LC Paper No. CB(2)1437/01-02(01) -- Consultation report on "Gambling  
(issued on 25 March 2002) Review : A Consultation Paper"  
  
(<http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/ha/papers/ha0412cb2-1437-1e.pdf>)
- (c) File Ref : HAB/CR/1/17/109 -- Legislative Council Brief on  
(issued on 26 November 2002 by Home Affairs Bureau) "Authorization of soccer betting : The way forward"  
  
([http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/ha/papers/hab\\_cr\\_1\\_17\\_109\\_e.pdf](http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/ha/papers/hab_cr_1_17_109_e.pdf))
- (d) LC Paper No. CB(2)815/02-03(01) -- Paper on "Proposed arrangements  
(issued on 6 January 2003) for the authorization and regulation of soccer betting"  
  
(<http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/ha/papers/ha0110cb2-815-1e.pdf>)
- (e) LC Paper No. CB(2)1419/02-03(02) -- Paper on "Authorization of football  
(issued vide LC Paper No. betting : Betting Duty  
CB(2)1493/02-03 on 13 March 2003) (Amendment) Bill"  
  
(<http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/ha/papers/ha0314cb2-1419-2e.pdf>)

Official Records of Proceedings of meetings of the Legislative Council

- (f) Meeting on 24 November 1999  
  
(<http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/counmtg/hansard/991124fe.pdf>)
- (g) Meeting on 15 December 1999  
  
(<http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr99-00/english/counmtg/hansard/991215fe.pdf>)

Minutes of meetings of the Panel on Home Affairs

- (h) LC Paper No. CB(2)174/01-02 -- Minutes of special meeting on  
(*issued vide LC Paper No.* 28 June 2001  
*CB(2)173/01-02 on 26 October 2001*)  
  
(<http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr00-01/english/panels/ha/minutes/ha010628.pdf>)
- (i) LC Paper No. CB(2)675/02-03 -- Minutes of special meeting on  
(*issued vide LC Paper No.* 25 September 2002  
*CB(2)674/02-03 on 13 December 2002*)  
  
(<http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr01-02/english/panels/ha/minutes/ha020925.pdf>)
- (j) LC Paper No. CB(2)805/02-03 -- Minutes of special meeting on  
(*issued vide LC Paper No.* 26 November 2002  
*CB(2)804/02-03 on 3 January 2003*)  
  
(<http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/ha/minutes/ha021126.pdf>)
- (k) LC Paper No. CB(2)1118/02-03 -- Minutes of meeting on 10 January  
(*issued vide LC Paper No.* 2003  
*CB(2)1116/02-03 on 13 February 2003*)  
  
(<http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/ha/minutes/ha030110.pdf>)
- (l) LC Paper No. CB(2)1421/02-03 -- Minutes of special meeting on  
(*issued vide LC Paper No.* 15 January 2003  
*CB(2)1420/02-03 on 13 March 2003*)  
  
(<http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/ha/minutes/ha030115.pdf>)
- (m) LC Paper No. CB(2)1676/02-03 -- Minutes of meeting on 14 March  
(*issued vide LC Paper No.* 2003  
*CB(2)1675/02-03 on 10 April 2003*)  
  
(<http://www.legco.gov.hk/yr02-03/english/panels/ha/minutes/ha030314.pdf>)