

立法會

Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)483/12-13(03)

Ref : CB2/PL/CA

Panel on Constitutional Affairs

Updated background brief prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat for the meeting on 21 January 2013

Work of the Office of the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data

Purpose

This paper summarizes the relevant discussions held by the Panel of Home Affairs ("the HA Panel") and the Panel on Constitutional Affairs ("the CA Panel") regarding the work of the Office of the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data ("PCPD") since the First Legislative Council ("LegCo").

Background

2. The Office of PCPD is a statutory body responsible for overseeing the enforcement of the Personal Data (Privacy) Ordinance (Cap. 486) ("PDPO") which protects the privacy of individuals in relation to personal data. The Office of PCPD is headed by PCPD appointed by the Chief Executive ("CE"). According to section 5(4) of PDPO, PCPD shall hold office for a period of five years and shall be eligible for reappointment for not more than one further period of five years. Section 8 of PDPO prescribes the functions and powers of PCPD as set out in **Appendix I**. The Office of PCPD is funded mainly by recurrent subvention from the Government.

3. Mr Stephen LAU was appointed as the first PCPD when the Office of PCPD was established in 1996. His successor was Mr Raymond TANG whose appointment commenced in November 2001 but Mr TANG took up the post of the Chairperson of the Equal Opportunities Commission ("EOC") in January 2005. The previous PCPD, Mr Roderick WOO, was appointed on 1 August 2005 to fill the vacant position. The incumbent PCPD, Mr Allan CHIANG, has taken up the post since 4 August 2010.

4. Section 11(1) of PDPO provides for the establishment of the Personal Data (Privacy) Advisory Committee ("the Advisory Committee") to advise PCPD on matters relevant to the privacy of individuals in relation to personal data or implementation of PDPO. Chaired by the Commissioner, the Advisory Committee comprises members appointed by the Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs ("SCMA").

5. Since July 2007, the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau ("CMAB") has taken over from the Home Affairs Bureau ("HAB") as the housekeeping bureau of the Office of PCPD. Also, with effect from the 2008-2009 legislative session, the policy area of personal data protection ("issues relating to rights of the individual") has been transferred from the HA Panel to be placed under the purview of the CA Panel.

Review and amendment of PDPO

6. In the light of social development and technology advancement over the past decade or so, as well as the community's increasing concern about personal data privacy protection, CMAB, with the support of the Office of PCPD, has conducted a comprehensive review of PDPO. The Consultation Document on Review of PDPO was issued on 28 August 2009 to invite public views on the proposals to amend PDPO. The Administration published the Consultation Report in October 2010.

7. According to the Administration, the legislative proposals in the Consultation Report were drawn up in the light of the views received during the public consultation exercise as well as subsequent developments; and the coming to light of the transfer of massive customer personal data by some enterprises, most notably the Octopus Rewards Limited ("the Octopus incident"). In the Octopus incident, Octopus cardholders' personal data collected under the Octopus Rewards Programme were passed to third parties by Octopus Rewards Limited for direct marketing purposes. The incident aroused wide public concern over the provision of customers' personal data by some enterprises to others for direct marketing purposes without explicitly and specifically informing the customers of the purpose of the provision and the identity of the receivers, or seeking the customers' consent. The Administration further consulted the public on the legislative proposals from October to December 2010, and published the Further Public Discussions Report in April 2011. The Personal Data (Privacy) (Amendment) Bill 2011, which sought to implement proposals in the Report, was introduced into LegCo in July 2011¹.

Major issues discussed at meetings of the HA Panel and the CA Panel

8. The HA Panel received a briefing by the previous PCPD on the work plan of the Office of PCPD at its meeting on 8 November 2005. The HA Panel also

¹ The Bill sought to, inter alia, provide for regulation over the use of personal data in direct marketing and provision of personal data for use in direct marketing, create a new offence for disclosure of personal data obtained without consent, impose a heavier penalty for repeated contravention of enforcement notices ("ENs"), create a new offence for repeated contravention of the requirements under PDPO for which ENs have been served, and empower PCPD to assist data subjects in bringing proceedings to seek compensation from data users under PDPO, etc.

discussed the proposed approval procedure for overseas duty visits of PCPD and the Chairperson of EOC at its meeting on 9 December 2005, and the review of PDPO at its special meeting on 4 July 2008 during which the resource requirement of the Office of PCPD was also raised. The CA Panel followed up on the financial provision for the Office of PCPD at its meeting on 15 December 2008, and received a briefing by the previous PCPD on his work at its meeting on 19 March 2010. At the meetings on 15 November 2010 and 16 May 2011, the CA Panel received briefings by the incumbent PCPD on his future work plans, including his proposals on the review of PDPO. The major issues raised at these meetings are summarized in ensuing paragraphs.

Financial provisions for the Office of PCPD

9. During his briefing for the HA Panel on the work plan of the Office of PCPD on 8 November 2005, the previous PCPD raised the issue of resource constraints faced by his Office. According to the previous PCPD, the resource constraints had restricted the scope of new work commitment of the Office of PCPD. Some members of the HA Panel expressed the view that the relevant housekeeping bureau should provide sufficient resources to the Office of PCPD to ensure smooth implementation of PDPO.

10. Following a spate of personal data leakage incidents involving government bureaux/departments and the Hospital Authority, the HA Panel discussed with the Administration and the previous PCPD the progress of the review of PDPO and the actions taken by the Office of PCPD in following up on these incidents at a special meeting held on 4 July 2008. Members of the HA Panel noted with concern the statements made by the previous PCPD that the Office of PCPD had not been given adequate resources for handling its heavy caseload, and that the Office of PCPD had coped with the problem of inadequate funding by setting priorities to its investigation work. The HA Panel considered it necessary to provide adequate manpower and expertise for the Office of PCPD to strengthen its work given the seriousness of the spate of personal data leakage incidents.

11. The Administration advised that the Office of PCPD had been provided with a subvention of \$39.1 million in 2008-2009, representing an increase of \$2.8 million (or 7.7%) over the revised estimates for 2007-2008. CMAB would further explore the allocation of additional funding to the Office of PCPD from the financial provision allocated to CMAB upon receipt of such requests from the Office of PCPD.

12. When briefing the CA Panel on his work on 19 March 2010, the previous PCPD pointed out that the subvention provided to PCPD was far less than that to The Ombudsman and EOC, despite its much wider scope of work. Some members of the CA Panel reiterated their concern about the resource constraints

faced by the Office of PCPD. They considered that the reason for the Office of PCPD failing to comply with the 45-day requirement of serving the refusal notice under section 39(3) of PDPO and the increase in the number of long outstanding cases (i.e. those aged beyond 180 days) was due to the lack of manpower resources and increasing caseload. These members urged the Administration to increase the provision for the Office of PCPD substantially in the coming year in view of the privacy impact of unforeseen incidents.

13. The Administration advised that since CMAB took over from HAB as the housekeeping bureau of the Office of PCPD in July 2007, the provision for the Office of PCPD had increased from \$36.2 million in 2007-2008 to \$48.6 million in 2010-2011, representing an increase of 34% over 2007-2008. An additional provision of \$4.57 million had been earmarked for the Office of PCPD in 2010-2011 to step up enforcement and promotion work. This included the creation of five posts to strengthen the enforcement team of the Office of PCPD, to provide the necessary legal support and to enhance public education and promotion work. Apart from additional manpower resources, the Office of PCPD would conduct a post-implementation review of complaint cases with a view to streamlining procedures.

14. The incumbent PCPD informed the CA Panel on 15 November 2010 that the Office of PCPD had insufficient resources to cope with rapidly-increasing demand for its services, given in particular the proliferation of web and IT-enabled technological advancement. Members considered that the increase in provision for the Office of PCPD from \$36.2 million in 2007-2008 to \$48.6 million in 2010-2011 was still far from adequate.

15. When the issue of the resource requirement of the Office of PCPD was raised again at the CA Panel meeting on 16 May 2011, the Administration advised that CMAB strived to increase the annual financial provision to the Office of PCPD which soared to \$52 million in 2011-2012, representing a substantial increase of 46% compared with the provision in 2007-2008. The Administration had also increased the recurrent resources provided to the Office of PCPD in recent years with about \$11 million additional annual recurrent funding provided to the Office since 2008-2009, representing 70% of the increase in financial provision. The Administration had allocated funding for the creation of 12 posts in the past. In 2011-2012, \$3.8 million recurrent funding was allocated to the Office for the creation of four permanent posts. The Administration advised that the upper limit of the Office's Reserve Fund had also been increased from \$5 million to 20% of the total annual recurrent resources allocated to the Office and the Office had sufficient reserves of nearly \$10 million at the present stage.

16. PCPD advised that albeit more resources had been allocated to his Office

by the Administration, his staff still had difficulty in coping with the increasing workload. The existing 19 investigation officers engaged had to handle up to 1 200 complaints a year and 21 of the existing 73 staff in the Office were employed on temporary contracts as a significant part of the allocated resources were non-recurrent in nature. Some members considered that the Administration should continue to provide more resources to PCPD for creation of permanent posts to alleviate the manpower shortage. The Administration assured members that CMAB would strive to provide the Office of PCPD with adequate resources for the effective implementation of PDPO.

Promotion and public education on protection of personal data

17. Some members of the HA Panel considered it pivotal for the Office of PCPD to strengthen its work on the preventive front by stepping up promotion and public education on protection of personal data. The Office of PCPD should therefore take a proactive role in advising and assisting private organizations to put in place a mechanism for the protection of personal data, akin to the advisory services provided by the Independent Commission Against Corruption to the private sector on practices to prevent corruption. They suggested that the Office of PCPD should take measures to enhance the understanding of the public of the requirements of PDPO, such as drawing up a list of frequently asked questions on how to determine whether there was an infringement of privacy.

18. The previous PCPD explained that the Office of PCPD recognized the importance of its educational role in enhancing protection of personal data privacy. However, there was only one training officer in the Office of PCPD to organize seminars on PDPO and to undertake other educational work. The Office of PCPD would like to recruit at least two more staff to handle promotion and educational work but lacked the resources to do so. The Office of PCPD had also issued codes of practice and pamphlets which were aimed at enhancing the understanding of the public about its work and the requirements under PDPO. The Administration advised that it recognized that, apart from monitoring and enforcing compliance with PDPO, promotion and education was also a key component of the Office of PCPD's work, and had allocated an extra provision of \$1 million to the Office of PCPD in 2008-2009 to strengthen its work in this regard.

19. At the meetings on 15 November 2010 and 16 May 2011, the incumbent PCPD briefed the CA Panel on a number of promotion and education initiatives taken to promote public awareness of and compliance with the provisions of PDPO. Members noted that such initiatives included organization of free introductory seminars on personal data protection for public and tailor-made courses for individual organizations and specific sectors, promotion of privacy

and personal data protection message through Liberal Studies and Other Learning Experience under the New Senior Secondary curriculum, organization of the Data Protection Officers Club to exchange views on compliance with PDPO, publication of guidance notes and information leaflets, and the launch of a series of mass media publicity campaign.

Corporate governance of PCPD

20. Arising from public concern about false claims of allowances by the former Deputy PCPD for his overseas duty visits and complaint of impropriety against the former Chairperson of EOC while in service as a judge of the Court of Appeal for improper applications for reimbursement of Leave Passage Allowance, the Administration consulted the HA Panel at the meeting on 9 December 2005 on the proposed approval procedure for overseas duty visits of PCPD and the Chairperson of EOC. The procedures included, among others, to issue a Code of Conduct to PCPD and the Chairperson of EOC, including a section on overseas duty visits, to promote higher standards of corporate governance for PCPD and the Chairperson of EOC; and to ask PCPD and the Chairperson of EOC to seek the approval of the Secretary for Home Affairs ("SHA"), Director of the housekeeping bureau at that time, before embarking on any overseas duty visit.

21. A majority of the members of the HA Panel expressed objection to the Administration's proposal to ask PCPD and the Chairperson of EOC to seek prior approval of SHA before embarking on overseas duty visits, although they appreciated the need for the two bodies to take measures to enhance the transparency of their administrative systems. These members were concerned that the proposal would give the impression that the Government was interfering with the work of the two statutory bodies and that PCPD and the Chairperson of EOC were subordinates to SHA, hence adversely affecting the independent status and autonomy of the two statutory bodies.

22. The Office of PCPD was of the position that an effective mechanism had already been put in place providing sufficient safeguards against misuse of public funds by PCPD in conducting overseas duty visits. The previous PCPD considered that the proposed approval procedure would undermine his independence.

23. The Administration explained that the proposed approval procedure had been drawn up in response to public concern about the inadequacy of existing monitoring mechanism for overseas duty visits of statutory bodies. HAB had no intention to interfere with the work of the Office of PCPD or EOC, but the Bureau had the responsibility to monitor the expenditures of these two bodies. The Administration subsequently informed the HA Panel that the Administration

had no plan to review the governance structure of PCPD for the time being, but would consider doing so where necessary.

24. On 27 October 2009, the Director of Audit published Report No. 53 containing recommendations to PCPD covering areas of corporate governance; complaint management; promotional activities; overseas duty trips; hospitality expenditure as well as other administrative issues. The Public Account Committee ("PAC") subsequently conducted an inquiry based on the contents of the Audit Report. At the Council meeting of 3 February 2010, PAC tabled its report on the Office of PCPD in which a number of conclusions and recommendations regarding the governance and administration of the Office of PCPD had been made. PCPD accepted the recommendations and had taken steps to address the concerns expressed in the Audit Report and the PAC Report. A progress report was provided by the Office of PCPD on the implementation of recommendations put forward by the Director of Audit and PAC to the CA Panel on 19 March 2010 (Annex A to LC Paper No. CB(2)1094/09-10(12)).

25. At the CA Panel meeting on 16 May 2011, PCPD further advised that the administrative and financial irregularities identified by the Director of Audit had been remedied and the recommendations of the Director of Audit and PAC had been followed up. In particular, an internal compliance check system had been set up to ensure compliance with PCPD's established policies and rules in finance, personnel and administrative matters. A special task force, reporting directly to PCPD, would be assembled to conduct annual checks. The first series of checks were conducted in June 2011.

Enforcement power of PCPD

26. Members of the CA Panel had expressed diverse views at its various meetings on PCPD's proposals of granting criminal investigation and prosecution power to PCPD, empowering PCPD to award compensation to aggrieved data subjects, and requiring data user to pay monetary penalty for serious contravention of Data Protection Principles ("DPPs")². Nevertheless, members in general expressed concern that PCPD had inadequate powers for the effective enforcement of PDPO.

² Data users must follow the fair information practices stipulated in the six DPPs in Schedule 1 to PDPO in relation to the purpose and manner of data collection, accuracy and duration of data retention, use of personal data, security of personal data, availability of data information, and access to personal data. PCPD is empowered to direct the data user concerned to take corrective actions for non-compliance with the provisions of DPPs by issuing an EN. With effect from 1 October 2012, if a data user fails to take corrective actions for his contravention by the date specified in an EN, he will be liable to a fine at Level 5 (at present \$50,000) and imprisonment for two years. The data user is liable to a daily penalty of \$1,000 if the offence continues. On a second or subsequent conviction, the maximum penalty is a fine at Level 6 (at present \$100,000) and imprisonment for two years.

27. At the CA Panel meetings on 15 and 20 November 2010, the incumbent PCPD pointed out that the recent serious contraventions of PDPO and unauthorized sale of personal data had reflected the inadequacy of the enforcement power of PCPD. The proposal of empowering PCPD criminal investigation and prosecution powers could meet the public expectations for enhancing deterrent measures against serious contravention of PDPO. PCPD advised that his team had the knowledge and experience to perform these roles efficiently and effectively. However, the discretion to prosecute or not still vested with the Secretary of Justice.

28. The Administration explained that to afford better protection of personal data privacy, it had proposed to introduce in PDPO additional specific requirements on data users for the collection and use of personal data for direct marketing, make a serious contravention of PDPO such as the unauthorized sale of personal data an offence, and impose a heavier penalty on repeated non-compliance with EN etc. On enhancing the sanctioning powers of PCPD, the Administration had proposed to empower PCPD to provide legal advice and assistance to an aggrieved data subject to institute legal proceedings to seek compensation under section 66 of PDPO. In order to maintain checks and balances, the Administration, however, maintained its view that PCPD should not be provided with the power to carry out criminal investigations and prosecutions as it was important to retain the existing arrangement under which criminal investigation and prosecution were vested respectively in the Police and Department of Justice. The Government announced in April 2011 that proposals of granting criminal investigation and prosecution power to PCPD, empowering PCPD to award compensation to aggrieved data subjects and requiring data user to pay monetary penalty for serious contravention of DPPs under PDPO would not be implemented.

Recent developments

29. The Personal Data (Privacy) (Amendment) Ordinance 2012 ("PDPAO") was enacted in June 2012. Most of the provisions therein have come into operation since 1 October 2012. According to the Administration, the remaining provisions relating to direct marketing and the legal assistance scheme would come into operation on a day to be appointed by SCMA, taking into account the need to provide sufficient time for PCPD to prepare guidance notes in relation to the promotion of and compliance with the new requirements in PDPAO and for data users to prepare for the necessary documentation and procedural changes. The Administration has undertaken to revert to the CA Panel on the preparation of the guidance notes and the publicity and public education work for implementing the relevant provisions in PDPAO. The Administration intends to bring the remaining provisions in PDPAO into operation in the second quarter of 2013.

30. PCPD will brief the CA Panel on an update of the work of the Office of PCPD and its preparations for implementing the remaining provisions in PDPAO at the Panel meeting on 21 January 2013.

Relevant questions/motions and papers

31. Details of relevant questions raised and motions moved at Council meetings since the First LegCo, and relevant papers available on the LegCo website (<http://www.legco.gov.hk>) are in **Appendix II**.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
15 January 2013

~~則行政長官可藉書面通知委任一人署理專員職位，直至(視情況所需)——(由 1999 年第 34 號第 3 條修訂)~~

- ~~(i) 新的專員根據第 5(3) 條獲委任為止；或~~
~~(ii) 專員回任為止。~~
 (2) 根據第 (1) 款獲委任署理專員職位的人，在他獲委任的期間——
 (a) 須執行專員在本條例下的職能；及
 (b) 可行使專員在本條例下的權力。
 (3) 第 6 條須適用於根據第 (1) 款獲委任署理專員職位的人，猶如該人是專員一樣。

8. 專員的職能及權力

- (1) 專員須——
- 就遵守本條例條文作出監察及監管；
 - 促進及協助代表資料使用者的團體為第 12 條的施行擬備實務守則，以在遵守本條例條文(尤其是各保障資料原則)方面提供指引；
 - 促進對本條例的條文(尤其是各保障資料原則)的認識及理解以及遵守；
 - 對他認為可影響在個人資料方面的個人私隱的建議制定的法例(包括附屬法例)加以審核，並向建議制定該法例的人報告其審核結果；
 - 進行視察，包括對屬政府部門或法定法團的資料使用者所使用的任何個人資料系統的視察；
 - 為更佳地執行他的其他職能而對資料處理及電腦科技進行研究及監察其發展，以顧及該等發展在個人資料方面對個人私隱相當可能有的不利影響；
 - 與——
 - 在香港以外任何地方執行專員認為與其在本條例下的任何職能相似(不論全部或部分相似)的職能的人，進行聯絡及合作；及

~~then the Chief Executive may, by notice in writing, appoint a person to act as the Commissioner until, as the case requires— (Amended 34 of 1999 s. 3)~~

- ~~(i) a new Commissioner is appointed under section 5(3); or~~
~~(ii) the Commissioner resumes his office.~~
 (2) A person appointed under subsection (1) to act as the Commissioner, whilst he is so appointed—
 (a) shall perform the functions; and
 (b) may exercise the powers,
 of the Commissioner under this Ordinance.
 (3) Section 6 shall apply to a person appointed under subsection (1) to act as the Commissioner as if that person were the Commissioner.

8. Functions and powers of Commissioner

- (1) The Commissioner shall—
- monitor and supervise compliance with the provisions of this Ordinance;
 - promote and assist bodies representing data users to prepare, for the purposes of section 12, codes of practice for guidance in complying with the provisions of this Ordinance, in particular the data protection principles;
 - promote awareness and understanding of, and compliance with, the provisions of this Ordinance, in particular the data protection principles;
 - examine any proposed legislation (including subsidiary legislation) that the Commissioner considers may affect the privacy of individuals in relation to personal data and report the results of the examination to the person proposing the legislation;
 - carry out inspections, including inspections of any personal data systems used by data users which are departments of the Government or statutory corporations;
 - for the better performance of his other functions, undertake research into, and monitor developments in, the processing of data and computer technology in order to take account of any likely adverse effects such developments may have on the privacy of individuals in relation to personal data;
 - liaise and co-operate with any person in any place outside Hong Kong—
 - performing in that place any functions which, in the opinion of the Commissioner, are similar (whether in whole or in part) to any of the Commissioner's functions under this Ordinance; and

(ii) 該等人士在某些相互關注的並涉及在個人資料方面的個人私隱的事項方面進行聯絡及合作；及

(h) 執行根據本條例或其他成文法則委予他的其他職能。

(2) 專員可作出所有為更佳地執行其職能而需要作出的或對此有助的所有事情，或為更佳地執行其職能而連帶須作出的所有事情，而在不影響前文的概括性原則下，專員尤可——

(a) 在認為任何類別的財產對——

(i) 為專員或任何訂明人員供給地方；或

(ii) 專員可執行的任何職能的執行，屬必要時，取得及持有該財產，並可在持有該財產所按的條款及條件的規限下，處置該財產；

(b) 訂立、履行、轉讓、更改或撤銷任何合約、協議或其他義務，或接受他人所轉讓的合約、協議或其他義務；

(c) 承辦及執行合法信託，但限於以推動專員在本條例下須予執行或准予執行的職能為宗旨的信託或具有其他類似宗旨的信託；

(d) 接受饋贈及捐贈，不論是否受信託所規限的饋贈或捐贈；

(e) 在獲得行政長官事先批准下，成為任何關注 (不論是全部或部分) 在個人資料方面的個人私隱的國際組織的正式成員或附屬成員； (由 1999 年第 34 號第 3 條修訂)

(f) 行使本條例或其他成文法則賦予他的其他權力。

(3) 專員在執行其職能或行使其權力時，可製備及簽立任何文件；凡任何與他執行職能或行使權力所合理附帶或相應引起的事宜，專員亦可在與該等事宜有關連的情況下，製備及簽立任何文件。

(4) 任何文件如看來是以專員的印章簽立的，須予接納為證據，在沒有相反證據的情況下須當作已妥為簽立。

(5) 為向資料使用者提供指引，專員可不時安排擬備不抵觸本條例的指引以顯示他擬執行其在本條例下任何職能或行使其在本條例下任何權力的方式，並安排將該指引藉憲報公告刊登。

(ii) in respect of matters of mutual interest concerning the privacy of individuals in relation to personal data; and

(h) perform such other functions as are imposed on him under this Ordinance or any other enactment.

(2) The Commissioner may do all such things as are necessary for, or incidental or conducive to, the better performance of his functions and in particular but without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing, may—

(a) acquire and hold property of any description if in the opinion of the Commissioner such property is necessary for—

(i) the accommodation of the Commissioner or of any prescribed officer; or

(ii) the performance of any function which the Commissioner may perform,

and, subject to the terms and conditions upon which such property is held, dispose of it;

(b) enter into, carry out, assign or accept the assignment of, vary or rescind, any contract, agreement or other obligation;

(c) undertake and execute any lawful trust which has as an object the furtherance of any function which the Commissioner is required or is permitted by this Ordinance to perform or any other similar object;

(d) accept gifts and donations, whether subject to any trust or not;

(e) with the prior approval of the Chief Executive, become a member of or affiliate to any international body concerned with (whether in whole or in part) the privacy of individuals in relation to personal data; (Amended 34 of 1999 s. 3)

(f) exercise such other powers as are conferred on him under this Ordinance or any other enactment.

(3) The Commissioner may make and execute any document in the performance of his functions or the exercise of his powers or in connection with any matter reasonably incidental to or consequential upon the performance of his functions or the exercise of his powers.

(4) Any document purporting to be executed under the seal of the Commissioner shall be admitted in evidence and shall, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, be deemed to have been duly executed.

(5) The Commissioner may from time to time cause to be prepared and published by notice in the Gazette, for the guidance of data users, guidelines not inconsistent with this Ordinance, indicating the manner in which he proposes to perform any of his functions, or exercise any of his powers, under this Ordinance.

**Relevant documents on the Work of
the Office of the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data**

Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
Legislative Council	8.11.2000	Official Record of Proceedings Page 65 - 66 (Written question)
	27.2.2002	Official Record of Proceedings Page 103 - 105 (Written question)
Panel on Home Affairs	8.11.2005 (Item VI)	Agenda Minutes
	9.12.2005 (Item V)	Agenda Minutes
	4.7.2008 (Item I)	Agenda Minutes CB(2)2657/07-08(01)
Panel on Constitutional Affairs ("CA Panel")	15.12.2008 (Item III)	Agenda Minutes
	19.3.2010 (Item V)	Agenda Minutes CB(2)1146/09-10(01)
Legislative Council	20.10.2010	Official Record of Proceedings Page 145 - 248 (Motion)
CA Panel	15.11.2010 (Item IV)	Agenda Minutes
	20.11.2010	Agenda Minutes
Legislative Council	12.1.2011	Official Record of Proceedings Page 126 - 209 (Motion)

Committee	Date of meeting	Paper
Legislative Council	6.4.2011	Official Record of Proceedings Page 13 - 15 (Written question)
CA Panel	18.4.2011 (Item IV)	Agenda Minutes
	16.5.2011 (Item III)	Agenda Minutes
Legislative Council	22.6.2011	Official Record of Proceedings Page 139 - 141 (Written question)
	6.7.2011	Official Record of Proceedings Page 115 - 118 (Written question)
	13.7.2011	Official Record of Proceedings Page 138 - 143 (Written question)
	31.10.2012	Official Record of Proceedings Page 96 - 100 (Written question)

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
15 January 2013