

立法會
Legislative Council

Ref : CB2/PL/CA

LC Paper No. CB(2)1194/19-20

(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Panel on Constitutional Affairs

Minutes of meeting
held on Monday, 20 April 2020, at 2:30 pm
in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex

Members present : Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP(Chairman)
Hon Kenneth LAU Ip-keung, BBS, MH, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, GBS, JP
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Kin-por, GBS, JP
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee, GBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon Claudia MO
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon KWOK Wai-keung, JP
Hon Dennis KWOK Wing-hang
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Hon IP Kin-yuen
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, GBS, JP
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, SBS, JP
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan

Hon Alvin YEUNG
Hon CHU Hoi-dick
Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, BBS, JP
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP
Hon HO Kai-ming
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding
Hon Tanya CHAN
Hon HUI Chi-fung
Hon LUK Chung-hung, JP
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai
Hon KWONG Chun-yu
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho

**Member
absent** : Hon CHAN Han-pan, BBS, JP

Public Officers : Item IV
attending

Mr Andy CHAN Shui-fu, JP
Under Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs

Ms Judy CHUNG Sui-kei
Principal Assistant Secretary (Constitutional and Mainland
Affairs)⁵

Miss Cathy LI King-tsz
Assistant Secretary (Constitutional and Mainland Affairs) 5A

Item V

The Administration

Miss Rosanna LAW Shuk-pui, JP
Deputy Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs

Office of the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data

Mr Stephen WONG Kai-yi
Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data

Mr Tony LAM Chik-ting
Deputy Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data

Clerk in attendance : Ms Joanne MAK
Chief Council Secretary (2) 3

Staff in attendance : Mr Bonny LOO
Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 3(Acting)

Ms Jasmine TAM
Senior Council Secretary (2) 3

Mr Dennis HO
Council Secretary (2) 3

Mrs Fonny TSANG
Legislative Assistant (2) 3

Action

I. Information paper(s) issued since the last meeting

[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)776/19-20(01), CB(2)780/19-20(01) and CB(2)801/19-20(01)]

Members noted that the following papers had been issued after the last meeting:

- (a) joint letter dated 20 March 2020 from 22 Members to Chairmen of committees [LC Paper No. CB(2)776/19-20(01)];
- (b) letter dated 19 March 2020 from Mr Dennis KWOK to the Chairmen of this Panel and the Panel on Security [LC Paper No. CB(2)780/19-20(01)];
- (c) written response of the Equal Opportunities Commission ("EOC") to the letter dated 28 February 2020 from Dr Priscilla LEUNG [LC Paper No. CB(2)801/19-20(01)]; and
- (d) fourth Report of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("HKSAR") under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

2. Regarding Mr Dennis KWOK's letter in (b) above, the Chairman said that he was given to understand that the Administration would provide within the week a written response. The Chairman further said that upon receipt of the Administration's written response, he would consider Mr KWOK's request in consultation with the Chairman of the Panel on Security.

Action

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's response to Mr KWOK's letter [LC Paper No. CB(2)860/19-20(01)] was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(2)862/19-20 on 21 April 2020.]

3. The Chairman informed members that he had received the night before a joint letter dated 19 April 2020 from five members belonging to the Civic Party, viz. Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Ms Tanya CHAN and Mr Jeremy TAM ("the five members concerned"), requesting him to convene a special meeting to discuss issues relating to Article 22 of the Basic Law ("BL 22"). The joint letter was tabled at the meeting for members' reference.

(Post-meeting note: The above joint letter [LC Paper No. CB(2)851/19-20(01)] was issued to members after the meeting on 20 April 2020.]

4. Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr Dennis KWOK, Mr Alvin YEUNG and Mr Jeremy TAM expressed grave concern that the Liaison Office of the Central People's Government ("CPG") in HKSAR ("the Liaison Office") had recently claimed that the Hong Kong and Macao Affairs Office of the State Council and the Liaison Office were not within the general meaning of the "department of CPG" as referred to in BL 22, which seemed to imply that the two offices were not subject to BL 22. They were also deeply concerned that the HKSAR Government had issued three press releases on 18 and 19 April 2020 giving contradictory statements about the applicability of BL 22 to the Liaison Office. These members pointed out that the latest statement given by the HKSAR Government, i.e. the Liaison Office was an office set up in HKSAR by CPG, and not "offices in HKSAR set up by departments of CPG" as stated in BL 22(2), was clearly contrary to its previous explanation given to the Legislative Council ("LegCo") as well as the public understanding that the Liaison Office was one of the three offices set up in HKSAR by CPG under BL 22(2) and that it should abide by the laws of Hong Kong in accordance with BL 22(3). They stressed that as the aforesaid remarks by the Liaison Office and the contradictory statements given by the HKSAR Government had aroused serious concerns both locally and internationally about whether the "one country, two systems" principle was faithfully and effectively implemented in Hong Kong, it was necessary for the Panel to hold an urgent special meeting to discuss relevant issues. Mr YEUNG added that the Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs should be requested to attend the special meeting to explain the reasons for the change of HKSAR Government's stance on the matter.

Action

5. Mr James TO, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Dr Helena WONG, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Mr HUI Chi-fung and Mr KWONG Chun-yu expressed support for the above request raised by the five members concerned. Mr TO, Ms MO, Dr WONG and Mr HUI considered that relevant remarks by the Liaison Office had given rise to a constitutional crisis and contravened general understanding that the Liaison Office was subject to BL 22 and, in particular, BL 22(1) which expressly provided that no department of CPG might interfere in the affairs which HKSAR administered on its own in accordance with the Basic Law. They considered that the matter had serious implications on the proper operation of Hong Kong's political structure and implementation of "one country, two systems", "Hong Kong people administering Hong Kong" and a high degree of autonomy in Hong Kong. They urged the Panel to hold a special meeting so that the Administration could clarify the relevant issues as soon as possible.

6. Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mrs Regina IP, Mr LUK Chung-hung and Mr Holden CHOW commented that the recent controversy over the interpretation of BL 22 had reflected a lack of accurate and comprehensive understanding of the Basic Law amongst some LegCo Members and officials of the HKSAR Government over the past years. They stressed that it was reasonable and legitimate for the Liaison Office, which was authorized by CPG to have special responsibility to handle issues relating to Hong Kong, and the HKSAR Government to clarify the matter so as to put the record straight. Ms Starry LEE and Dr Junius HO said that in examining the roles and functions of the Liaison Office, due regard should be given to various relevant articles of the Basic Law, including BL 12 which stipulated that HKSAR was a local administrative region of the People's Republic of China that enjoyed a high degree of autonomy and came directly under CPG. Ms LEE further said that the proposed discussion, if deemed necessary by the Panel, should cover not only BL 22 but also other important articles concerning the relationship between the Central Authorities and HKSAR, so as to enable Members and the public to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the Basic Law. Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr Martin LIAO and Mr KWOK Wai-keung said that while they did not object to discussing the issues raised by the five members concerned, they did not see any urgency to do so or any need to hold a special meeting for the purpose.

7. The Chairman said that he had taken note of members' views and undertook to consider the request. He would inform members of his decision in due course. The Chairman added that in considering whether

Action

Clerk

the request should be acceded to, he would have regard to, among other factors, whether significant public interest was involved and whether there was urgency to discuss the issues raised that warranted the holding of a special meeting by the Panel. Meanwhile, he would request the Administration to provide for members' reference a written response to the issues raised in the joint letter from the five members concerned.

II. Items for discussion at the next meeting

[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)815/19-20(01) and (02)]

8. Members agreed to discuss the following items proposed by the Administration at the next meeting on 18 May 2020 at 2:30 pm:

- (a) briefing by the Chairperson of EOC; and
- (b) practical arrangements and publicity for the 2020 Legislative Council General Election.

III. Matters arising from the meeting on 16 March 2020

[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)836/19-20(01) to (04)]

9. The Chairman said that at the last meeting on 16 March 2020, four motions were respectively proposed by Ms Starry LEE, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr CHAN Han-pan and Dr Helena WONG under agenda item III "Electoral Affairs Commission Report on the 2019 District Council Ordinary Election" and item IV "Proposed Guidelines on Election-related Activities in respect of the Legislative Council Election issued by the Electoral Affairs Commission". Owing to insufficient meeting time, members had agreed to deal with the four proposed motions at this meeting. The Chairman added that as Mr CHAN Han-pan was absent, his motion would not be dealt with at this meeting.

10. The Chairman said that he would first invite members to decide one by one by voting whether the motions proposed by Ms Starry LEE, Mr Alvin YEUNG and Dr Helena WONG respectively should be proceeded with. Should the Panel agree to proceed with any of the three proposed motions, he would then invite members to vote on the motion(s) concerned. The Chairman further said that as agreed at the last meeting, he would only

Action

invite members to vote on the proposed motions but would not allow any more time for further discussion of the motions.

11. The Chairman said that according to the order in which the three proposed motions were presented to the Panel, he would first put to vote the question as to whether the Panel agreed to proceed with the motion proposed by Ms Starry LEE (at **Annex I(a)**). At the request of Ms Claudia MO, the Chairman ordered a division and that the voting bell be rung for five minutes to notify members of the voting.

12. The voting result was that 20 members voted for and 19 members voted against the question, and no member abstained from voting (details of the division at **Annex I(b)**). The Chairman declared that Ms Starry LEE's proposed motion would be proceeded with.

13. The Chairman then put to vote the question as to whether the Panel agreed to proceed with the motion proposed by Mr Alvin YEUNG (at **Annex II(a)**). At the request of Mr Alvin YEUNG, the Chairman ordered a division and that the voting bell be rung for five minutes to notify members of the voting.

14. The voting result was that 30 members voted for and eight members voted against the question, and one member abstained from voting (details of the division at **Annex II(b)**). The Chairman declared that Mr YEUNG's proposed motion would be proceeded with.

15. The Chairman further put to vote the question as to whether the Panel agreed to proceed with the motion proposed by Dr Helena WONG (at **Annex III(a)**) and ordered a division. The voting result was that 29 members voted for and 11 members voted against the question, and one member abstained from voting (details of the division at **Annex III(b)**). The Chairman declared that Dr WONG's proposed motion would be proceeded with.

16. Mr Steven HO said he noted that part of Ms Starry LEE's motion (i.e. "according priority to all electors who are Senior Citizen Card holders to cast their votes") and that of Mr Alvin YEUNG's motion (i.e. "without the need to arrange extra queues (commonly known as 'caring queues')") were inconsistent with each other. He enquired about the voting arrangements in respect of these two motions. The Chairman concurred that the cited part of

Action

Mr YEUNG's motion was clearly in conflict with that of Ms LEE's motion. He said that as such, if Ms LEE's motion, which would be voted on first, was passed, Mr YEUNG's motion would not be proceeded with unless Mr YEUNG agreed to amend the relevant part of his motion, in which case, Mr YEUNG's motion as amended would then be proceeded with.

17. Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 3 (Acting) observed that as Dr Helena WONG's motion sought to urge the Administration to, among others, ensure that "queue jumping is prohibited", members might wish to consider whether this part of Dr WONG's motion was also inconsistent with the aforementioned part of Ms Starry LEE's motion. The Chairman asked Dr Helena WONG whether she wished to clarify the meaning of the relevant part of her motion. Dr WONG replied in the negative and stated that her motion should be understood according to the ordinary meaning of the words used. After discussion, the Chairman ruled that it was arguable whether or not the cited part of Dr WONG's motion was inconsistent with that of Ms LEE's motion. As such, he would allow Dr WONG's motion to be put to vote without amendment even if Ms LEE's motion was passed.

18. In reply to Dr Helena WONG's enquiry, the Clerk advised that as stated in paragraph 3.58 of the Handbook for Chairmen of Panels, in the case of two motions being inconsistent with each other, if the motion which was voted on first was passed, the other motion was deemed to be negated.

19. The Chairman put Ms Starry LEE's motion (at Annex I(a)) to vote. At members' request, the Chairman ordered a division. The voting result was that 22 members voted for and 18 members voted against the motion, and no member abstained from voting (details of the division at **Annex IV**). The Chairman declared that the motion was passed. The Administration would be requested to provide a written response to the motion.

Admin

20. In reply to the Chairman's enquiry, Mr Alvin YEUNG said that he would not amend his motion. The Chairman said that as earlier explained, he would not put Mr Alvin YEUNG's motion to vote as the motion was inconsistent with Ms Starry LEE's motion, which had been passed by the Panel.

21. The Chairman then put Dr Helena WONG's motion (at Annex III(a)) to vote and ordered a division. The voting result was that 18 members voted for and 19 members voted against the motion, and one member abstained from voting (details of the division at **Annex V**). The Chairman declared that the motion was negated.

Action

IV. Administrative Guidelines on Promotion of Racial Equality
[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)610/19-20(03) and CB(2)815/19-20(03)]

22. The Under Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs ("USCMA") briefed members on the salient points of the Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(2)610/19-20(03)].

Discussion

Scope of application and implementation of the Administrative Guidelines on Promotion of Racial Equality

23. In reply to the enquiries of Ms Claudia MO and Dr Helena WONG, USCMA said that the Administrative Guidelines on Promotion of Racial Equality ("the Guidelines") had been refined for application to all government bureaux/departments ("B/Ds") as well as related organizations providing services to people of different races (collectively referred to as "public authorities") with effect from April 2020.

24. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen considered it problematic that the prohibition against racial discrimination in the provision of "services" in the Race Discrimination Ordinance ("RDO") (Cap. 602) was not applicable in terms of government acts in relation to law enforcement. He sought clarification on whether the disciplined services, including the Police, were required to comply with the Guidelines in performing law enforcement duties, and if so, whether individual officers who failed to do so would be subject to disciplinary action. Dr Helena WONG also expressed concern about how the Administration would ensure compliance with the Guidelines, which were only administrative in nature and not legally binding, and asked whether a complaint/reporting mechanism was in place to deal with cases of non-compliance by individual B/Ds.

25. USCMA reiterated that all B/Ds, including the disciplined services, were required to comply with the Guidelines. The Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau ("CMAB") would maintain an overview on the implementation of the Guidelines, as well as collate and publicize relevant information including the checklists of measures and relevant statistics from public authorities annually. CMAB would also keep the Guidelines under review in the light of implementation experiences as necessary. USCMA added that avenues were available to address complaints against public authorities, including those relating to non-compliance with the Guidelines, through The Ombudsman, complaint channels in B/Ds, the Legislative

Action

Council Redress System, etc. In reply to Dr Helena WONG's further enquiry, USCMA said that while CMAB would maintain an overview on the implementation of the Guidelines within the Government and would consider following up on serious cases of non-compliance by B/Ds if warranted, complaints about non-compliance by individual B/Ds could be dealt with by the existing complaint-handling mechanism of the B/Ds concerned directly.

26. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen sought details of the compulsory training that public authorities were required to provide to frontline staff and new recruits under the revised Guidelines. USCMA said that the revised Guidelines had specified the requirement for public authorities to provide training to enhance staff sensitivity and understanding of race-related issues in general so as to develop staff competencies in serving people of different races. USCMA added that in this respect, additional funding had been provided to EOC to, among others, enhance the provision of training on RDO and cultural sensitivity to civil servants.

27. Mr LUK Chung-hung said that the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions had issued in November 2017 a policy agenda for ethnic minorities ("EMs") recommending, among others, reviewing and refining the Guidelines to provide guidance on enhancing the provision of interpretation services to EMs and incorporate relevant service pledges. He enquired about the statistics on the interpretation services provided by various B/Ds to EMs, such as the number of EMs who had used such services and the average waiting time for receiving the services.

28. USCMA said that currently, suitable interpretation and translation services were provided by various public authorities to people of diverse race in need. For instance, the Home Affairs Department ("HAD") had commissioned the Hong Kong Christian Service to operate the Centre for Harmony and Enhancement of Ethnic Minority Residents ("CHEER"), which provided, among others, free Telephone Interpretation and Enquiry Services between English and eight other languages in non-specialized/non-professional areas. Besides, the Hospital Authority had engaged the Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui (HKSKH) Lady MacLehose Centre and part-time court interpreters to provide interpretation services covering 18 EM languages in public hospitals and clinics. USCMA further advised that according to the statistics provided by CHEER, it handled an average of 4 000 to 5 000 requests for interpretation and translation services annually, among which Bahasa Indonesia, Nepali and Punjabi were the most popular languages.

Action

29. Mr LUK Chung-hung said that while the Guidelines might not apply to the provision of public services to people in Hong Kong who came from different parts of the Mainland and spoke different Chinese dialects as they did not constitute a separate racial group under the definition of "race" in RDO, these people might also encounter difficulties in accessing public services due to inability to communicate effectively in English and Cantonese. He asked whether the Administration would consider providing interpretation services on Chinese dialects (e.g. Fukienese, Shanghainese, Chiu Chow and Hakka dialects) in future. USCMA responded that the suggested services appeared to be more related to support services for new arrivals from the Mainland, which fell under the purview of HAD. He undertook to relay Mr LUK's suggestion to HAD for its consideration.

Inadequacies of existing anti-discrimination ordinances

30. Mrs Regina IP said that while she welcomed the improvements made to the Guidelines, she was of the view that the revised Guidelines could hardly address the core issue of eliminating discrimination in society. She asked whether the Administration would consider legislating against hate crimes with reference to relevant legislation of the United Kingdom. Referring to the book "Rule of Law" written by Lord Tom BINGHAM, she also asked whether the Administration would consider introducing legislative amendments to expand the scope of protection provided under the existing anti-discrimination ordinances to cover discriminatory acts on new grounds (e.g. resident status and political stance).

31. USCMA explained that sections 45(1) and 46 of RDO specifically dealt with the issue of racial vilification and serious racial vilification respectively. Other racist acts could also be dealt with by, among others, the Public Order Ordinance (Cap. 245). That said, the Administration would consider how to follow up on the suggestion of enacting legislation to address hate crimes, together with other recommendations of priority under EOC's submission on the Discrimination Law Review and other relevant suggestions received. USCMA further explained that under RDO, the definition of "race" was confined to a person's race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin, and did not cover the person's nationality, citizenship or resident status. The Administration would need to examine carefully the suggestion of expanding the protected grounds of discrimination under the four anti-discrimination ordinances before deciding on the way forward, while maintaining communication with EOC.

Action

Other related issues

32. Ms Claudia MO expressed concern that many local EM residents had little knowledge of the measures taken by the Administration to tackle the coronavirus disease 2019 ("COVID-19"), the latest infection situation in Hong Kong and related health information. Noting that the Administration had launched a thematic website on COVID-19, she queried why only very little information contained therein had been made available in languages used by EMs. She urged the Administration to step up efforts to help the EM community keep abreast of the latest local situation of the pandemic and provide them with relevant health advice.

33. USCMA responded that apart from the aforementioned thematic website, the Administration had disseminated anti-pandemic information to people of diverse race through various other channels. For instance, the Centre for Health Protection ("CHP") under the Department of Health had produced various leaflets providing latest updates on COVID-19 and relevant health advice in nine EM languages. CHP and the Labour Department had also maintained close liaison with relevant consulate offices in Hong Kong and kept them informed of the latest local situation of the pandemic and related preventive measures. Nevertheless, the Administration welcomed suggestions on ways to enhance the dissemination of anti-pandemic information to people of diverse race.

V. Briefing by the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data
[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)815/19-20(04)and (05)]

34. At the invitation of the Chairman, the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data ("the Privacy Commissioner") briefed members on the salient points of the paper on the work of his Office ("PCPD") in 2019 [LC Paper No. CB(2)815/19-20(04)].

Discussion

Doxxing and cyberbullying

35. Mr LUK Chung-hung and the Deputy Chairman expressed concerns that according to PCPD's paper, PCPD had received as many as 4 370 cases relating to doxxing and cyberbullying in 2019, of which over 1 500 (around 36%) involved police officers and their family members. Mr LUK questioned why only eight people had reportedly been arrested by the Police

Action

and only one was prosecuted as at the end of 2019. The Deputy Chairman urged PCPD to step up efforts to initiate investigations into relevant suspected cases. The Deputy Chairman also asked what other measures could be taken to deter people more effectively from doxxing police officers.

36. The Privacy Commissioner explained that PCPD was not vested with the powers to conduct criminal investigation and prosecution for criminal offences under the Personal Data (Privacy) Ordinance (Cap. 486) ("PDPO"). As such, it had referred in 2019 around 1 400 suspected criminal doxxing cases, i.e. those cases involving a potential contravention of section 64 of PDPO, to the Police. The Privacy Commissioner said that the small number of prosecutions instituted might be due to difficulties in tracking the doxxers and collecting relevant evidence. According to PCPD's experience in handling doxxing-related cases, doxxers usually would not use their real names when registering as social media account holders. Besides, most of the online platforms involved did not operate from or were not registered in Hong Kong. PCPD had to resort to writing to the platforms concerned urging them to remove the relevant doxxing posts/web links, of which close to 70% had been removed. PCPD had also urged the platforms concerned to provide the registration information and IP addresses of the netizens who uploaded the doxxing posts, but no useful response had been received so far. The Privacy Commissioner said that PCPD would follow up on relevant suspected cases and initiate investigations as warranted in accordance with PDPO, with a view to reducing the damage caused to the victims concerned. The Privacy Commissioner further said that in the light of public concerns about doxxing and the difficulties encountered by PCPD in handling relevant cases, the Government and PCPD were studying how PDPO should be amended in order to curb doxxing behaviour more effectively. The Privacy Commissioner added that apart from law enforcement, PCPD would also step up promotion and public education through different channels in order to tackle the problem of doxxing at its root.

37. Mr LUK Chung-hung asked whether sharing a hyperlink with leaked personal data on a social media platform would amount to contravention of section 64 of PDPO. The Privacy Commissioner responded that the question had to be assessed based on the facts and circumstances as well as the evidence collected in each case.

38. Mrs Regina IP asked whether the Privacy Commissioner would recommend empowering PCPD to directly issue orders to require relevant online platforms or websites to take down the doxxing posts, so as to curb the harm caused to the victims concerned as soon as possible. The Privacy

Action

Commissioner replied that it was one of PCPD's recommended directions for amendments to PDPO and that PCPD was working with the Government to conduct further in-depth study on concrete legislative amendment proposals.

39. Mr Christopher CHEUNG considered that inadequate general awareness of the legal responsibility of doxxing acts and the importance of personal data protection was a major cause of the large increase in the number of doxxing cases. Referring to Annex B to PCPD's paper, Mr CHEUNG commented that many of the promotion and education activities (e.g. professional workshops and seminars) conducted by PCPD could hardly arouse the interest of the general public. He urged PCPD to tailor its promotion efforts in new and innovative ways, such that the promotional messages would be conveyed in a more lively and interesting manner that would also be easily understood by the general public.

40. The Privacy Commissioner said that the professional workshops and seminars targeting mainly organizational data users from various industries had been well received by the participants. He informed members that PCPD had launched new accounts and revamped its page/channel on various social media platforms (e.g. Instagram, Twitter, Facebook and YouTube) in early April 2020, with a view to enhancing the dissemination of information and updates on developments regarding protection of personal data privacy to the general public, particularly the younger generation and those who preferred mobile devices to conventional media channels. The Privacy Commissioner added that through these platforms, latest privacy issues of public concern would be explained to the public in simple language and with the help of visual illustrations and videos.

Privacy risks associated with the use of information and communications technology

41. Dr Helena WONG expressed concern that the online video conferencing software Zoom, which had become increasingly popular in recent months, was said to have a number of data security loopholes (e.g. lack of end-to-end encryption) and thus be vulnerable to hacking attacks. She asked what could be done to prevent abuse and misuse of personal data by software developers and operators.

42. The Privacy Commissioner said that PCPD had issued guidelines on compliance with PDPO in developing software and mobile applications. To promote the adoption of "Privacy by Design" and "Privacy by Default" as core considerations of enterprises when developing information and

Action

communications technology ("ICT") systems, PCPD and Singapore's Personal Data Protection Commission had released a jointly-developed guide to assist enterprises in applying "data protection by design" principles by offering practical guidance for all phases of software development and good practices for data protection for ICT systems. The Privacy Commissioner further said that since Zoom's security issues were reported, PCPD had provided guidance to users of Zoom and video-conferencing software in general through different channels and had written to schools to alert them to the risks of using video-conferencing software as an online teaching and learning platform. PCPD also noted that Zoom had made a public response stating that remedial measures were being taken to enhance its data security.

(At 4:29 pm, the Chairman announced that he would extend the meeting for 15 minutes beyond the appointed ending time.)

Regulation of the use of closed-circuit television systems

43. Mr IP Kin-yuen expressed concern that according to media reports earlier, a school sponsoring body had, without prior consultation with its staff and students' parents, installed closed-circuit television ("CCTV") cameras with audio-recording and zoom-in functions at different locations on the campuses of its 25 kindergarten-cum-nurseries. He asked whether PCPD had received any complaint in connection with the aforementioned case and whether it had conducted investigation accordingly. While noting that PCPD had issued a guidance note on CCTV surveillance and use of drones, Mr IP expressed concern that it was not stipulated in the law that consultation with relevant stakeholders had to be conducted before installation of CCTV systems or penalties would be imposed on abuse or misuse of such systems. He enquired whether PCPD had any plan to bring the use of CCTV systems under regulatory control. He also asked what could be done to tackle the issue apart from legislative measures.

44. The Privacy Commissioner said that while he did not have in hand information on whether any complaint in respect of the aforementioned case had been lodged with PCPD, PCPD had from time to time received complaints relating to the use of CCTV systems. The Privacy Commissioner explained that if the purpose of the installation of CCTV systems was to collect or compile information about identified persons, the data users must comply with the provisions of PDPO, including the Data Protection Principles ("DPPs"). Among others, the data users were required to take all reasonably practicable steps to notify the data subjects of the purpose of data collection (e.g. for security purpose) and how such data would be handled. The data

Action

users should also devise CCTV monitoring policies and/or procedures and communicate them to their staff as well as to the data subjects. The personal data collected should only be used for the purpose for which it was collected or for a directly related purpose, unless voluntary and explicit consent to a new purpose was obtained from the data subjects, or when applicable exemptions under PDPO applied. In any event, no CCTV cameras should be installed in places where people had a reason to expect privacy (e.g. changing rooms). The Privacy Commissioner added that PCPD had issued guidelines to assist data users to determine whether CCTV should be used and how to use CCTV responsibly. In general, data users should carry out a privacy impact assessment and consider whether there were other less privacy-intrusive alternatives before installing CCTV systems. Where CCTV was to be used, conspicuous notices should be put up at the entrance to as well as inside the monitored area to inform people that they were subject to CCTV surveillance.

Compliance with the Personal Data (Privacy) Ordinance by law enforcement agencies

45. In reply to Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's enquiry, the Privacy Commissioner said that since February 2020, PCPD had released various guidelines on privacy issues arising from COVID-19 through issuing media statements. The Privacy Commissioner added that to enhance public understanding of and access to the aforesaid guidelines, PCPD would make available the guidelines in simple version and disseminate them through different channels, including PCPD's new/revamped accounts on various social media platforms launched in early April 2020.

46. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen expressed concern about recent incidents of police officers being alleged to have excessively collected personal data in taking enforcement actions against contraventions of the directions issued under the Prevention and Control of Disease (Requirements and Directions) (Business and Premises) Regulation (Cap. 599F). He asked whether PCPD was empowered to initiate investigations into whether the Police had seriously infringed upon personal data privacy in the course of carrying out law enforcement duties, and if so, under what circumstances PCPD would do so. In his view, PCPD should keep a close watch on whether public authorities, including law enforcement agencies, had contravened PDPO in implementing anti-pandemic measures.

47. The Privacy Commissioner explained that as far as enforcement of PDPO was concerned, PCPD was vested with the power under PDPO to

Action

initiate investigations into cases where there was prima facie evidence of contravention of the requirements of PDPO, as well as cases which had aroused wide public concern. For instance, PCPD had recently initiated an investigation against the Police regarding a police officer displaying a reporter's Hong Kong identity card in front of a live streaming camera. The Privacy Commissioner stressed that PCPD would continue to enforce the law in every case in accordance with the powers conferred by PDPO in a fair and impartial manner.

48. Dr Helena WONG expressed concern that the Police had been using video cameras to record the facial images of participants at public meetings and processions. Pointing out that there was wide public concern about whether these recorded images and other personal data collected by the Police would be transferred to the Mainland authorities without the data subjects' consent/knowledge, Dr WONG asked whether PCPD had proactively sought clarifications from the Police on how those data would be used. She also sought the Privacy Commissioner's advice on whether the Police were permitted under the law to unlock the arrestees' mobile phones and examine the contents therein without the arrestees' consent.

49. The Privacy Commissioner said that as with other public and private organizations, any government department (as a data user) was required to comply with PDPO. He explained that under PDPO, the use of personal data for certain purposes (e.g. crime prevention and detection, and protection of public health) might be exempted from liability even if there was a contravention of relevant DPPs or requirements. That said, PCPD had advised relevant departments that before invoking the exemptions provided under PDPO, they should make every effort to comply with relevant DPPs and requirements as far as possible, including that the collection of personal data should not be excessive and should be in a fair manner, the personal data collected should be deleted as soon as reasonably practicable once the purpose of collection was fulfilled, and data subjects should be informed before their personal data were transferred to third parties. In reply to Dr WONG's further enquiry, the Privacy Commissioner said that PCPD would follow up and initiate investigations upon receipt of complaints or when it had reasonable grounds to believe that an act or practice done or engaged in by a data user might have contravened the requirements of PDPO.

(At 4:41 pm, the Chairman suggested and members agreed that the meeting be further extended for 15 minutes.)

Action

Other related issues

50. Referring to the \$10,000 cash payout scheme ("the Scheme") announced in the 2020-2021 Budget, Mrs Regina IP expressed concern that the Government had indicated that it would take time to complete relevant preparatory work as the data collected from eligible citizens for the purpose of making payment under the previous \$6,000 payout exercise in 2011 had been deleted and the Government had to collect afresh relevant data for implementing the Scheme. She asked whether the Government could, in the course of collecting relevant data for the Scheme, seek the consent of eligible citizens for the Government to use and retain the data specifically for the purpose of implementing the Scheme as well as other government relief measures in future (if any), such that relevant payments could be made more expeditiously to the recipients. The Privacy Commissioner concurred that so long as the personal data privacy rights of individuals were not compromised, measures should be taken to facilitate the provision of government services/assistance as far as practicable.

51. Mrs Regina IP considered that a balance should be struck between protecting personal data privacy and facilitating the development and application of innovative technologies (e.g. big data) as well as the opening up of data. She called on PCPD to conduct more studies in this regard. The Privacy Commissioner said that the Government had discussed with PCPD the privacy issues involved in opening up government data and had started implementing open data initiatives in recent years. PCPD had also communicated with the Hong Kong Monetary Authority, the Hong Kong Association of Banks and relevant business associations on the development of open data, open Application Programming Interface (Open API), open banking, etc., and would maintain dialogue with them on relevant issues.

52. Mrs Regina IP further said she noted that the General Data Protection Regulation ("GDPR") enacted by the European Union had established the principle that the data subject, as the owner of his/her personal data, could determine and control to whom such data would be provided. She also noted that GDPR contained provisions requiring the data user and the data processor to designate a data protection officer and to implement appropriate measures to ensure the security of processing of personal data. She asked whether the aforementioned principle and provisions would be introduced in PDPO so as to enhance the protection of personal data privacy.

53. The Privacy Commissioner agreed with the aforementioned principle and considered that it should be advocated. The Privacy Commissioner

Action

further said that many organizations and enterprises in Hong Kong had appointed a data protection officer although there was no express provision under PDPO requiring them to do so. In this connection, PCPD had established the "Data Protection Officers' Club" to promote the duties of data protection officers and to provide practising data protection officers with a platform for advancing the knowledge and practice of data privacy compliance through experience sharing and training. The Privacy Commissioner added that as GDPR had provided for various specific requirements regarding the appointment of the data protection officer, the feasibility of introducing similar provisions in PDPO would require further study and consultation with stakeholders concerned including small and medium enterprises.

VI. Any other business

54. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:54 pm.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
11 June 2020

Panel on Constitutional Affairs

**Motion proposed to be moved by Hon Starry LEE
at the meeting on 16 March 2020**

(English translation of the motion)

Given the prevalence of violence and election-related unfairness in the 2019 District Council ("DC") election, and the fact that many pro-establishment candidates were repeatedly under the threat of black violence in the election-related activities as a whole, the "Report on the 2019 DC Ordinary Election", however, had not issued a reprimand in this regard; and the Electoral Affairs Commission ("EAC") had also not come up with findings in its investigation into any complaint cases against election-related violence. In this connection, this Panel expresses great disappointment and strong regret about EAC's performance, and urges EAC, in proposing the Guidelines on Election-related Activities in respect of the Legislative Council Election after completing the public consultation exercise, to make various practicable improvement recommendations, including but not limited to issuing ballot papers by electronic means, according priority to all electors who are Senior Citizen Card holders to cast their votes, and authorizing Independent Commission Against Corruption to deploy officers at polling stations to provide the Presiding Officer with prompt advice on election-related unfairness or corrupt conduct, etc., with a view to preventing recurrence of violence and election-related unfairness, as well as chaos in relation to polling and vote counting, etc.

點名表決DIVISION: 1
日期 DATE: 20/04/2020
時間 TIME: 03:09:22 下午 PM

動議 MOTION: 本事務委員會同意處理李慧琼議員提出的議案
That this Panel agrees to proceed with the motion proposed by Hon Starry LEE

動議人 MOVED BY:

出席 Present : 40
投票 Vote : 39
贊成 Yes : 20
反對 No : 19
棄權 Abstain : 0
結果 Result : 通過 Passed

個別表決如下 THE INDIVIDUAL VOTES WERE AS FOLLOWS:

議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE	議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE
張國鈞	CHEUNG Kwok-kwan	出席	PRESENT	郭榮鏗	Dennis KWOK	反對	NO
涂謹申	James TO	反對	NO	張華峰	Christopher CHEUNG	贊成	YES
石禮謙	Abraham SHEK	贊成	YES	張超雄	Dr Fernando CHEUNG	反對	NO
李國麟	Prof Joseph LEE	反對	NO	黃碧雲	Dr Helena WONG	反對	NO
林健鋒	Jeffrey LAM			葉建源	IP Kin-yuen	反對	NO
黃定光	WONG Ting-kwong	贊成	YES	廖長江	Martin LIAO	贊成	YES
李慧琼	Starry LEE	贊成	YES	蔣麗芸	Dr CHIANG Lai-wan	贊成	YES
陳健波	CHAN Kin-por	贊成	YES	鍾國斌	CHUNG Kwok-pan		
梁美芬	Dr Priscilla LEUNG	贊成	YES	楊岳橋	Alvin YEUNG	反對	NO
黃國健	WONG Kwok-kin	贊成	YES	朱凱迪	CHU Hoi-dick	反對	NO
葉劉淑儀	Mrs Regina IP	贊成	YES	吳永嘉	Jimmy NG	贊成	YES
謝偉俊	Paul TSE	贊成	YES	何君堯	Dr Junius HO	贊成	YES
毛孟靜	Claudia MO	反對	NO	何啟明	HO Kai-ming		
何俊賢	Steven HO	贊成	YES	林卓廷	LAM Cheuk-ting	反對	NO
胡志偉	WU Chi-wai	反對	NO	周浩鼎	Holden CHOW	贊成	YES
馬逢國	MA Fung-kwok	贊成	YES	陳淑莊	Tanya CHAN	反對	NO
莫乃光	Charles Peter MOK	反對	NO	許智峯	HUI Chi-fung	反對	NO
陳志全	CHAN Chi-chuen	反對	NO	陸頌雄	LUK Chung-hung	贊成	YES
陳恒鎮	CHAN Han-pan			劉業強	Kenneth LAU	贊成	YES
梁志祥	LEUNG Che-cheung	贊成	YES	鄭松泰	Dr CHENG Chung-tai	反對	NO
麥美娟	Alice MAK			鄭俊宇	KWONG Chun-yu	反對	NO
郭家麒	Dr KWOK Ka-ki	反對	NO	譚文豪	Jeremy TAM	反對	NO
郭偉强	KWOK Wai-keung	贊成	YES				

秘書 CLERK



Panel on Constitutional Affairs

**Motion proposed to be moved by Hon Alvin YEUNG
at the meeting on 16 March 2020**

(English translation of the motion)

This Panel requests the Electoral Affairs Commission, in all future elections, to deploy whatever feasible and appropriate means (including but not limited to borrowing and renting venues) to ensure that amidst an increasing number of registered electors, there would be sufficient polling stations and ballot paper issuing desks for electors to cast their votes, as well as requests lowering the proportion of electors from 1 500 electors/desk to 1 200 electors/desk without the need to arrange extra queues (commonly known as "caring queues"), so as to facilitate electors to fulfil their civic responsibility.

點名表決DIVISION: 2
日期 DATE: 20/04/2020
時間 TIME: 03:16:54 下午 PM

動議 MOTION: 本事務委員會同意處理楊岳橋議員提出的議案
That this Panel agrees to proceed with the motion proposed by Hon Alvin YEUNG

動議人 MOVED BY:

出席 Present : 40
投票 Vote : 39
贊成 Yes : 30
反對 No : 8
棄權 Abstain : 1
結果 Result : 通過 Passed

個別表決如下 THE INDIVIDUAL VOTES WERE AS FOLLOWS:

議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE	議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE
張國鈞	CHEUNG Kwok-kwan	出席	PRESENT	郭榮鏗	Dennis KWOK	贊成	YES
涂謹申	James TO	贊成	YES	張華峰	Christopher CHEUNG		
石禮謙	Abraham SHEK	反對	NO	張超雄	Dr Fernando CHEUNG	贊成	YES
李國麟	Prof Joseph LEE	贊成	YES	黃碧雲	Dr Helena WONG	贊成	YES
林健鋒	Jeffrey LAM			葉建源	IP Kin-yuen	贊成	YES
黃定光	WONG Ting-kwong	贊成	YES	廖長江	Martin LIAO	反對	NO
李慧琼	Starry LEE	贊成	YES	蔣麗芸	Dr CHIANG Lai-wan	贊成	YES
陳健波	CHAN Kin-por	反對	NO	鍾國斌	CHUNG Kwok-pan		
梁美芬	Dr Priscilla LEUNG	反對	NO	楊岳橋	Alvin YEUNG	贊成	YES
黃國健	WONG Kwok-kin	贊成	YES	朱凱迪	CHU Hoi-dick	贊成	YES
葉劉淑儀	Mrs Regina IP	贊成	YES	吳永嘉	Jimmy NG	反對	NO
謝偉俊	Paul TSE	棄權	ABSTAIN	何君堯	Dr Junius HO	反對	NO
毛孟靜	Claudia MO	贊成	YES	何啟明	HO Kai-ming	贊成	YES
何俊賢	Steven HO	贊成	YES	林卓廷	LAM Cheuk-ting	贊成	YES
胡志偉	WU Chi-wai	贊成	YES	周浩鼎	Holden CHOW	贊成	YES
馬逢國	MA Fung-kwok	反對	NO	陳淑莊	Tanya CHAN	贊成	YES
莫乃光	Charles Peter MOK	贊成	YES	許智峯	HUI Chi-fung	贊成	YES
陳志全	CHAN Chi-chuen	贊成	YES	陸頌雄	LUK Chung-hung	贊成	YES
陳恒鎮	CHAN Han-pan			劉業強	Kenneth LAU		
梁志祥	LEUNG Che-cheung	反對	NO	鄭松泰	Dr CHENG Chung-tai	贊成	YES
麥美娟	Alice MAK	贊成	YES	鄭俊宇	KWONG Chun-yu	贊成	YES
郭家麒	Dr KWOK Ka-ki	贊成	YES	譚文豪	Jeremy TAM	贊成	YES
郭偉强	KWOK Wai-keung	贊成	YES				

秘書 CLERK



Panel on Constitutional Affairs

**Motion proposed to be moved by Dr Hon Helena WONG
at the meeting on 16 March 2020**

(English translation of the motion)

This Panel urges the Government to put in place all possible measures to uphold the fairness and integrity of elections, including:

1. substantially increasing the number of polling stations and polling staff to shorten the waiting time for electors to cast their votes, and ensuring that during the voting process, all electors are treated equally and queue jumping is prohibited.
2. strictly monitoring the handling of ballot papers at polling stations and stamping out any illegal fraudulent acts which attempt to undermine the integrity of elections.
3. that the capacity of the public area in a counting station should not be capped and the names of members of the public need not be recorded. The monitoring power of electors shall not be infringed.

點名表決DIVISION: 3
日期 DATE: 20/04/2020
時間 TIME: 03:19:03 下午 PM

動議 MOTION: 本事務委員會同意處理黃碧雲議員提出的議案
That this Panel agrees to proceed with the motion proposed by Dr Hon Helena WONG

動議人 MOVED BY:

出席 Present : 42
投票 Vote : 41
贊成 Yes : 29
反對 No : 11
棄權 Abstain : 1
結果 Result : 通過 Passed

個別表決如下 THE INDIVIDUAL VOTES WERE AS FOLLOWS:

議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE	議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE
張國鈞	CHEUNG Kwok-kwan	出席	PRESENT	郭榮鏗	Dennis KWOK	贊成	YES
涂謹申	James TO	贊成	YES	張華峰	Christopher CHEUNG	反對	NO
石禮謙	Abraham SHEK	反對	NO	張超雄	Dr Fernando CHEUNG	贊成	YES
李國麟	Prof Joseph LEE	贊成	YES	黃碧雲	Dr Helena WONG	贊成	YES
林健鋒	Jeffrey LAM			葉建源	IP Kin-yuen	贊成	YES
黃定光	WONG Ting-kwong	贊成	YES	廖長江	Martin LIAO	反對	NO
李慧琼	Starry LEE	贊成	YES	蔣麗芸	Dr CHIANG Lai-wan	贊成	YES
陳健波	CHAN Kin-por	反對	NO	鍾國斌	CHUNG Kwok-pan		
梁美芬	Dr Priscilla LEUNG	反對	NO	楊岳橋	Alvin YEUNG	贊成	YES
黃國健	WONG Kwok-kin	贊成	YES	朱凱迪	CHU Hoi-dick	贊成	YES
葉劉淑儀	Mrs Regina IP	贊成	YES	吳永嘉	Jimmy NG	反對	NO
謝偉俊	Paul TSE	棄權	ABSTAIN	何君堯	Dr Junius HO	反對	NO
毛孟靜	Claudia MO	贊成	YES	何啟明	HO Kai-ming	贊成	YES
何俊賢	Steven HO	贊成	YES	林卓廷	LAM Cheuk-ting	贊成	YES
胡志偉	WU Chi-wai	贊成	YES	周浩鼎	Holden CHOW	贊成	YES
馬逢國	MA Fung-kwok	反對	NO	陳淑莊	Tanya CHAN	贊成	YES
莫乃光	Charles Peter MOK	贊成	YES	許智峯	HUI Chi-fung	贊成	YES
陳志全	CHAN Chi-chuen	贊成	YES	陸頌雄	LUK Chung-hung	贊成	YES
陳恒鎮	CHAN Han-pan			劉業強	Kenneth LAU	反對	NO
梁志祥	LEUNG Che-cheung	反對	NO	鄭松泰	Dr CHENG Chung-tai	贊成	YES
麥美娟	Alice MAK	贊成	YES	鄭俊宇	KWONG Chun-yu	贊成	YES
郭家麒	Dr KWOK Ka-ki	贊成	YES	譚文豪	Jeremy TAM	贊成	YES
郭偉强	KWOK Wai-keung	反對	NO				

秘書 CLERK



點名表決DIVISION: 4
日期 DATE: 20/04/2020
時間 TIME: 03:26:02 下午 PM

動議 MOTION: 李慧琼議員提出的議案
Motion proposed by Hon Starry LEE

動議人 MOVED BY:

出席 Present : 41
投票 Vote : 40
贊成 Yes : 22
反對 No : 18
棄權 Abstain : 0
結果 Result : 通過 Passed

個別表決如下 THE INDIVIDUAL VOTES WERE AS FOLLOWS:

議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE	議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE
張國鈞	CHEUNG Kwok-kwan	出席	PRESENT	郭榮鏗	Dennis KWOK		
涂謹申	James TO	反對	NO	張華峰	Christopher CHEUNG	贊成	YES
石禮謙	Abraham SHEK	贊成	YES	張超雄	Dr Fernando CHEUNG	反對	NO
李國麟	Prof Joseph LEE	反對	NO	黃碧雲	Dr Helena WONG	反對	NO
林健鋒	Jeffrey LAM			葉建源	IP Kin-yuen	反對	NO
黃定光	WONG Ting-kwong	贊成	YES	廖長江	Martin LIAO	贊成	YES
李慧琼	Starry LEE	贊成	YES	蔣麗芸	Dr CHIANG Lai-wan	贊成	YES
陳健波	CHAN Kin-por	贊成	YES	鍾國斌	CHUNG Kwok-pan		
梁美芬	Dr Priscilla LEUNG	贊成	YES	楊岳橋	Alvin YEUNG	反對	NO
黃國健	WONG Kwok-kin	贊成	YES	朱凱迪	CHU Hoi-dick	反對	NO
葉劉淑儀	Mrs Regina IP	贊成	YES	吳永嘉	Jimmy NG	贊成	YES
謝偉俊	Paul TSE	贊成	YES	何君堯	Dr Junius HO	贊成	YES
毛孟靜	Claudia MO	反對	NO	何啟明	HO Kai-ming	贊成	YES
何俊賢	Steven HO	贊成	YES	林卓廷	LAM Cheuk-ting	反對	NO
胡志偉	WU Chi-wai	反對	NO	周浩鼎	Holden CHOW	贊成	YES
馬逢國	MA Fung-kwok	贊成	YES	陳淑莊	Tanya CHAN	反對	NO
莫乃光	Charles Peter MOK	反對	NO	許智峯	HUI Chi-fung	反對	NO
陳志全	CHAN Chi-chuen	反對	NO	陸頌雄	LUK Chung-hung	贊成	YES
陳恒鎮	CHAN Han-pan			劉業強	Kenneth LAU	贊成	YES
梁志祥	LEUNG Che-cheung	贊成	YES	鄭松泰	Dr CHENG Chung-tai	反對	NO
麥美娟	Alice MAK	贊成	YES	鄭俊宇	KWONG Chun-yu	反對	NO
郭家麒	Dr KWOK Ka-ki	反對	NO	譚文豪	Jeremy TAM	反對	NO
郭偉强	KWOK Wai-keung	贊成	YES				

秘書 CLERK



點名表決DIVISION: 5
日期 DATE: 20/04/2020
時間 TIME: 03:27:16 下午 PM

動議 MOTION: 黃碧雲議員提出的議案
Motion proposed by Dr Hon Helena WONG

動議人 MOVED BY:

出席 Present : 39
投票 Vote : 38
贊成 Yes : 18
反對 No : 19
棄權 Abstain : 1
結果 Result : 否決 Negatived

個別表決如下 THE INDIVIDUAL VOTES WERE AS FOLLOWS:

議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE	議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE
張國鈞	CHEUNG Kwok-kwan	出席	PRESENT	郭榮鏗	Dennis KWOK		
涂謹申	James TO	贊成	YES	張華峰	Christopher CHEUNG		
石禮謙	Abraham SHEK	反對	NO	張超雄	Dr Fernando CHEUNG	贊成	YES
李國麟	Prof Joseph LEE	贊成	YES	黃碧雲	Dr Helena WONG	贊成	YES
林健鋒	Jeffrey LAM			葉建源	IP Kin-yuen	贊成	YES
黃定光	WONG Ting-kwong	反對	NO	廖長江	Martin LIAO	反對	NO
李慧琼	Starry LEE	反對	NO	蔣麗芸	Dr CHIANG Lai-wan	反對	NO
陳健波	CHAN Kin-por	反對	NO	鍾國斌	CHUNG Kwok-pan		
梁美芬	Dr Priscilla LEUNG	反對	NO	楊岳橋	Alvin YEUNG	贊成	YES
黃國健	WONG Kwok-kin	反對	NO	朱凱迪	CHU Hoi-dick	贊成	YES
葉劉淑儀	Mrs Regina IP	反對	NO	吳永嘉	Jimmy NG	反對	NO
謝偉俊	Paul TSE	棄權	ABSTAIN	何君堯	Dr Junius HO	反對	NO
毛孟靜	Claudia MO	贊成	YES	何啟明	HO Kai-ming	反對	NO
何俊賢	Steven HO	反對	NO	林卓廷	LAM Cheuk-ting	贊成	YES
胡志偉	WU Chi-wai	贊成	YES	周浩鼎	Holden CHOW	反對	NO
馬逢國	MA Fung-kwok	反對	NO	陳淑莊	Tanya CHAN	贊成	YES
莫乃光	Charles Peter MOK	贊成	YES	許智峯	HUI Chi-fung	贊成	YES
陳志全	CHAN Chi-chuen	贊成	YES	陸頌雄	LUK Chung-hung	反對	NO
陳恒鎮	CHAN Han-pan			劉業強	Kenneth LAU		
梁志祥	LEUNG Che-cheung	反對	NO	鄭松泰	Dr CHENG Chung-tai	贊成	YES
麥美娟	Alice MAK	反對	NO	鄭俊宇	KWONG Chun-yu	贊成	YES
郭家麒	Dr KWOK Ka-ki	贊成	YES	譚文豪	Jeremy TAM	贊成	YES
郭偉强	KWOK Wai-keung	反對	NO				

秘書 CLERK

