

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)1753/09-10

Ref : CB2/HS/2/09

Paper for the House Committee meeting on 11 June 2010

**Report of the Subcommittee on Package of Proposals for the Methods for
Selecting the Chief Executive and for Forming the Legislative Council in 2012**

Purpose

This paper reports on the deliberations of the Subcommittee on Package of Proposals for the Methods for Selecting the Chief Executive and for Forming the Legislative Council in 2012 ("the Subcommittee").

Background

Existing methods for selecting CE and forming LegCo

2. At present, in accordance with the provisions of Annex I to the Basic Law ("BL"), the Chief Executive ("CE") is elected by a broadly representative Election Committee ("EC") and appointed by the Central People's Government ("CPG"). EC is composed of 800 members from four sectors made up of 38 subsectors.

3. Currently, there are 60 seats in the Legislative Council ("LegCo"), half of them returned by geographical constituencies ("GCs") through direct elections, and the other half by functional constituencies ("FCs"). For direct elections in GCs, the 30 seats are returned from five GCs by adopting the list system operating under the largest remainder formula, which is a form of proportional representation voting system. For FC elections, 30 seats are returned from 28 FCs.

Methods for selecting CE and LegCo by universal suffrage

4. Under BL 45, CE of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("HKSAR") shall be selected by election or through consultations held locally and be appointed by CPG. The method for selecting CE shall be specified in the light of the actual situation in HKSAR and in accordance with the principle of gradual and orderly progress. The ultimate aim is the selection of CE by universal suffrage upon nomination by a broadly representative nominating committee in accordance with democratic procedures.

5. Under BL 68, LegCo shall be constituted by election. The method for forming LegCo shall be specified in the light of the actual situation in HKSAR and in accordance with the principle of gradual and orderly progress. The ultimate aim is the election of all LegCo Members by universal suffrage.

6. The specific methods for selecting CE and for forming LegCo (the "two electoral methods") are specified in Annex I and Annex II to BL respectively. If there is a need to amend the method for selecting CE for the terms subsequent to the year 2007, such amendments must be made with the endorsement of a two-thirds majority of all LegCo Members and the consent of CE and be reported to the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress ("NPCSC") for approval. Any amendments made to the method for forming LegCo after 2007 must be made with the endorsement of a two-thirds majority of all LegCo Members and the consent of CE and be reported to NPCSC for the record.

The NPCSC Interpretation on 6 April 2004

7. On 6 April 2004, NPCSC adopted the "Interpretation of Article 7 of Annex I and Article III of Annex II to the Basic Law" ("the NPCSC Interpretation"). Clause 3 of the NPCSC Interpretation states that CE of HKSAR shall make a report to NPCSC as regards whether there is a need to amend the two electoral methods and its procedures for voting on bills and motions, and NPCSC shall, in accordance with the provisions of BL 45 and BL 68, make a determination in the light of the actual situation in HKSAR and in accordance with the principle of gradual and orderly progress.

The NPCSC Decision on 29 December 2007

8. On 12 December 2007, CE submitted the "Report on the Public Consultation on Constitutional Development and on whether there is a need to amend the methods for selecting CE of HKSAR and for forming LegCo of HKSAR in 2012" ("the CE Report") to NPCSC.

9. After considering the CE Report, NPCSC made a decision on 29 December 2007 on issues relating to the methods for selecting CE and for forming LegCo in the year 2012 and on issues relating to universal suffrage ("the 2007 NPCSC Decision"). The 2007 NPCSC Decision is summarized below -

- (a) universal suffrage for electing CE and for election of all the Members of LegCo by universal suffrage may respectively take place in 2017 and thereafter;
- (b) the election of the fourth term CE in 2012 and the fifth LegCo in 2012 shall not be by means of universal suffrage;

- (c) the 50:50 ratio for Members returned by FCs and Members returned by GCs through direct elections shall remain unchanged for the fifth LegCo;
- (d) the procedures of voting on bills and motions in LegCo shall remain unchanged; and
- (e) subject to the above not being contravened and consistent with BL 45 and BL 68, and the provisions of Annex I and Annex II to BL, the two electoral methods for 2012 may be appropriately amended.

Consultation Document on the Methods for Selecting CE and for Forming LegCo in 2012

10. At the Council meeting on 18 November 2009, the Chief Secretary for Administration made a statement on the Consultation Document on the Methods for Selecting CE and for Forming LegCo in 2012 and announced the commencement of a three-month public consultation exercise ending by 19 February 2010. It is stipulated in paragraph 1.03 of the consultation document that in accordance with BL and the NPCSC Interpretation, it is necessary to go through a "five-step mechanism" for amending the two electoral methods -

Step One: CE shall make a report to NPCSC as to whether there is a need to amend the two electoral methods;

Step Two: A determination shall be made by NPCSC that the two electoral methods may be amended;

Step Three: The motions on the amendments to the two electoral methods shall be introduced by the HKSAR Government to LegCo, and be endorsed by a two-thirds majority of all the Members of LegCo;

Step Four: Consent shall be given by CE to the motions endorsed by LegCo; and

Step Five: The relevant bill shall be reported by CE to NPCSC for approval or for the record.

11. At the Council meeting on 14 April 2010, the Chief Secretary for Administration made a statement on a package of proposals for the methods for selecting CE and for forming LegCo in 2012 published on the same day. The two draft motions to be put by the HKSAR Government to LegCo concerning the amendments to the two electoral methods are in Annex II and Annex III to the package of proposals.

The Subcommittee

12. At the House Committee meeting on 16 April 2010, members formed a subcommittee to study the package of proposals. Mr TAM Yiu-chung and Mr Jeffrey LAM were elected as Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Subcommittee respectively. The membership list of the Subcommittee is in **Appendix I**.

13. The Subcommittee has held nine meetings to study the package of proposals and related issues. The Subcommittee has also received views from 163 organizations and individuals at three of these meetings. The names of organizations and individuals which/who have submitted views to the Subcommittee are in **Appendix II**.

Deliberations of the Subcommittee

Method for selecting CE in 2012

Administration's proposals

14. Regarding the method for selecting CE in 2012, the Administration has proposed that -

- (a) the number of members of EC be increased from the current 800 to 1 200;
- (b) the number of members of the four sectors of EC be increased by the same proportion, i.e. adding 100 members for each sector;
- (c) 75 out of the 100 new seats in the fourth sector (i.e. the political sector) be allocated to elected District Council ("DC") members;
- (d) apart from the 10 seats to be allocated to LegCo, the remaining 15 new seats in the fourth sector will be allocated to members of the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference (10 seats) and Heung Yee Kuk (five seats);
- (e) the 117 representatives of DCs in EC be returned through election from among elected DC members;
- (f) the current nomination threshold at the ratio of one-eighth of the total membership of EC (i.e. the number of subscribers required shall be not less than 150) be maintained with no upper limit to be set, at this stage, on the number of subscribers; and
- (g) the current requirement that CE should not have any political affiliation should not be changed but can be reviewed in the longer term.

Nomination mechanism for the CE election

15. Some members including Mr Albert HO, Ms Audrey EU and Mr Ronny TONG have expressed the view that the current package of proposals in respect of the election of CE in 2012 is retrogressive. They consider that the proposed increase in the number of members of EC from the current 800 to 1 200 is worse than the proposal put forward by the Administration in 2005, which intended to increase the size of EC to 1 600 members. Also in the 2005 package, all DC members would be included in EC, but in the current package, only 75 new seats would be allocated to elected DC members, increasing the total number to 117 only. With the proposed increase in the number of nomination from 100 to 150, it would be difficult for the pan-democratic camp to field a candidate for the CE election because the proportion of EC members to be returned by election would decrease, but the number of nomination required will be increased from 100 to 150.

16. Some other members including Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr WONG Kwok-hing and Mr IP Kwok-him express support for the Administration's current package of proposals because it would enhance the role of elected DC members and the representativeness of CE election. They also consider that maintaining the existing nomination threshold at one-eighth of the total membership of EC could already allow competition in the CE election.

17. The Administration does not subscribe to the view that the current package of proposals in respect of the election of CE in 2012 is retrogressive. Its explanation is that the aim of the proposal in 2005 was to enhance the democratic elements of the election as far as possible to facilitate Hong Kong moving towards the ultimate aim of universal suffrage during which time Hong Kong had yet to have a clear timetable for attaining universal suffrage. The 2007 NPCSC Decision has already made it clear that the election of CE in 2017 could be implemented by universal suffrage under the one-person-one-vote system. The most democratic element in the election would lie in the election of CE by all registered voters by way of one-person-one-vote. To ensure that the CE elected would have the broad support of different sectors of the community, the Administration has also proposed to increase the number of seats for each of the four sectors of EC evenly. The Administration has also clarified that it does not propose to raise the nomination threshold. Its proposal is to maintain the existing nomination threshold of one-eighth of the total membership of EC. The Administration believes that the pan-democrats would be able to secure the required 150 nominations in EC to field a candidate for the CE election in 2012.

18. Mr Albert HO, Ms Audrey EU and Mr Ronny TONG have indicated that they are unable to see how the retrogression in the current package of proposals in respect of the election of CE in 2012 has anything to do with the availability of the timetable for implementing universal suffrage for the selection of CE. They have suggested that all 405 elected DC members should be included in EC in order to enhance the representativeness of EC.

19. The Administration has advised that the package of proposals in respect of the election of CE in 2012 would facilitate the EC in 2012 being used as the basis for transforming into the nominating committee when universal suffrage for CE is implemented in 2017. The Administration has further pointed out that on the basis of the views received during the public consultation exercise, there is more support among the political parties/groups and LegCo Members, as well as various organizations and individuals in the community for enhancing the representativeness of EC through enhancing the participation of elected DC members, who have a public mandate, in EC. The Administration has reiterated that its proposal could provide more room and opportunities for members of the community to participate in the CE election and help maintain the principle of balanced participation of the four existing sectors in EC.

20. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong has requested the Administration to clarify whether the nominating committee in 2017 would be formed with reference to the current provisions regarding EC in Annex I to BL should the relevant motion be vetoed by LegCo. The Administration has explained that in accordance with the 2007 NPCSC Decision, when universal suffrage for CE is implemented in 2017, the nominating committee "may" (and not "must") be formed with reference to the current provisions regarding EC in Annex I to BL. Hence, there is room for the fourth-term HKSAR Government to put forward a proposal for the composition of the nominating committee which is not exactly the same as that of the EC in 2012. In considering the composition of EC and the nominating committee, the overriding principle is to maintain the balanced participation of the four existing sectors in EC.

21. Some members including Mr Ronny TONG, Ms Cyd HO and Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung have expressed dissatisfaction that the Administration has not taken into account the right of the members of the public to make nominations when formulating the nomination arrangements for CE election. They have pointed out that under the current package of proposals in respect of the election of CE in 2012, there are only 35 directly elected LegCo Members and 117 elected DC members out of the 1 200 EC members and a person has to secure the support of over 95% of these elected representatives of the public in order to be a CE candidate. However, a CE candidate may only need to secure the support of over 50% of all EC members in order to get elected. Mr TONG and Ms HO have suggested that a person should be eligible as a CE candidate if that person has secured a certain number of registered voters for nomination. Mr LEUNG considers that LegCo Members, who have a public mandate, should be entitled to make nominations for CE election. Mr TONG has also expressed concern that it would be difficult for the public to hold the elected DC members accountable for how they would vote in the election to return EC representatives.

22. The Administration has reiterated that the nomination mechanism for the CE election must be formulated in accordance with BL 45 and Annex I to BL under which the support from different sectors of EC is required for any nomination. There would be an increase in the number as well as the percentage of EC members who are returned through direct elections under the current package of proposals in respect of the election

of CE in 2012. When the DC election is held in November 2011, voters would know then that the DC members they vote for could elect representatives into EC and LegCo, and candidates would have to make known to their voters how they intend to vote in the CE and LegCo elections in 2012.

The number of members and composition of EC

23. Members have enquired about the electoral methods for returning the 117 DC seats in EC and the allocation of the new seats among the subsectors in the first, second and third sectors of EC. The Administration has explained that according to the 2007 NPCSC Decision, a broadly representative nominating committee should be formed in selecting CE by universal suffrage. The Decision also stipulates that the nominating committee might be formed with reference to the current provisions regarding EC. It is essential to ensure the balanced participation of different sectors in the nominating committee to ensure that the CE elected by universal suffrage would have the support of not only the 3.3 million registered voters, but also different sectors of society. The Administration's proposal of increasing the number of members in the four EC sectors in an even manner is aimed at maintaining the principle of balanced participation to help transform the 2012 EC into the nominating committee in 2017. The Administration has also informed the Subcommittee that there are mainly three types of views received during the public consultation exercise, namely increasing proportionally the number of seats according to the existing distribution of seats; splitting the existing subsectors; and adding new subsectors. The Administration has not yet formed specific proposals at the present stage on how the additional 100 seats should be allocated among the subsectors of these three sectors of EC, and would continue to listen to views from the community and LegCo. Any such arrangements could be specified by local legislation, i.e. in the context of the CE Election (Amendment) Bill.

24. Dr Priscilla LEUNG has suggested allocating some of the new EC seats to representatives of the environmental protection field, small and medium size enterprises, real estate agents, youth and ethnic minorities. Mrs Regina IP has suggested that in considering the allocation of EC seats among different subsectors, account should also be taken of forward-looking criteria such as potential for economic development and strategic importance of the trade/profession concerned. The Administration has advised that there are also suggestions of splitting the dental profession from the medical subsector and adding new subsectors for small and medium enterprises and women. The Administration welcomes proposals on the allocation of new seats in the different sectors of EC.

25. Noting that the Administration has proposed to adopt the proportional representation system for returning the six DC FC seats (paragraph 33(c) refers), Mr WONG Kwok-hing considers that for the sake of consistency, the same should be adopted for returning DC representatives to EC. Mr IP Kwok-him has expressed concern that the single transferable voting system (one of the possible options under the

proportional representation voting system) would be too complicated for returning 117 DC members to EC through a single constituency.

26. Ms Miriam LAU has asked the Administration to clarify whether ex-officio DC members would have the right to stand as candidates and to vote in the elections of the DC sub-sector of EC and the DC FC of LegCo in 2012. Ms LAU is of the view that it would be inconsistent with the Administration's objective of enhancing the representativeness of the CE and LegCo elections through the participation of elected DC members if ex-officio members could also participate in the two elections. The Administration has explained that according to the existing requirements, the 27 ex-officio DC members can either stand for election in the DC or Heung Yee Kuk subsector and FC. However, they can only register as voters and vote in the Heung Yee Kuk subsector and FC. The Administration has taken note of the views received during the public consultation exercise on the consultation document that as ex-officio DC members are returned through village elections and have a public mandate, they should enjoy the same rights as elected DC members. The Administration would continue to listen to views on whether the existing arrangement should be maintained in 2012. The specific arrangements can be discussed in detail during the local legislation stage and a final decision would then be made.

27. Dr Margaret NG is of the view that it is unfair to allocate a total of 900 seats to the first, second and third sectors of EC which represent some 230 000 electors, while the fourth sector, which includes directly elected LegCo members and DC members representing an electorate base of over 3.3 million registered voters, has only 300 seats. She considers that the composition of EC does not accord with the principle of balanced participation, given the differences in the size of their electorates. She has also commented that such unbalanced allocation is a distortion of the meaning of "broadly representative".

28. The Administration has explained that its proposal of increasing the number of members in the four EC sectors is aimed at maintaining the principle of balanced participation to help transform the 2012 EC into the nominating committee in 2017, and such a principle is currently realized in the even allocation of the 800 EC seats among the four sectors as set out in Annex I to BL.

29. Dr Margaret NG and Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, however, take the view that the principle of balanced participation, which is not found in BL, should not prevail over the provisions in BL themselves. The implementation of universal suffrage for CE which is provided for under BL45 should not be distorted to include nomination by a nominating committee the composition of which is unbalanced.

30. Mr IP Kwok-him has asked how the 10 new seats in the fourth sector of EC proposed to be allocated to LegCo would be dealt with if only the motion to amend Annex I to BL regarding the method for selecting CE in 2012 is endorsed by LegCo. The Administration has explained that adjustment has to be made to the composition of

EC as to how these seats should be allocated if the number of seats in LegCo in 2012 remains as 60 instead of 70. However, the issue can be dealt with in the context of local legislation.

Political affiliation of CE

31. Dr LAM Tai-fai considers that the current requirement that CE should not have any political affiliation would hinder the development of political parties, which plays a pivotal role in nurturing political talents. Dr Priscilla LEUNG has expressed the view that the development of political parties is crucial to the grooming of political talents in Hong Kong. The Administration should consider formulating a political party law to facilitate the development and regulation of political parties, particularly if CE is allowed to have political party membership.

32. The Administration has reiterated that having regard to the general view of the public that the existing requirement should be retained to ensure that CE would maintain impartiality when dealing with requests from different political parties, the HKSAR Government considers that the relevant requirement should be retained for the CE election in 2012, but could be reviewed in the longer term. The Administration also takes the view that there is ample room for CE to form political alliances under the existing political system and, at the present stage, widening the scope for political participation is the most practicable way to facilitate the development of political parties.

Method for forming LegCo in 2012

Administration's proposals

33. Regarding the method for forming LegCo in 2012, the Administration has proposed that -

- (a) the number of LegCo seats should be increased from 60 to 70 with 35 seats returned by GCs through direct election and 35 returned by FCs;
- (b) all the five new FC seats and the existing DC FC seat be returned through election from among elected DC members;
- (c) the six DC FC seats be returned under the "proportional representation system"; and
- (d) the existing arrangement that permanent residents of Hong Kong who are not of Chinese nationality or who have the right of abode in foreign countries can stand in the elections for 12 FCs be maintained.

Number of seats in LegCo

34. Mr Ronny TONG has asked the Administration whether consideration would be given to increasing the number of LegCo seats from 60 to 80 in 2012, given that some academic studies have suggested that on the basis of Hong Kong's population, there can be up to 100-120 directly elected LegCo Members.

35. The Administration has advised that on the basis that the population is projected to rise to about 7.2 million in 2012, if the number of seats is increased to 70, the seat-to-population ratio would be reduced from about 1:116 800 to about 1:103 000. The Administration considers such seat-to-population ratio reasonable in the light of the seat-and-population ratios in other jurisdictions. Moreover, the proposed increase to 70 seats already represents a significant increase of 16.7%. It would be too drastic an increase if the number of seats is increased from 60 to 80 in 2012. Any further increase in the number of LegCo seats can be dealt with by the fifth-term CE and the sixth LegCo before the implementation of universal suffrage for LegCo in 2020.

36. Ms Emily LAU considers that the seat-to-population ratio in Hong Kong as quoted by the Administration does not accord with the reality as only half of all LegCo Members are returned by GCs through direct elections. Mr Paul TSE, however, does not subscribe to the view that FC Members should not be included in calculating the seat-to-population ratio. At the request of Mr IP Kwok-him, the Administration has provided the Subcommittee with the seat-to-population ratios of three major cities, namely London, New York and Tokyo which are 1:304 792, 1:163 994 and 1:102 276 respectively.

The DC proposal

37. Some members have reservation about increasing the number of DC FC Members as some DC members are only returned from a constituency area with a small electorate or returned uncontested and some of them might be prone to defending interests of their districts only. They are concerned that allocating the new FC seats to DC members would make LegCo a forum for dealing with district matters. Given the differences in the functions and powers of DCs and LegCo, voters would be confused as to the criteria to be adopted for choosing DC members.

38. Some other members, however, consider the DC proposal acceptable as it is a pragmatic proposal for enhancing the representativeness of the LegCo election within the framework of the 2007 NPCSC Decision. Moreover, the proposal could help nurture political talents. They also do not agree with the view that DC members would focus only on district matters because of the small size of the DC constituencies. These members have further pointed out that many incumbent LegCo Members had served/are serving as DC members, and their experience serving at district level would be useful for dealing with LegCo business.

39. The Administration has explained that while DC members may bring district matters into LegCo, they have to pay heed to the well-being of Hong Kong people as a whole when dealing with territory-wide issues. Incumbent LegCo Members who are also DC members have catered to both the overall interest of community and local interests in dealing with business in LegCo. The Administration considers that DC is the cradle for nurturing political talents. The experience of DC members in participating in politics and in serving the public would facilitate their work at LegCo.

40. Dr Margaret Ng considers that the Government's current proposal of having six DC FC seats returned through election from among elected DC members is retrogressive. She has pointed out that back in 1985, 12 seats in LegCo were already returned by an electoral college comprising all members of the two Municipal Councils and the former District Boards.

41. The Administration maintains that the DC proposal is not retrogressive because in 1985, appointed members of the two Municipal Councils and the former District Boards could vote in the election to return LegCo Members whereas under the Administration's current proposal, only elected DC members could vote. In addition, the elected DC members have an electorate base of over 3.3 million registered voters and their enhanced participation would increase the representativeness of the LegCo election.

42. Some members express concern that the six DC FC seats would be monopolized by large political parties holding a large number of elected DC seats, and candidates from small political parties/groups or independent candidates would stand little chance of being elected. The Administration has explained that the proportional representation system is proposed to be adopted for returning these DC FC seats under which candidates from political parties/groups of different sizes and independent candidates would all have a chance to get elected. The Administration reckons that there is a sufficient number of independent elected DC members to put up a list of candidates to contest in the election.

43. The Administration has briefed the Subcommittee on the possible options for the proportional representation voting system, namely the list proportional representation system and the single transferrable voting system. According to the Administration, as the list proportional representation system is currently adopted in the LegCo election for GCs, electors are in general familiar with the voting system. However, as the ranking of the candidates on the list are already predetermined by the group, electors would not be able to indicate their preference towards individual candidates on the list. If the whole territory is delineated as one single constituency, there will be a maximum of six candidates on each list. Under the single transferrable voting system, candidates are nominated as individual candidate. Each elector can cast one vote which is transferrable. Electors rank candidates in order of preference on the ballot paper. The Administration has pointed out that as the single transferrable voting system has not been in use since the establishment of HKSAR, electors are unfamiliar with the voting

system. The mechanism of transferring of surplus votes and the calculation of values of votes transferred is also relatively more complicated and difficult to understand. However, the system does allow electors to indicate their preference towards individual candidates and hence the choice of electors could be better reflected.

44. In response to Mr IP Kwok-him's enquiry about the pros and cons of the two types of voting systems for returning the DC FC seats, the Administration has elaborated that if the single transferrable voting system is adopted, votes cast would not be wasted due to the mechanism of transferring of surplus votes, while for the list proportional representation system, some votes might be wasted. Irrespective of which voting system is to be adopted, the quota of votes required for returning a candidate is about 68 votes (i.e. a total of 405 votes from elected DC members divided by six seats). The Administration reckons that independent DC candidates could work together to return at least one candidate, as there are more than 68 independent elected DC members.

45. Mrs Regina IP is of the view that the single transferrable voting system should be adopted for DC FC in 2012, as votes cast would not be wasted. She does not consider such a voting system over complicated given that there should be a nomination mechanism and there are only 405 electors. The Administration has advised that it has not yet formed any views on the nomination procedure for returning the six DC FC seats which would be dealt with in the context of the local legislation.

46. On delineation of constituencies, the Administration has explained to the Subcommittee that given that only six Members would be returned in DC FC, the number of constituencies in DC FC should remain small in order not to affect the effect of proportional representation. Consideration could be given to returning all the six seats through a single constituency representing the whole territory, or dividing the territory into two constituencies. According to the forecast of population for 2012, the total population in the Hong Kong Island and Kowloon and that in the New Territories are forecast to be around 3.47 million and 3.75 million respectively. If the six seats are distributed among two constituencies, three seats could be allocated to a constituency consisting of the Hong Kong Island and Kowloon, and the other three seats to the other constituency comprising the New Territories. According to the Administration, the details of the voting system will be dealt with in the context of the local legislation.

47. The Subcommittee notes that the Democratic Party ("DP") has proposed to have all six DC FC seats nominated by elected DC members and elected by all registered voters of Hong Kong. The Administration has, however, advised that there is an opinion that such proposal may not be consistent with the 2007 NPCSC Decision (which stipulates that the half-and-half ratio between Members returned by FCs and Members returned by GCs through direct elections should remain unchanged) and that should DP's proposal be adopted, the nature of the election would be akin to that of a GC election, the adoption of which would result in about 60% of all the LegCo seats being returned through direct or indirect GC elections. The Administration has further

pointed out that on the basis of the views received during the public consultation exercise, there is more support among political parties/groups and LegCo Members, as well as various organizations and individuals in the community for enhancing the representativeness of the LegCo election through enhancing the participation of elected DC members, who have a public mandate, in LegCo.

48. Mr LEE Wing-tat does not agree with the Administration's view that implementation of the DP's proposal would render the election of DC FC Members akin to implementing GC elections. He has explained that the DP's proposal would not comply with the principle of universal suffrage as it only provides for equality in voting right but not equality in the right to nominate and the right to stand for election.

The electorate base of "traditional" FCs

49. The Subcommittee notes the Liberal Party's proposal of replacing corporate votes with director's votes and the Civic Party's proposal of combining FCs of similar nature and with relatively small electorates. Many members have taken the view that to comply with the principle of gradual and orderly progress, the Administration should have considered broadening the electorate base of "traditional" FCs in 2012 in accordance with the actual situation in Hong Kong. They have pointed out that opinion polls have also indicated that the public are generally in support of broadening the electorate base of FCs.

50. The Administration has advised that it is aware of the different proposals made by academics/various organizations for broadening the electorate base of existing FCs. These proposals cover a wide spectrum, ranging from replacing corporate votes with director's votes to returning FC seats by all registered voters in Hong Kong. However, many different sectors and organizations are represented under the current FC system and the process of replacing corporate votes with "director's/executive's/association's/individual votes" is complex. During the public consultation exercise, different political parties/groups and organizations have not voiced strong support for the proposal. There is also no prominent support within LegCo for the proposal. The Administration considers that it would be difficult at this stage to reach consensus on proposals involving substantial changes to the existing FCs, but it would be willing to consider including more bodies into "traditional" FCs if appropriate such as the Transport FC. Consideration could be made to broadening the electorate base of FCs in the context of amending the relevant local legislation. The Administration has also reiterated that its proposal of freezing the "traditional" FC seats while expanding the number of DC FC seats would broaden the electorate base of FCs, as elected DC members are returned by more than 3.3 million voters through GC elections. The Administration believes that such a proposal would stand the best possible chance of being accepted by two-thirds of LegCo Members.

51. Dr Margaret NG is of the view that the Administration should have explained the criteria for the delineation of electorate of the FCs as stipulated in the Schedules to the

LegCo Ordinance (Cap. 542). Dr NG feels strongly that the Administration should have conducted a comprehensive review to assess and verify the status of the registered corporate electors of FCs on a regular basis to ensure that they remain to be eligible for registration as electors, i.e. whether they are still active and representative since the Ordinance was enacted back in 1997. The Administration has explained that the Registration and Electoral Office has kept in touch with relevant umbrella organizations to update the electoral records. The Administration would review the Ordinance before every LegCo general election, taking into account the latest developments and relevant factors.

Universal suffrage for selecting CE and for forming LegCo

Timetable for implementing universal suffrage

52. According to the Administration, in accordance with the 2007 NPCSC Decision, CE shall make a report to NPCSC at an appropriate time prior to the selection of CE and the formation of LegCo by universal suffrage and a determination thereon shall be made by NPCSC. It would be appropriate for the fourth-term CE and the fifth LegCo to address together the issues relating to the model for implementing universal suffrage for CE in 2017, and for the CE returned by universal suffrage in 2017 to work with the sixth LegCo to deal with the issue relating to the model for implementing universal suffrage for LegCo in 2020.

53. Some members have pointed out that in the past few years, opinion polls have indicated consistently that the majority of members of the public favour implementation of universal suffrage in 2012. They stress that if that is not possible, the Central Authorities should give an unequivocal assurance that genuine universal suffrage for CE and LegCo would be implemented in 2017 and 2020 respectively.

54. The Administration has advised that after NPCSC decided in December 2007 on the timetable for implementing universal suffrage for CE and LegCo in 2017 and 2020 respectively, an opinion poll conducted then showed that over 60% of the respondents accepted the decision. The opinion poll conducted by the Chinese University of Hong Kong during the public consultation period likewise revealed that 64% of the respondents accepted the 2007 NPCSC Decision which stipulated the timetable for universal suffrage. In addition, the Deputy Secretary-General of NPCSC, Mr Qiao Xiaoyang, has already stated that the 2007 universal suffrage timetable decision has legal effect. He has also stated that the door to universal suffrage has been thrown open. The Administration has stressed that Hong Kong only needs to attain consensus on the universal suffrage electoral models and complete the five-step mechanism, and universal suffrage can then be implemented.

Model for implementing universal suffrage for CE in 2017

55. Mr Ronny TONG has expressed concern that there may be conflict of interest for the CE elected in 2012 to put forward model for implementing universal suffrage for selecting CE in 2017. He has therefore suggested that the "five-step mechanism" for implementing universal suffrage for CE in 2017 should be initiated and completed by the current-term HKSAR Government so that the CE elected in 2012 would not have the opportunity to put forward an electoral model for selecting CE in 2017 which may not be consistent with the principles of genuine universal suffrage in order to serve his or her own purpose.

56. The Administration has explained that any model on the 2017 CE election put forth by the fourth-term CE must comply with the 2007 NPCSC Decision which has set out the timetable as well as the framework of the model for implementing universal suffrage for CE in 2017. Moreover, LegCo can always provide the necessary checks and balances under the "five-step mechanism" as any motion on the amendments to the two electoral methods has to be endorsed by a two-thirds majority of all LegCo Members.

57. The Administration has further advised that the 2007 NPCSC Decision stipulates that the "five-step mechanism" should be initiated at an appropriate time prior to the selection of CE by universal suffrage in accordance with the principles under BL as set out in BL 45, including gradual and orderly progress and being appropriate to the actual situation in Hong Kong. The Administration considers that the years between 2012 and 2017 is the most appropriate time for initiating the "five-step mechanism" to implement the model for introducing universal suffrage for CE, so that the actual situation in Hong Kong would be suitably taken into account.

58. Mr Ronny TONG considers it important for the Administration to explain to the public as early as practicable its views on the meaning of "democratic procedures" to allay concerns about a screening mechanism being put in place in the nomination procedures in the model for implementing universal suffrage for CE. The Administration has advised that the current HKSAR Government has not formulated any specific proposals on the democratic procedures for nominating candidates for the office of CE when universal suffrage is implemented in 2017 as it should be the task of the fourth-term CE.

59. Mr Ronny TONG has reiterated his concern that members of the public do not have adequate representation in EC. He urges the Administration to consider increasing the number of directly or indirectly elected representatives of the public in the first, second and third sectors of EC with a view to enhancing the democratic elements in EC for the ultimate implementation of universal suffrage for CE.

60. The Administration has advised that it has already made the best effort to enhance the democratic elements of EC to pave the way for the implementation of universal suffrage in 2017. Under its proposal for the composition of EC, 152 members are returned from direct or indirect GC elections (i.e. 35 directly elected LegCo Members and 117 representatives of DC). Regarding the allocation of members among

the subsectors of the first three sectors of EC, during the public consultation on the two electoral methods for 2012, the HKSAR government has received mainly three types of views, including increasing proportionally the number of seats according to the existing distribution of seats; splitting the existing subsectors; and adding new subsectors. The HKSAR Government has not yet formed specific proposals at this stage on how the additional seats should be allocated among the subsectors of the first three sectors of EC, and would continue to listen to views from the community and LegCo. Any such arrangements could be specified by local legislation, i.e. in the context of the CE Election (Amendment) Bill. The Administration stresses that the four sectors of the current EC are broadly representative and no substantial change should be made to the existing composition of EC in order to maintain the principle of balanced participation and facilitate the EC in 2012 being used as the basis for transforming into the nominating committee when universal suffrage for the CE is implemented in 2017.

Retention or abolition of FCs

61. Some members hold a strong view that the FC system does not comply with the principles of universality and equality and should be abolished ultimately for implementing universal suffrage for LegCo in 2020. They also consider that if there is any restriction in the right to stand for election, i.e. a requirement that candidates must come from a particular sector, the FC system would not be compatible with the principles of universality and equality even though the FC seats are returned on the basis of "one-person-one-vote". These members query whether the HKSAR Government has changed its stance in its first report submitted to the United Nations in the light of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights ("ICCPR") about the FC system being a transitional arrangement. They consider that the systemic flaw of the FC system is that the public could not hold FC Members accountable for their performance as the public have no power to vote FC Members out of their offices. They have further pointed out that the United Nations Human Rights Committee has already reiterated its view in its concluding observations issued after consideration of the HKSAR's reports submitted in the light of ICCPR that the electoral system for the formation of LegCo does not meet the requirements of Article 25 of ICCPR and once direct election is introduced into LegCo, the reservation made in respect of Article 25(b) would no longer apply.

62. Dr Margaret NG and Mr Ronny TONG are also of the view that the current split voting system has given the power to FC Members who are returned from a small electorate to veto proposals put forward by GC Members who have a public mandate. They urge that such a voting system should be abolished as soon as possible. Ms Miriam LAU, however, considers that the split voting system has provided the necessary check and balance as GC Members could also veto proposals put forward by FC Members.

63. The Administration has explained that the consistent position of the HKSAR Government is that the existing FC electoral model for LegCo does not comply with the

principles of universality and equality. The existing electoral arrangements cannot be maintained when universal suffrage for LegCo is implemented. CPG notified the United Nations Secretary General in June 1997 that the provisions of the ICCPR as applied to Hong Kong shall remain in force beginning from 1 July 1997. In other words, those provisions which do not apply to Hong Kong (including Article 25(b) of ICCPR for which a reservation has been made by the United Kingdom Government in 1976) also shall not be applied to HKSAR. In the case of *Chan Yu Nam v Secretary for Justice* (HCAL32/2009 and HCAL55/2009) in 2009, the High Court has ruled that such reservation continues to apply to HKSAR. The Administration has further explained that universal suffrage for LegCo would be implemented in accordance with BL, the principles of universality and equality, and the timetable set out in the 2007 NPCSC Decision. The Decision has made it clear that FC seats should not be abolished in 2012. Any proposal to abolish FCs in future would require support from FC Members and it would be very difficult to reach consensus on the matter at this stage. Besides, there are conflicting views in the community as to whether the FC seats should be abolished in one go, or only the electoral model for returning the FC seats needs to be changed when universal suffrage is implemented. There are views that all FC seats should be abolished and replaced by district-based seats returned by universal suffrage, i.e. the "one-person-one-vote" model. There are also views that the FC seats should be retained, but the electorate base of FCs should be broadened, for example, by allowing FCs to nominate candidates for election by all voters of Hong Kong, i.e. the "one-person-two-votes" model whereby each voter can cast one vote in the GC election, and the other in the FC election. However, there are views that under this model, the right to stand for election and the weight of each vote among different sectors may not be equal. The Administration stresses that there is ample time between the present and 2020 for the community to discuss the specific models for implementing universal suffrage for LegCo.

64. The Administration has reiterated that should the Administration's proposals in respect of the formation of LegCo in 2012 be endorsed, the 35 directly-elected seats and the six indirectly-elected seats through DCs would altogether comprise about 60% of the LegCo seats in 2012. Coupled with the seats in the professional sectors which are currently returned through one-person-one-vote, the 70-seat LegCo would have a considerable level of democratic elements, which would create conditions for LegCo to build consensus on resolving the issue of FCs and for implementing universal suffrage for LegCo in 2020.

65. Some other members are of the view that the FC system with the merit of balanced participation has its value for Hong Kong and should be retained, albeit in some other form with changes to its electoral method and expansion of its electorate base, when universal suffrage is implemented for forming LegCo. They consider that the FC system is not necessarily incompatible with the principles of universality and equality, and its value should not be denied altogether. Moreover, LegCo is constituted according to BL, and both FC and GC Members have their respective representativeness. Although some FC Members are returned by only a few hundred

registered corporate voters, they represent not only the corporate voters, but the entire sector concerned. For example, the some 600 body electors for the Labour FC represent some 500 000 people in the labour sector. Many members returned from FCs have stressed that while FC Members are not elected by the general public, they have made their best endeavour to service not only their respective sectors but also the wider community at large. They have further expressed the view that it is not stipulated in BL that FCs or split voting system must be abolished. While BL has provided that the ultimate aim is the election of all LegCo Members by universal suffrage, it also stipulates that the method for forming LegCo should accord with the actual situation in Hong Kong and comply with the principle of gradual and orderly progress. They consider that the FC system can safeguard the interests of the business community for the sake of the overall interests of Hong Kong.

Legislative process and timetable

66. It is the Administration's aim to introduce into LegCo the two motions regarding the amendments to the two electoral methods and put them to vote before LegCo recess starting mid-July 2010. According to the Administration, this is to allow sufficient time to complete the reporting to NPCSC for approval or record, and to deal with the relevant local legislation between autumn 2010 and the second quarter of 2011, as well as to put in place the detailed implementing arrangements before the end of 2011.

67. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong has asked whether the HKSAR Government could, in terms of legal principle, put forth another package of proposals on the two electoral methods for 2012 in the next legislative session, should the package of proposals currently put forth by the HKSAR Government be vetoed by LegCo. Mr CHEUNG has also asked whether the Administration would consider postponing the introduction of the two motions until the beginning of the next legislative session so as to allow more time for reaching possible consensus.

68. The Administration has advised that in the event that the package of proposals on the two electoral methods for 2012 is vetoed by LegCo, the HKSAR Government could, in theory, put forth to LegCo another proposed package in accordance with BL and the relevant Interpretation and Decision of NPCSC and the procedures set out therein. However, in reality, it would be extremely difficult to put forth to LegCo another proposed package for the two electoral methods for 2012. Firstly, in accordance with the NPCSC Interpretation, "the bills on the amendments to the method for selecting the CE and the method for forming the LegCo and its procedures for voting on bills and motions and the proposed amendments to such bills shall be introduced by the HKSAR Government into the LegCo." The proposed package put forth by the HKSAR Government on the two electoral methods for 2012 could enhance the democratic elements of the two electoral methods through the participation of elected DC members who have a broad electorate base. Under the framework of the NPCSC decision of 2007, the HKSAR Government has already strived for maximum latitude to put forth such a package. If the proposed package is vetoed by LegCo, the

HKSAR Government would have no room from the policy perspective to put forth another package which could contain more democratic elements than the current proposal and could stand the possibility of being supported by the majority of the public, two-thirds of all LegCo Members and the Central Authorities. Secondly, the HKSAR Government needs sufficient time to deal with the local legislation work relating to the amendments to the two electoral methods for 2012 and the practical arrangements for the elections. If the proposed package receives the endorsement of a two-thirds majority of all LegCo Members, the consent of CE, and is reported to NPCSC for approval or for the record, the HKSAR Government would have to introduce the CE Election (Amendment) Bill and the LegCo (Amendment) Bill into LegCo in the autumn of 2010 and strive to have the amendments to the two electoral ordinances passed by LegCo before May 2011, so that the relevant subsidiary legislation could be amended respectively by the CE-in-Council and the Electoral Affairs Commission ("EAC"). On the other hand, the EAC also needs to carry out work relating to the delineation of constituencies and make recommendations to CE in accordance with section 18 of EAC Ordinance (Cap.541) by early September 2011 at the latest. If the proposed package put forth by the HKSAR Government is vetoed by LegCo, there would not be sufficient time for the HKSAR Government to formulate a new package of proposals, submit it to LegCo for a vote in the next legislative session and to complete the local legislative work relating to the amendments to the two electoral methods for 2012 and the practical arrangements for the elections within the statutory time limit.

69. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong has also asked whether the two motions on amendments to the two electoral methods must be dealt with at the same Council meeting. Mr WONG Kwok-hing has asked whether the Administration would consider dealing with the two motions separately, given the divergent views on the package of proposals in respect of the election of LegCo in 2012 and the relatively less controversial views on the electoral method for the election of CE in 2012.

70. The Administration has advised that as a matter of procedure, the two motions are separate motions and would be voted on separately. These motions do not necessarily have to be presented to LegCo for endorsement at the same Council meeting. However, as the two motions are related (e.g. the Administration has proposed to enhance the role of elected DC members in both the CE and LegCo elections), the Administration would strive to gain LegCo's support for the two motions at the same Council meeting.

Advice sought

71. Members are invited to note the deliberations of the Subcommittee.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
10 June 2010

**Subcommittee on Package of Proposals for the
Methods for Selecting the Chief Executive
and for Forming the Legislative Council in 2012**

Membership list

Chairman	Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Deputy Chairman	Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, SBS, JP
Members	Hon Albert HO Chun-yan Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, SBS, S.B.St.J., JP Dr Hon Margaret NG Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, GBS, JP Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong, GBS Hon WONG Yung-kan, SBS, JP Hon LAU Kong-wah, JP Hon Miriam LAU Kin-ye, GBS, JP Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, SBS, JP Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH Hon LEE Wing-tat Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, SBS, JP Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, GBS, JP Hon WONG Ting-kwong, BBS, JP Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai, BBS, JP Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun Hon WONG Kwok-kin, BBS Hon IP Wai-ming, MH Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP Dr Hon PAN Pey-chyou Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC (since 19 May 2010) Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung (since 18 May 2010) Hon Tanya CHAN (since 18 May 2010) Hon WONG Yuk-man (since 26 May 2010)

Total: 35 Members

Clerk Miss Flora TAI

Legal Adviser Mr Arthur CHEUNG

Date 26 May 2010

2012年行政長官及立法會產生辦法建議方案小組委員會
Subcommittee on Package of Proposals for the
Methods for Selecting the Chief Executive
and for Forming the Legislative Council in 2012

曾向小組委員會表達意見的團體/個別人士名單
List of organizations/individuals which/who have
submitted views to the Subcommittee

<u>名稱</u>	<u>Name</u>
1. 九龍西區各界協會	The Unified Association of Kowloon West Ltd.
2. 九龍東區各界聯會	九龍東區各界聯會
3. 九龍城區居民聯會	Kowloon City District Resident Association
4. 九龍總商會	Kowloon Chamber of Commerce
5. 十九行動	Nineteen Action
6. 大角咀區民生關注會	Tai Kok Tsui District Resident Livelihood
7. 大學生報	UPOST
8. 女人有明天協會	女人有明天協會
9. 中西區區議會	Central & Western District Council
10. 中國社會主義民主促進會	Democratic Progressive Union of Chinese Social Democrats
* 11. 中國香港手球總會	Handball Association of HK China
12. 中國高等院校香港校友會聯合會	The Federation of Alumni Associations of Chinese Colleges and Universities in Hong Kong
13. 中國傳統民族舞學會	Institute of Chinese Cultural Dance
14. 公民黨	Civic Party
15. 公共專業聯盟	公共專業聯盟
16. 屯門區議會議員陳樹英女士	Ms CHAN Shu-ying, member of Tuen Mun District Council
17. 屯動力	屯動力
18. 方賢斌先生	Mr FONG Yin-bun
19. 牛頭角 TEEN 網絡	Ngau Tau Kok Teen Network
20. 半山社區事務促進會	Mid-level Community Development Association
21. 民主建港協進聯盟	Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong
22. 民主動力	Power for Democracy
* 23. 民主發展資源中心	Democracy and Reform Resources Centre

- | | | |
|-------|--------------|--|
| 24. | 民主黨 | The Democratic Party |
| 25. | 民間人權陣線 | Civil Human Rights Front |
| 26. | 田之動力 | 田之動力 |
| 27. | 全民發聲 | Speak Up Hong Kong |
| 28. | 印刷媒體專業人員協會 | Institute of Print-media Professionals |
| 29. | 回歸基督精神 | 回歸基督精神 |
| 30. | 安田邨社區促進會 | On Tin Estate Community Association |
| 31. | 西九龍詩歌舞區關注會 | Sycamore District Concerning Association of Kowloon West |
| 32. | 西貢區議會議員方國珊女士 | Ms FONG Kwok-shan, members of Sai Kung District Council |
| 33. | 何少平先生 | Mr HO Siu-ping |
| 34. | 余悅湛先生 | Mr YU Yuet-charm |
| 35. | 吳任豐先生 | Mr NG Yam-fung |
| 36. | 吳苑清小姐 | Miss Catherine NG |
| 37. | 吳智培先生 | Mr NG Chi-pui |
| 38. | 呂迪明小姐 | Miss LUI Dik-ming |
| 39. | 呂智偉先生 | Mr Stanley LUI |
| 40. | 李世榮先生 | Mr LI Sai-wing |
| 41. | 李國柱先生 | Mr LEE Kwok-chu |
| 42. | 李啟禧先生 | Mr LI Kai-hei |
| * 43. | 李新華先生 | Mr LEE Sun-wah |
| 44. | 李寧中先生 | Mr LEE Ning-choun |
| * 45. | 沙田區議會議員李子榮先生 | Mr LEE Chi-wing, member of Sha Tin District Council |
| 46. | 汽車交通運輸業總工會 | Motor Transport Workers General Union |
| 47. | 阮文滔先生 | Mr Tomas YUEN |
| 48. | 卓昀瑩女士 | Miss CHEUK Wan-ying |
| 49. | 周浩鼎先生 | Mr Holden CHOW |
| 50. | 周耀明先生 | Mr CHOW Yiu-ming |
| 51. | 服務業工會聯合會 | Federation of Employees Unions in Service |
| 52. | 東區區議會議員郭偉強先生 | Mr KWOK Wai-keung, member of Eastern District Council |
| * 53. | 東區區議會議員楊位醒先生 | Mr YEUNG Wai-sing, member of Eastern District Council |

54.	東區區議會議員趙資強先生	Mr CHIU Chi-keung, member of Eastern District Council
55.	林東亮先生	Mr LAN Tung-leung
* 56.	的士、小巴權益關注大聯盟	的士、小巴權益關注大聯盟
57.	社區發展動力培育	Community Development Initiative
58.	社會民主聯誼會	社會民主聯誼會
59.	青台	Greenradio
60.	青民大專發展小組	青民大專發展小組
61.	青年民建聯社會議題小組	Young Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong
62.	青年通識研究組	青年通識研究組
63.	青年網絡	Youth Network
* 64.	青言社	Action for Voice
65.	侯鎮球先生	Mr HOU Chun-kau
66.	勁松聯誼會	勁松聯誼會
* 67.	南區區議會議員楊默博士	Dr YANG Mo, member of Southern District Council
68.	建造及工程專業發展中心	Construction Professionals' Development Centre
69.	施漢強先生	Mr SY Hon-keong
70.	柯文山先生	Mr OR Man-shan
71.	活力離島	Dynamic Island
72.	胡健民先生	Mr Clement WU
73.	香港女同盟會	Women Coalition of HKSAR
74.	香港工業總會	Federation of Hong Kong Industries
75.	香港中文大學學生會	The Student Union of the Chinese University of Hong Kong
76.	香港中國旅遊協會	Hong Kong Association of China Travel Organisers
77.	香港中華文化總會	The Association of Chinese Culture of Hong Kong
78.	香港公共行政學會	HK Public Administration Association
* 79.	香港天主教勞工事務委員會	Hong Kong Catholic Commission for Labour Affairs
80.	香港少青社	Hong Kong Society of Juvenile & Youth
* 81.	香港出版印刷唱片界國情班同學會	China Studies Alumni Association of HK Publishing Printing and Records Industry

82.	香港民主促進會	Hong Kong Democratic Foundation
83.	香港印刷業商會	The Hong Kong Printers Association
84.	香港行政管理文職人員協會	The Hong Kong Executive, Administrative and Clerical Staff Association
85.	香港青年大專學生協會	Hong Kong Youth & Tertiary Students Association
86.	香港青年交流促進聯會	Hong Kong Youth Exchange Promotion United Association
87.	香港青年智庫	Hong Kong Youth Think-Tank
88.	香港青年聯會	Hong Kong United Youth Association Ltd.
89.	香港建設管理交流中心	Hong Kong Project Management Exchange Centre Ltd
90.	香港建造業總工會	Hong Kong Construction Industry Employees General Union
91.	香港拯溺總會	Hong Kong Life Saving Society
92.	香港政治經濟文化學會	Hong Kong Political Economic and Cultural Society
93.	香港政經 2.0	HK Politics 2.0
94.	香港浸會大學學生會	The Student Union of the Hong Kong Baptist University
95.	香港高齡教育工作者聯誼會有限公司	Hong Kong Senior Education Workers Association Limited
96.	香港基督徒學會	Hong Kong Christian Institute
97.	香港專上學生聯會	Hong Kong Federation of Students
* 98.	香港崇正總會	Tsung Tsin Association
99.	香港教育工作者聯會	Hong Kong Federation of Education Workers
100.	香港理工大學學生會	The Hong Kong Polytechnic University Students' Union
101.	香港規劃師學會	The Hong Kong Institute of Planners
102.	香港菁英會	香港菁英會
103.	香港華僑華人總會	The Hong Kong Overseas Chinese General Association
104.	香港新界工商業總會	Hong Kong New Territories Commercial and Industrial General Association Limited
105.	香港群青會	Hong Kong All Youth Alliance
106.	香港電影商協會	Hong Kong Chamber of Films

107. 香港僑界社團聯會	Hong Kong Federation of Overseas Chinese Associations
108. 香港漁民團體聯會	Hong Kong Fishermen Consortium
109. 香港福建社團聯會	Hong Kong Federation of Fujian Associations
110. 香港廣東社團總會	Federation of Hong Kong Gongdong Community Organizations
111. 香港職工會聯盟	Hong Kong Confederation of Trade Unions
112. 唐躍峰先生	Mr TONG Yeuk-fung
* 113. 徐小明先生	Mr Siuming TSUI
114. 砲台山學會	Fortresshill Research Institute
115. 荃灣青年會	Tsuen Wan Youth Association
116. 袁武先生	Mr YUEN Mo
117. 袁漢華先生	Mr YUEN Hon-wah
118. 馬淑燕女士	Ms MA Suk-yin
119. 將軍澳區社區服務及規劃發展委員會	將軍澳區社區服務及規劃發展委員會
* 120. 崇正中學	Tsun Tsin Middle School
* 121. 張志泉先生	Mr CHEUNG Chee-chuen
122. 張志輝先生	Mr CHEUNG Chi-fai
* 123. 張碧芳女士	Ms CHEUNG Bik-fong
124. 戚振華先生	Mr CHIK Chun-wah
125. 梁永鏗先生	Mr LEUNG Wing-hang
* 126. 梁啟盛先生	Mr LEUNG Kai-shing
127. 蛇宴同鄉會	Snake Banquet Association
* 128. 郭仲文先生	Mr 郭仲文
* 129. 郭佩傑先生	Mr KWOK Pui-kit
130. 郭德亮先生	Mr KWOK Tak-leung
131. 陳子揚先生	Mr CHAN Tsz-yeung
* 132. 陳世光先生	Mr CHEN Sai-kwong
133. 陳可明先生	Mr CHAN Ho-ming
134. 陳志興先生	Mr CHAN Chi-hing
135. 陳宗佑先生	Mr CHAN Chung-yau
136. 陳延山女士	Ms CHAN Yin-shan
137. 陳思誦先生	Mr CHAN Sze-chung
138. 陳家泰先生	Mr CHAN Kar-tai

139. 陳國偉先生	Mr CHAN Kwok-wai
140. 陳婉碧小姐	Miss CHAN Yuen-pik
141. 陳羨明先生	Mr CHAN Sin-ming
142. 陳嘉偉先生	Mr CHAN Ka-wai
143. 陳福榮先生	Mr CHAN Fook-wing
144. 陳德昌先生	Mr CHAN Tak-cheong
145. 陳曉津先生	Mr CHAN Hiu-chun
* 146. 陳禮忠先生	Mr 陳禮忠
147. 陳權康先生	Mr CHAN Kuen-hong
148. 創新科技協會	Innovation & Technology Association
149. 勞校校友會	Association of Hong Kong Schools for Workers' Children Alumni Limited
150. 媚共政客監察組	媚共政客監察組
151. 彭芷君小姐	Miss PANG Che-kwan, Gigi
152. 彭振聲先生	Mr PANG Chun-sing, George
153. 善為扶貧助學會	Good Contribution Association
* 154. 逸東社區網絡協會	逸東社區網絡協會
* 155. 順利區社區事務促進會	Shun Lee District Community Affairs Promotion Association
156. 黃君達先生	Mr WONG Kwan-tat
157. 黃東曉先生	Mr WONG Tung-hiu
158. 愛國愛港聯合陣線	愛國愛港聯合陣線
159. 新界青年聯會	Federation of New Territories Youth
160. 楊榮輝先生	Mr YOUNG Wing-fai
161. 楊學明先生	Mr YEUNG Hok-ming
162. 葵涌南文藝協進會	葵涌南文藝協進會
* 163. 董健莉小姐	Miss TUNG Kin-lei
164. 跳躍青年	Jump Youth
165. 雷連生女士	Ms LUI Lin-sang
166. 漢華中學校友會	Hon Wah College Alumni Association
167. 維園行動	Victoria Park in Action
* 168. 翠屏青年力量	Tsui Ping Teen Power
* 169. 翠屏街坊商戶聯合會	翠屏街坊商戶聯合會
170. 劉旭先生	Mr LAU Yuk

171. 劉京科先生	Mr LAU King-for
172. 劉迪鴻先生	Mr LAU Tik-hong
173. 劉偉倫先生	Mr LAU Wai-lun
* 174. 劉崧先生	Mr LAU Sung
175. 潘卓斌先生	Mr POON Cheuk-bun
* 176. 潘德明先生	Mr POON Tak-ming
177. 黎熙琳小姐	Miss LI Shee-lin
178. 歷史青年聯盟	歷史青年聯盟
179. 激進反政改力量	Radical Anti-government Power
180. 霍定洪先生	Mr FOK Ting-hung
181. 嶺南大學學生會	Lingnan University Students' Union
182. 謝瑋淦先生	Mr TSE Wai-kam
183. 鍾宏安先生	Mr Edmon CHUNG
184. 羅錦洪先生	Mr LAW Kam-hung
185. 關懷香港	Caring Hong Kong
186. 顧世力先生	Mr KU Sai-lik
* 187. 灣仔區議會議員黎大偉先生	Mr David LAI, member of Wan Chai District Council
* 188. 一名市民	A member of public
189. Abolish Functional Constituencies	Abolish Functional Constituencies
190. Community TV	Community TV
191. Democracy Depot	Democracy Depot
192. IT 呼聲	IT Voice
* 193. Libertarian.HK	Libertarian.HK

* 只提交書面意見的團體/個別人士
Organizations/individuals which/who have submitted written views only