

立法會

Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)1440/20-21

Ref : CB1/BC/13/20

Report of the Bills Committee on Film Censorship (Amendment) Bill 2021

Purpose

This paper reports on the deliberations of the Bills Committee on Film Censorship (Amendment) Bill 2021 ("the Bills Committee").

Background

2. The Film Censorship Ordinance (Cap. 392) provides that any film intended for exhibition in Hong Kong shall be submitted to the Film Censorship Authority¹ ("the Authority"), who shall assign a censor to view the film and decide whether the film can be approved for exhibition, and, if so, its appropriate classification. In carrying out his or her film censorship duties, a censor shall consider (i) whether the film portrays matters such as violence, crime, sexuality, and offensive language and behaviour; and (ii) whether it denigrates or insults any class of the public by reference to matters such as race, religion and gender. In considering the matters above, the censor shall consider the effect of the film as a whole and its likely effect on persons likely to view it; the artistic, educational, literary, scientific, social or cultural value of the film; and the circumstances of its intended exhibition.

3. Section 30 of Cap. 392 provides that the Secretary for Commerce and Economic Development ("SCED") may from time to time cause to be prepared guidelines for censors, indicating the manner in which censors exercise their duties under Cap. 392. Censors make decisions on approval for exhibition and classification of films in accordance with the requirements of Cap. 392 and the guidance as set out in the Film Censorship Guidelines for Censors ("the Guidelines").

¹ Under section 3 of Cap. 392, the Film Censorship Authority is the public officer appointed by the Secretary for Commerce and Economic Development.

Amendments to the Film Censorship Guidelines for Censors and need for amending the Film Censorship Ordinance

4. On 30 June 2020, the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress enacted the Law of the People's Republic of China on Safeguarding National Security in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("NSL"). Article 3 of NSL provides that it is the constitutional duty of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("HKSAR") to safeguard national security, and the executive authorities, legislature and judiciary of HKSAR shall effectively prevent, suppress and impose punishment for any act or activity endangering national security in accordance with NSL and other relevant laws. According to the Administration, by virtue of NSL, censors should give considerable weight to preventing and suppressing any act or activity endangering national security when discharging their duties under Cap. 392.

5. In the light of operational experience, the Administration has amended the Guidelines. The revised Guidelines were gazetted on 11 June 2021 and took effect on the same day. They aim to provide censors with clearer guidance when performing film censorship duties in determining whether and to what extent a film may be related to national security. Having reviewed Cap. 392, the Administration has also recommended that Cap. 392 should be amended to enhance the film censorship regulatory framework and ensure more effective implementation of the duty to safeguard national security as required by NSL, to prevent and suppress acts or activities which may endanger national security, to close any identified loopholes, and to meet the needs of recent circumstances.

The Film Censorship (Amendment) Bill 2021

6. The Film Censorship (Amendment) Bill 2021 ("the Bill") was gazetted on 27 August 2021 and received its First Reading at the meeting of the Legislative Council ("LegCo") of 1 September 2021. The main provisions in the Bill provide for the following:

- (a) national security as one of the matters to be considered by a censor;
- (b) powers to be exercised by the relevant authorities on national security grounds; and
- (c) penalty, enforcement and other operational measures.

7. Details of the main provisions of the Bill are set out in paragraph 15 of the LegCo Brief (File Ref: CCIB/A 230-5/1(C) dated 24 August 2021), and paragraphs 5 to 18 of the Legal Service Division Report on the Bill (LC Paper No. LS115/20-21).

Commencement

8. The Bill, if passed, will come into operation on the day on which the enacted Ordinance is published in the Gazette.

The Bills Committee

9. At the House Committee meeting on 3 September 2021, Members agreed to form a Bills Committee to scrutinize the Bill. Hon MA Fung-kwok was elected Chairman of the Bills Committee. The membership list of the Bills Committee is in the **Appendix I**.

10. The Bills Committee has held two meetings with the Administration and invited written views from the public. A list of the organization and individual which/who have provided written views to the Bills Committee is in **Appendix II**. At the request of the Bills Committee, the Administration has provided written responses (LC Paper Nos. CB(1)1390/20-21(01)) to the submissions.

Deliberations of the Bills Committee

11. Members of the Bills Committee generally support the Bill on account of the objectives it seeks to achieve. The deliberations of the Bills Committee are summarized in the ensuing paragraphs, as follows:

- (a) scope of the Bill (paragraphs 12 to 14);
- (b) national security being a censorship criterion in other jurisdictions (paragraphs 15 to 16);
- (c) guidelines for censoring films (paragraphs 17 to 19);
- (d) determining whether a film contains national security issues (paragraphs 20 to 22);
- (e) modifications to be made to a film to obtain approval for exhibition and classification (paragraphs 23 to 24);

- (f) enforcement power of the Film Censorship Authority (paragraphs 25 to 31);
- (g) the power of the Chief Secretary for Administration in revoking certificates (paragraphs 32 to 36);
- (h) panels of censors and advisers (paragraphs 37 to 39);
- (i) review mechanism (paragraphs 40 to 43);
- (j) increasing the penalty for certain offences under Cap. 392 (paragraphs 44 to 46); and
- (k) legal and drafting issues relating to the Bill (paragraph 47).

Scope of the Bill

12. Members have expressed concerns about the scope of the Bill. They have enquired whether films (including short films) broadcast on online platforms (local and overseas) through live-streaming would be subject to the regulatory requirements proposed in the Bill.

13. The Administration has responded that Cap. 392 sets out a film censorship regulatory framework for films intended for exhibition in Hong Kong and the Bill aims at enhancing the framework following the enactment of NSL. Neither Cap. 392 nor the Bill regulates films accessible on the Internet or social media platforms. However, other statutes, including NSL and the Crimes Ordinance (Cap. 200), provide for criminal liabilities of activities concerning secession, subversion, organization and perpetration of terrorist activities, collusion with a foreign country or with external elements to endanger national security and other offences endangering national security, such as publication of seditious materials. Activities on online platforms are subject to these laws.

14. As regards publication of messages that are likely to endanger national security on electronic platforms, the Administration has explained that, pursuant to Schedule 4 to the Implementation Rules for Article 43 of NSL, the Commissioner of Police, with the approval of the Secretary for Security, may require the person who has published such electronic messages on an electronic platform to remove the message from the platform or require the relevant services provider to disable access to the messages. Unlike exhibition of films, prior approval is not required for the transmission of messages and videos online. In response to further queries by members, the Administration has clarified that the

proposed regulatory regime is enforceable against films intended for "exhibition" as defined in section 2(1) of Cap. 392, regardless of the media in which the film is stored or transmitted.

National security being a censorship criterion in other jurisdictions

15. Some members have sought information from the Administration on the film censorship legislation in other jurisdictions which includes national security consideration as a censoring criterion and from which the Administration has drawn reference when drafting the Bill.

16. The Administration has responded that national security considerations can be found in various legislation in the United Kingdom and other common law jurisdictions. For film censorship legislation that includes national security consideration as a censoring criterion, for example, section 16 of Singapore's Films Act provides that the parties responsible for film censorship must refuse to classify any film that is against national security.

Guidelines for censoring films

17. The Bills Committee has noted that the revised Guidelines promulgated in June 2021 spells out the assessment criteria in more concrete terms and are an open document accessible to the public. The revised Guidelines serves to provide censors with clearer guidance when performing film censorship duties. Censors may seek the advice of the Department of Justice ("DoJ") when in doubt about the application of the Guidelines to ensure that decisions made under Cap. 392 are justifiable and legally in order.

18. Clause 7(3) of the Bill seeks to amend section 10(2) of Cap. 392 so that, when viewing a film submitted for approval for exhibition and classification, a censor has to consider whether the exhibition of the film would be "*contrary to the interests of national security*". Some members have pointed out that the provision appears to be inconsistent with paragraph 7(a) of the revised Guidelines which provides that a censor should be vigilant to the portrayal, depiction or treatment of any act or activity which may "*amount to an offence endangering national security*". Members have requested clarification on how a censor should interpret the requirements in the two documents when handling issues involving national security.

19. The Administration has explained that, in order to ensure that the film censorship regulatory framework would accord with, and implement effectively, the HKSAR's duty to safeguard national security under NSL, it is necessary to adopt the formulation of "*contrary to the interest of national security*" as the

relevant consideration. This is in line with the preventive nature of the duty to safeguard national security under NSL, i.e. to prevent any act or activity which would be contrary to the interests of national security from taking place before there is any actual harm or prejudice caused to national security. Guidelines caused to be prepared and published by SCED must not be inconsistent with Cap. 392 or the Bill. Censors should be vigilant to the issues set out in the revised Guidelines. The Guidelines would be further updated after the Bill comes into effect.

Determining whether a film contains national security issues

20. Members have asked whether portraying corruption of Mainland and local government officials and destruction of properties by bad elements in films may risk breaching the law. Some members have raised the question of whether filmmakers could claim as a defence that the contents of their films are purely fictional, when the film is, in fact, dramatizing certain real-life events or promoting acts which may be considered as jeopardizing national security. Some members have also enquired about the Administration's work in familiarizing relevant stakeholders, including those who produce films for non-commercial purposes, with the new regulatory requirements.

21. The Administration has explained that in assessing the suitability of a film for exhibition, censors would view the films in detail and set out their evaluations in the respective film censorship report as to the manner of depiction, including the level of details and the length of depiction; whether the depiction purports to be based on or adapted from real-life events; overall effect of the portrayal of the film; whether the film contains any biased presentation of viewpoints, etc. The fact that a film purports to be a documentary or purports to report on or re-enact certain real events with immediate connection to the circumstances in Hong Kong would necessitate an even more careful consideration of its contents by the censors. Censors would also assess whether the contents of a film could be objectively and reasonably capable of being perceived as endorsing, supporting, promoting, glorifying, encouraging or inciting act or activity endangering national security or which would otherwise be contrary to the interests of national security. Censors may require part or parts of the film be modified or excised, may approve the film for exhibition with conditions imposed.

22. The Administration has also advised that since the promulgation of the revised Guidelines in June 2021, the Authority has processed about 470 films which are mostly commercial productions. Under the current film censorship regime, filmmakers may seek non-binding advice from the Office for Film, Newspaper and Article Administration ("OFNAA") at all stages of their production. Judging by the number and variety of films going on screen in Hong

Kong since the promulgation of the revised Guidelines, the Administration considers that the room for creativity is still very wide and filmmakers appear to be conversant with the censoring criteria. During the Administration's contacts with the film industry, the Administration got the impression that the industry appreciated the objective of the proposed new censorship requirements in curbing the portrayal of acts/activities contrary to the interests of national security. The Administration has undertaken to keep in touch with the industry to explain further to allay their worries. Since the implementation of NSL in late June 2020, the Administration has not received many enquiries or complaints as far as non-mainstream film productions are concerned.

Modifications to be made to a film to obtain approval for exhibition and classification

23. By the proposed amendment under clause 7(4) of the Bill to section 10(4)(c) of Cap. 392, a censor may, after viewing a film, form an opinion that a film is not suitable for exhibition unless it is modified in the specified way. The proposed section 10(4A) under clause 7(6) of the Bill provides that a film is modified in the specified way if a particular piece is, or particular pieces of the film are, excised from the film, and/or a particular notice is added to the film. Members have enquired what particular notice would be required to be added to the film.

24. The Administration has advised that the proposed section 10(4A) (clause 7(6) of the Bill) seeks to empower the censor to impose a condition that (a) part or parts of the film which the censor considers inappropriate for exhibition be excised; and/or (b) a notice in the specified way so as to warn the viewers against imitating certain acts portrayed in the film be added, for the film to be approved for exhibition. The censor may specify the length of the notice, the duration of such notice to be shown at the beginning of the film, etc., to ensure that viewers are aware of the warning. As regards excision, the applicant may propose to the censor alternative means such as mosaicking certain part(s) of the film.

Enforcement power of the Film Censorship Authority

Extending the period for making film censorship decisions in cases involving national security

25. Some members have pointed out that the film industry has expressed concerns about the proposed extension of the period for making film censorship decision ("decision period") and the number of extensions allowed by the Bill for cases involving national security, as well as the potential financial loss inflicted

on film distributors in the event of repeated extensions. They have also enquired whether an interim notification would be issued to the applicant concerned stating the reason of delay in completing the censorship procedure when national security issues arise.

26. The Administration has stressed that the proposed power of extension is exercisable only for films with national security concerns. There is no express limit on the number of extensions allowable under the proposed section 10A of Cap. 392 under clause 8 of the Bill. The proposed provision would provide censors with sufficient time to process cases and where necessary, censors may seek expert and legal advice in order to make the appropriate decisions. In exercising the power of extension on the recommendation by the Authority, SCED has to be of the opinion that (a) the exhibition of the film might be contrary to the interests of national security; and (b) the censor concerned could not reasonably be expected to make a decision for the film within the decision period because of the time required for considering the matters relating to national security. Although there is no express limit on the number of extensions allowed, in deciding whether an extension should be granted, SCED should also bear in mind the common law duty of the censor to make a decision within a reasonable time.

27. For films that do not involve national security considerations, under Cap. 392, a censor should make a decision on a film not later than 14 days after a film is submitted to and accepted by the Authority or within a longer period, but in any case not more than 28 days, as SCED may allow. The performance pledge of OFNAA specifies that applicants should be notified on film classification decisions within eight days. The Administration has advised that the requirement and performance pledge remain unchanged. In the past three years, censors have been able to make decisions for 99% of some 2 000 films submitted each year within eight working days. The Administration has made the point that few films would require more time to process under the new regulatory regime, and the proposed arrangement is unlikely to have material effects on the film industry. The Administration has been reaching out to the industry since the promulgation of the revised Guidelines in June 2021 and has gained the understanding of the industry in this regard.

Requiring information about exhibition of films

28. Clause 13 of the Bill seeks to add a new section 14B to Cap. 392 to empower the Authority to require a person who has been issued a certificate of exemption or approval for a film to provide any information about the exhibition of the film concerned. Members have expressed concerns about the implications of the proposed section on films that have been issued a certificate of exemption or certificate of approval before the proposed regulatory regime comes into effect. Members have also queried the rationale for introducing the proposed provision,

and the scope of information that the Authority may require an applicant to provide. They suggested that, to avoid uncertainty, a date after the enactment of the Bill be specified so that the notice under section 14B would only require information about exhibitions that took place after that date.

29. The Administration has advised that the objective of the proposed section 14B is to facilitate the Authority in enforcing Cap. 392 by requiring the holder of the certificate of approval or the certificate of exemption to provide information, such as the location, time and occasion of the exhibition, etc., about the film exhibitions. Other information relating to the production of the film that does not relate to the exhibition of the film, such as the source of fund in film making, is not covered in section 14B. This section would be enforceable in respect of exhibitions and re-exhibitions of films after the enactment of the Bill.

30. Some members have observed that the proposed section 14D provides for circumstances where a person has to make a claim, under the proposed subsection (1)(c), that the information he or she provides under the proposed section 14B(1) would tend to incriminate himself or herself, so that the information so provided would not be admissible in evidence against that person in certain criminal proceedings. Members have made the point that any person has the privilege against self-incrimination under the common law without having to make a claim as in the proposed section 14D(1)(c), in order to enjoy the privilege. They have queried whether the requirement to make a claim in section 14D(1)(c) aligns with similar provisions compelling a person to furnish information in other ordinances.

31. The Administration has explained that, under the proposed section 14D(2), the information is not admissible in evidence against the person in criminal proceedings (usually known as a "direct use prohibition") other than those in which the person is charged with offences in the proposed section 14C (providing false and misleading information about the exhibition information of a film) and perjury-related offences. The Administration has drawn members' attention to the proposed section 14D(3) that the Authority must ensure that, on or before imposing a requirement on a person to provide information under section 14B(1), the person is informed or reminded of the limitations imposed by section 14D(2) on the admissibility in evidence of the information. The Administration has advised that the proposed section 14D aligns with the arrangement in similar provisions in other ordinances and recent bills, such as the Financial Reporting Council Ordinance (Cap. 588), the Personal Data (Privacy) (Amendment) Bill 2021 and the Landlord and Tenant (Consolidation) (Amendment) Bill 2021 in the handling of self-incriminating information in criminal proceedings.

The power of the Chief Secretary for Administration in revoking certificates

32. Some members have asked the Administration to elaborate (a) the appeal/review mechanism for a direction given by the Chief Secretary for Administration ("CS") to the Authority to revoke the certificate of exemption or the certificate of approval for exhibition of a film; (b) the procedures and framework of such mechanism; and (c) the disclosure of information on which CS has formed his decision in the event that such information may be related to the work of the Committee for Safeguarding National Security of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("CSNSHK").

33. The Administration has confirmed that the remit of the Board of Review (Film Censorship) ("Board of Review") is not intended to include judging whether a decision involving national security considerations is appropriate. The Bill is drafted in such a way that a person may seek a judicial review ("JR") of the decision of (a) a censor / the Authority where the decision is based on the opinion that the exhibition of such film would be contrary to the interests of national security; or (b) CS to revoke a certificate of approval or a certificate of exemption. The procedures generally applicable to any JR would apply. Information relating to the work of CSNSHK on which CS may base to form his opinion is not subject to disclosure in JR, pursuant to Article 14 of NSL.

34. Some members have enquired about the re-exhibition arrangements for films for which certificates of approval had already been obtained some time ago. They have requested the Administration to provide information in response to a letter submitted by the Hong Kong Motion Picture Industry Association Limited which has suggested that the Administration should issue guidelines in this regard.

35. The Administration has advised that under the existing legal framework, a certificate of approval or a certificate of exemption shall remain in force after it is issued, unless the certificate is subject to conditions in relation to the time and venue of exhibition or other relevant conditions. If the Bill is enacted, once CS has exercised the power to direct the Authority to revoke a certificate of approval or certificate of exemption previously issued for a particular film on grounds that the exhibition of the film would be contrary to the interests of national security, the film must not be exhibited or re-exhibited without any valid certificate. The Government would give notice to the person to whom the relevant certificates were issued, and make appropriate arrangements (such as by issuing a press release) to inform the public that the certificates for that film have been revoked.

36. Some members have expressed concerns whether people arranging for the exhibition or re-exhibition of films with valid certificates would be prosecuted under NSL if the Guidelines are subsequently revised so that the contents of the

film would fail to fulfill the censoring criteria under the updated Guidelines. The Administration has advised that one should consider all relevant facts and evidence, including the circumstances of such exhibition or re-exhibition when determining whether any offences including those under NSL or other ordinances have been committed. People arranging for exhibition of films with valid certificates should ensure compliance with the conditions of exhibition set out in the relevant certificates, as well as observing all other applicable laws and statutes. Private screening of films among family members or friends in private premises is not regulated under Cap. 392.

Panels of censors and advisers

37. Members have asked about the professional profile of the censors and advisers whom the censors shall consult as prescribed under section 10(6)(a) of Cap. 392, and their respective numbers and roles in making decisions about a film. Members have also sought clarification on the identity of "*any other person*" in section 10(6) of Cap. 392 whom censors may consult. Some members have expressed concerns about the objectivity of the opinion of the viewing censor on the suitability of a film for exhibition.

38. The Administration has responded that the Authority shall assign a censor and may at the same time assign not less than two advisers to view a film submitted and accepted by OFNAA unless the film is exempted under section 9 of Cap. 392. Censors working in the Film Division of OFNAA are civil servants of the Entertainment Standards Control Officer grade. They are appointed to the Panel of censors by the Chief Executive ("CE") and their appointments are published in the Gazette. Each censor would usually view about 200 films every year. On-the-job training and opportunities to exchange with peers are readily available to staff members newly joining the Division. The Panel of Advisers, which comprises citizens from all walks of life, age groups and professions, shall be appointed by the Authority in writing. Any member of the public aged 18 or above and proficient in Chinese and English could apply to become a member of the Panel of Advisers. The Administration may also refer to the Central Personality Index System in recruiting suitable candidates for the Panel. There are about 300 members in the Panel of Advisers at present.

39. The censor shall make the decision on the suitability of a film for exhibition and give the film a classification (if the film is considered suitable for exhibition) after viewing the film and deliberating with the advisers (if the latter are assigned to view the film). The censor shall adhere to the Guidelines in performing his duties under Cap. 392 and, in case of doubt, may consult DoJ with the written approval of the Authority. Censors may also consult experts in a particular area of interest. For example, the Hong Kong Police Force may be

consulted on matters related to triad society cultures if such matters are found in a film.

Review mechanism

40. Members have enquired about the composition and chairmanship of the Board of Review, and the quorum of a meeting of the Board.

41. The Administration has advised that under the proposed section 16(2), CE may appoint not less than five persons, not being public officers, to the Board and appoint one of the Board members as Chairman. Under the proposed section 16(5B), SCED, the ex-officio member of the Board, may appoint a public officer to, on his behalf, attend and exercise the functions of a member at a meeting of the Board, and the public officer may or may not be an officer of the Commerce and Economic Development Bureau. Six members shall form a quorum but if, after 30 minutes have elapsed since the time fixed for the meeting, less than six members are in attendance at the meeting, then four members shall form a quorum.

42. Noting that a person may seek JR against a decision by a censor that a film is unsuitable for exhibition or a decision by CS that a certificate of approval or a certificate of exemption shall be revoked, members have enquired whether it might be more appropriate for designated organizations more familiar with the implementation of NSL, such as the National Security Department of the Hong Kong Police Force ("the NS Department") or CSNSHK, to determine whether the exhibition of a film is contrary to the interests of national security. Members have pointed out that, with this approach, the handling of issues of national security in film censorship will align with the procedure for assessment and validation of the eligibility of candidates for the Election Committee Members, CE and the LegCo Members. In these circumstances, the Candidate Eligibility Review Committee would make decisions pursuant to the advice of CSNSHK, which, in turn, would make reference to the assessment made by the NS Department.

43. The Administration has advised that a party aggrieved by a decision that the exhibition of a film would be contrary to the interests of national security may seek to review the decision by JR. The Administration has added that, should the decision that the exhibition of a film would be contrary to the interests of national security be made by CSNSHK, such decision would not be amenable to judicial review pursuant to Article 14 of NSL. The existing amendments to Cap. 392 would allow an applicant to seek the review of a decision by the Board of Review on non-national security-related matters or, on national security-related matters, by initiating judicial proceedings.

Increasing the penalty for certain offences under Cap. 392

44. According to section 15K of Cap. 392, a person who wishes to display or publish any advertising material relating to a film (which has the classification described in section 12(1)(c) of Cap. 392 or to which that classification applies pursuant to section 15A(3) of Cap. 392) must first obtain approval for the material from the Authority, who, if the approval is given, will issue a certificate to that effect. A person who displays or publish any advertising material relating to a film, which has the classification described in section 12(1)(c) of Cap. 392 or to which that classification applies pursuant to section 15A(3) of Cap. 392, but the certificate for the advertising material has not been issued, commits an offence under section 15K(7). According to section 15K(10), the maximum penalty for the offence, on conviction, is a fine of \$200,000 and imprisonment for one year. Clause 15(2) and clause 15(3) of the Bill propose that the maximum penalty should be increased to a fine of \$1,000,000 and imprisonment for three years.

45. The Administration has explained that Cap. 392 was last amended in 1999, and there is a need to adjust the level of penalty with the change in time. The proposed increase will also align the penalty with the relevant provisions in the Control of Obscene and Indecent Articles Ordinance (Cap. 390).

46. Some members have pointed out that the proposed level of penalty appears to be too heavy when, by comparison, the penalty for exhibiting a film without displaying the certificate of approval or certificate of exemption in accordance with section 15 is a fine of \$10,000 and without imprisonment term; the Administration has not proposed amendment to that penalty to reflect the change in time. They have queried about the rationale for the disparate treatment. The Administration has explained that exhibiting a film without having obtained a certificate at all is considered to be more serious than the offence of failing to display a certificate of approval or a certificate of exemption that has been issued.

Legal and drafting issues relating to the Bill

47. The Bills Committee has noted the enquiries raised by the legal adviser to the Bills Committee ([LC Paper No. CB\(1\)1315/20-21\(03\)](#)) and the Administration's written responses, on certain legal and drafting issues relating to the Bill ([LC Paper No. CB\(1\)1331/20-21\(01\)](#)).

Proposed amendments to the Bill

48. The Bills Committee has completed scrutiny of the Bill. Neither the Bills Committee nor the Administration intends to propose amendments to the Bill.

Resumption of the Second Reading debate on the Bill

49. The Bills Committee supports the resumption of the Second Reading debate on the Bill at the Council meeting of 27 October 2021.

Consultation with the House Committee

50. The Bills Committee reported its deliberations to the House Committee on 15 October 2021.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
21 October 2021

Bills Committee on Film Censorship (Amendment) Bill 2021

Membership List

Chairman Hon MA Fung-kwok, GBS, JP

Members Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBM, GBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding
Hon SHIU Ka-fai, JP
Hon YUNG Hoi-yan, JP

(Total : 7 members)

Clerk Mr Daniel SIN

Legal Adviser Mr Mark LAM

Bills Committee on Film Censorship (Amendment) Bill 2021

**List of organization/individual from which/whom
the Bills Committee has received written views**

1. Hong Kong Motion Picture Industry Association
2. Mr SIN Cheuk-nam, member of the Sha Tin District Council