

2006年11月23日會議

文件編號：CSD/GC/10/2006

策略發展委員會
管治及政治發展委員會

立法會普選的可能模式的
進一步討論

引言

委員已就有關普選原則和概念的討論作總結(文件CSD/GC/6A/2006)。根據有關總結，在討論行政長官及立法會普選的可能模式時，提出的方案須能符合：

- (a) 國家對香港的基本方針政策；
- (b) 政制發展的四項原則，包括：兼顧社會各階層利益、有利於資本主義經濟的發展、循序漸進及適合香港實際情況；
- (c) 行政主導的原則；及
- (d) “普及”和“平等”選舉的原則。

2. 委員於本年九月的會議及十一月舉行的工作坊中，詳細討論了在符合《基本法》及有關普選原則和概念下，立法會普選的可能模式。本文件旨在歸納委員的意見，讓委員就有關議題作進一步探討。

3. 為方便委員參考，我們更新了不同團體和人士向當局及立法會提供有關立法會普選模式的意見撮要，分別載於附件一及附件二。本委員會秘書處過往及最近收到個別委員提供的相關書面意見撮要，則載於附件三。

《基本法》的規定

4. 《基本法》第六十八條規定：“香港特別行政區立法會由選舉產生。立法會的產生辦法根據香港特別行政區的實際情況和循序漸進的原則而規定，最終達至全部議員由普選產生的目標”。根據人大常委會 2004 年 4 月的《決定》，第四屆立法會的功能團體和分區直選產生的議員各佔半數的比例維持不變。

5. 在邁向立法會最終普選的過程中，現有功能界別應如何演變是一項重要議題。委員普遍認同有關的重要考慮包括：

(a) 須顧及香港的特別需要、訴求及歷史現實；及

(b) 須確保有利兼顧各階層的利益，維持“均衡參與”的原則，及考慮功能界別歷來在這方面所擔當的角色。

6. 委員同意無論採取何種普選模式，都必須符合《基本法》中有關全部立法會議員最終由普選產生的目標。委員同時認同，要推動香港政制發展，一定要從現實角度出發，讓社會各方面形成共識；而當中一個重要的政治現實，是立法會六十個議席中，有三十席是由功能界別所產生的。由於立法會選舉辦法的任何修改，須得到立法會全體議員三分之二多數通過，即實際上須同時得到功能界別和地區直選產生的議員的認同和支持。

立法會功能界別議席的長遠安排

7. 在上文第 4-6 段所述的前提下，委員討論了立法會功能界別議席的長遠安排。委員普遍認同功能界別議席不能繼續按照現有的選舉方式產生。然而，就普選制度應否以某種形式保留立法會內功能界別的議席，則持不同意見。

8. 有委員提出，立法會在實行普選時也應以某種形式保留功能界別議席，但可在選舉制度作改變，以符合“普及”與“平

等”選舉的原則。委員認為值得保留功能界別議席的原因包括：

- (a) 功能界別在立法會及社會上均發揮重要作用，尤其能把工商界和專業界的聲音帶進立法會，並運用他們的專業知識，協助立法會有關立法及監察政府的工作。功能界別議員對社會是有貢獻的；
- (b) 功能界別能兼顧社會不同階層利益，符合“均衡參與”的原則；及
- (c) 若要全面取消功能界別，社會必然會有反對聲音，難以達成共識。

9. 然而，有委員認為應盡快廢除功能界別，透過地區直選產生全部議席，達至普選。任何給予功能界別特別的提名權或投票權的選舉制度，都不符合普選的原則。

立法會最終普選的可能模式

10. 有關立法會普選模式的具體方案，委員提出了不同意見。

(i) 全部議席由地區直選產生，取消全部功能界別議席

11. 有委員建議全部議席都應由地區直選產生，一半議席透過分區單議席單票制選出，另一半透過全港一個大選區以比例代表制選出，即每名選民“一人兩票”選出立法會議員，理由包括：

- (a) 讓全港市民有普及和平等的選舉權；
- (b) 符合《基本法》第六十八條的規定，全部議員由普選產生；及
- (c) 一方面可透過單議席單票制平衡地區利益，另一方面可透過比例代表制讓不同界別及黨派在議會都有代表。

12. 有委員則建議以“一人一票”產生全部議席，不同政黨可按得票比例取得相對的議席數目；這方案將有助政黨發展。不過，有委員認為選舉制度應能確保獨立人士有機會參選，讓選民可選擇投票予非政黨人士。

13. 不過，部分委員對取消全部功能界別議席的方案有保留，原因包括：

(a) 在《基本法》附件層面改變選舉制度，須取得立法會全體議員三分之二多數通過，取消所有功能界別議席的建議是不可能在立法會獲得足夠支持；

(b) 根據民意調查，市民並不反對保留功能界別，毋須一次過悉數取消。有委員認為，有些界別可能較難透過地區直選取得議席，建議分三屆才完成取消所有功能界別議席，讓這些界別有多些時間準備面對普選；及

(c) 香港目前政治發展未成熟，取消全部功能界別議席不能兼顧各階層利益。

(ii) 除由地區直選產生的議席外，功能界別議席不能繼續按照現有的選舉方式產生

14. 基於上文第 8 段的考慮，委員就在達至普選時如何以某種形式保留功能界別議席，討論了不同方案。

(1) 把目前在功能界別無投票權的選民納入功能界別

15. 有委員建議把目前在功能界別選舉無投票權的選民納入功能界別，即每名選民“一人兩票”，一票選地區直選議員，另一票選功能界別議員。只要每名選民都有資格選出功能界別議員，便應能符合“普及”和“平等”的選舉原則。亦有委員表示，基於政治現實是不可能一次過取消所有功能界別議席，他提議先擴大功能界別選民範圍，例如加入家庭主婦、退休工

人及學生等界別，再在日後分階段取消功能界別議席。然而，有委員認為按這類方案，不同功能界別的選民數目相差將很大，以致每張選票的“票值”並不平等。

(2) 由功能界別提名候選人，然後由全港選民投票

16. 部分委員建議由功能界別提名候選人，然後由全港選民“一人多票”，即一票選地區直選議員，多票選功能界別議員，原因包括：

- (a) 可確保候選人不會只顧及界別利益，而會同時爭取市民支持，這符合普選及“均衡參與”兩項原則，有利保持香港長期繁榮穩定；及
- (b) 由地區直選及功能界別代表各一半組成的議會，更具代表性，事實也做到長期協助社會穩定，令政府的政策更能全面照顧各方面的利益。

17. 部分委員則提出就這方案須進一步研究的地方：

- (a) 具體運作是否實際可行，例如，若每名選民可在分區直選投一票，以及就三十個功能界別議席投票，即一人可投三十一票，投票制度對選民來說可能會太過複雜。此外，選民或會傾向於某些較熟悉的功能界別投票，以致在不同界別獲選的議員得票率差距或會很大。不過，有意見認為應先確定這方案是否符合普選的原則，然後才討論具體運作。若決定採納這個方案時，可考慮把目前的功能界別合併為幾組，以名單制選出；
- (b) 由市民普選功能界別議員，候選人大多須借助政黨的力量，因此，選舉結果會取決於選民對政黨的接受程度，而不一定能反映界別的意向；及

- (c) 建議會限制選民的提名權，不算是符合“普及”而“平等”選舉的原則，故最多只可作過渡安排，待香港政治條件成熟後，最終應以一人一票選立法會議員。

18. 有委員提出，可先在現有基礎上分階段增強立法會選舉的民主成分，例如在 2012 年增加地區直選議席的比例，並擴大功能界別的選民基礎，然後才分階段取消功能界別議席。他建議可考慮第一階段先重新界定功能界別，讓所有選民都被納入功能界別，並可在所屬的界別投票；第二階段讓選民可在所有功能界別投票，使功能界別候選人須同時保障界別及市民的利益，含普選的原素；而第三階段才取消功能界別議席，由一人一票選出立法會議員。部分委員表示可進一步考慮此方案。

19. 此外，有委員提出，可考慮把一半議席改為“職能直選”議席，即這些議席的參選資格以職業劃分，然後以普選產生。這可確保候選人能同時顧及界別及香港的整體利益。

(iii) 兩院制

20. 有委員認為兩院制(即第一院由地區直選議員組成；第二院則由功能界別產生的議員組成)，是合適的普選模式，理據包括：

- (a) 鑑於難以說服功能界別議員同意取消本身在立法會的議席的政治現實，此方案能顧及界別的利益，較有機會為功能界別議員接受；
- (b) 下議院由普選產生，符合普選的原則；
- (c) 兩院制更能達致“均衡參與”，使立法機關更加能夠對行政機關作出制衡；及
- (d) 在法律層面上，立法會仍可被視為單一議會，應該不用修改《基本法》主體條文。

21. 不過，不少委員對實行兩院制有保留，並有意見認為應暫時不再繼續討論這方案，原因包括：

- (a) 要推行兩院制，涉及的過程複雜，除須修改《基本法》附件二，更可能須修訂主體條文。若這只是一個過渡安排，政治上不值得花太多精力；但若這是一個最終模式，卻又未必符合普選的原則，無論如何，從政治現實的角度來看，社會很難就修改《基本法》達成共識；
- (b) 兩院制假設了地區直選議員不能保障中央或界別利益，這假設只會分化兩院議員，影響他們之間的溝通；
- (c) 兩院的權力如何分配，不易解決。若上議院只能拖延通過法案而沒有否決權，將不能對下議院作出足夠制衡。反之，倘若上議院的權力與下議院相若，即意味著政府提出的法案和議案須同時獲兩院通過，會進一步增加通過法案/議案的難度，對政府的管治及行政效率有負面影響；及
- (d) 當年草擬《基本法》時，已詳細研究「兩院制」作為立法會的模式，而最終沒有採納，因此現時不應重新研究一次。

在達至最終普選前的過渡安排

22. 有委員建議可考慮在達至最終普選前，先作出過渡安排，提出的方案包括：

- (a) 在全面取消功能界別前，先引入改革，包括擴大功能界別的選民基礎，將公司/團體票改為個人票，及取消或合併一些現有界別；
- (b) 議席分別由分區直選及由功能界別提名候選人再由普選產生的建議，讓具經驗及能力的議會

領袖在過渡過程可繼續參與議會工作，可確保政策制訂過程有一定的穩定性；

- (c) 兩院制。在達至所有立法會議員由普選產生之前，可實行兩院制，並藉著賦予經普選產生的下議院較多權力，向功能界別提供誘因來參與普選。而實行這模式，只須修改《基本法》附件二內的有關立法會對法案、議案的表決程序，例如，規定政府提交的草案須經兩院通過，便能達到類似兩院制的效果，不需要修改《基本法》的主體條文。若日後下議院的表現成熟，能與行政主導的政府建立夥伴關係，便可推行全面普選。

23. 此外，有委員提出可考慮在實行最終普選前作過渡安排，但必須先決定最終普選模式及訂立一個時間表，這樣有關安排才可在過渡期內有秩序地推行，減少社會的爭論。有委員認為這安排較易為中央及香港內部的一些人士接受。不過，有委員則認為，分階段達至普選只會把目前的問題(例如功能界別的長遠出路)拖延下去。

24. 有委員提出可在政府去年提出的 2007/08 建議方案(即增加區議會在立法會的議席數目)的基礎上，研究達至普選的方案。

意見歸納

25. 總的而言，有關立法會普選可能模式，委員普遍認同在達至普選時，功能界別議席不能繼續按照現有的選舉方式產生，否則將與《基本法》普選目標相違背。

26. 此外，委員傾向認為應暫時不再繼續討論兩院制作為普選模式的方案。

27. 不過，委員就以下議題並未形成主流意見，須進一步討論：

- (a) 應否全面取消功能界別議席，或是以某種形式保留功能界別；
- (b) 視乎如何取代現有功能界別的選舉模式，應採取何種具體普選模式；及
- (c) 應否在達至最終普選前，先作過渡安排。若認為應先作過渡安排，應採取何種模式。

政制事務局
2006 年 11 月

**Commission on Strategic Development
Committee on Governance and Political Development**

**Further Discussion on Possible Models for
Forming the Legislative Council by Universal Suffrage**

Introduction

Members have concluded discussions on the concepts and principles relating to universal suffrage (Paper CSD/GC/6A/2006). According to the conclusions, in discussing possible models for electing the Chief Executive (“CE”) and the Legislative Council (“LegCo”) by universal suffrage, any proposal put forward should comply with:

- (a) the basic policies of the State regarding Hong Kong;
- (b) the four principles on constitutional development, namely, meeting the interests of different sectors of society, facilitating the development of the capitalist economy, gradual and orderly progress, and being appropriate to the actual situation in Hong Kong;
- (c) the principle of an executive-led system; and
- (d) the principles of universal and equal suffrage.

2. At the meeting in September and the workshop in November this year, members discussed in detail possible models for forming the LegCo in accordance with the Basic Law and the concepts and principles relating to universal suffrage. This paper summarizes members’ views to facilitate members’ further discussion on the subject.

3. For members’ easy reference, we have updated the summary of views of various organizations and individuals on possible models for forming the LegCo received by the Administration and the LegCo, as appended at Annex I and Annex II respectively. A summary of written submissions received from individual members in the past and recently by

the Committee Secretariat is provided at Annex III.

Provisions in the Basic Law

4. Article 68 of the Basic Law provides that “the LegCo of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (“HKSAR”) shall be constituted by election. The method for forming the LegCo shall be specified in the light of the actual situation in the HKSAR and in accordance with the principle of gradual and orderly progress. The ultimate aim is the election of all the members of the LegCo by universal suffrage”. In accordance with the Decision made by the Standing Committee of the National People’s Congress (“NPCSC”) of April 2004, in the fourth term of the LegCo, the ratio between members returned by functional constituencies (“FCs”) and members returned by geographical constituencies (“GCs”) through direct elections, who shall respectively occupy half of the seats, is to remain unchanged.

5. In moving towards the ultimate aim of forming LegCo by universal suffrage, the future of the FCs is one of the key issues to be considered. Members generally agreed that the major considerations included the following:

- (a) we must have regard to the special needs, aspirations and historical background of Hong Kong; and
- (b) we must ensure that the interests of different sectors were taken into consideration, and that the principle of “balanced participation” was upheld. In this regard, the role which the FCs had been playing should be considered.

6. Members agreed that, regardless of which universal suffrage model was adopted, the ultimate aim of electing all the members of LegCo by universal suffrage, as stipulated in the Basic Law, must be attained. Members also recognized that, to take forward Hong Kong’s constitutional development, we must proceed in a pragmatic manner so as to forge consensus within the community. One important political reality was that 30 out of the 60 LegCo seats were returned by FCs. As any amendment to the electoral method for LegCo required the endorsement of a two-thirds majority of all the members of the LegCo, in practice, this meant that the endorsement and support of members returned by FCs as well as those returned by GCs through direct elections would be required.

Long Term Arrangements for LegCo FC seats

7. On the premise set out in paragraphs 4-6 above, members discussed the long term arrangements for the LegCo FC seats, and generally agreed that the FC seats could not continue to be returned by the existing election method. However, views were diverse as to whether, when universal suffrage was implemented, the FC seats should be retained in LegCo in some form.

8. Some members proposed that when universal suffrage was implemented for LegCo, the FC seats should be retained in some form, but the changes could be made to the electoral system so as to make the arrangements consistent with the principles of universal and equal suffrage. Members considered it worthwhile to retain the FC seats for the following reasons:

- (a) FCs had been playing an important role in LegCo and in society. In particular, they had brought the voices of the business and professional sectors into LegCo and had, through their expertise, assisted LegCo in carrying out legislative function and in monitoring the Government. FC Members had made contributions to the community;
- (b) FCs could meet the interests of different sectors of society, which was consistent with the principle of “balanced participation”; and
- (c) abolition of FCs altogether was bound to meet with objections from the community, and it would be difficult to reach consensus on the issue.

9. However, some members considered that FCs should be abolished as soon as possible, and universal suffrage should be attained by returning all seats by GCs through direct elections. Any electoral system conferring special rights on FCs to nominate candidates or to vote would not be consistent with the principle of universal suffrage.

Possible models for forming LegCo by universal suffrage

10. Members expressed different views on specific models for forming LegCo by universal suffrage.

(i) *To return all seats by GCs through direct elections; to abolish all FC seats*

11. A member proposed that all seats should be returned by GCs through direct elections, with half of the seats returned by a “single seat single vote” system on a district basis, and the other half by a proportional representation system, under which the whole of Hong Kong would form a single constituency. In other words, each voter would elect LegCo Members on the basis of “one-person-two-votes”. The arguments for this proposal included the following:

- (a) the proposal could give all members of the public universal and equal voting rights;
- (b) the proposal would be consistent with the requirement of Article 68 of the Basic Law of electing all the members of LegCo by universal suffrage; and
- (c) on the one hand, a “single seat single vote” system could help balance the interests of different districts, and on the other hand, a proportional representation system could allow different sectors and political parties/groups to be represented in LegCo.

12. A member proposed returning all seats by “one-person-one-vote”, such that the number of seats allocated to different political parties would be proportional to the respective number of votes they received. This proposal would be conducive to promoting the development of political parties. However, a member considered that any electoral system should ensure that independent candidates would have the opportunity to stand for election, so that voters could vote for candidates with no political party background.

13. However, some members had reservations about the proposal to abolish all FC seats. Their reasons included the following:

- (a) given that any amendment to the electoral methods specified in the Annexes to the Basic Law required the endorsement of a two-thirds majority of all the members of LegCo, it would not be possible to secure sufficient support in LegCo for a proposal to abolish all FC seats;
 - (b) as opinion polls had indicated that the public did not object to retaining the FCs, it would not be necessary to abolish them in one go. A member suggested that all FC seats could be phased out over three terms. As some sectors might find it more difficult to win seats through direct elections by GCs, this proposal could allow these sectors more time to prepare themselves for universal suffrage; and
 - (c) at the current early stage of political development in Hong Kong, abolishing all FC seats could not meet the interests of different sectors of society.
- (ii) *To return seats by GCs through direct elections; FC seats would not continue to be returned by the existing election method*

14. On the basis of the considerations set out in paragraph 8 above, members discussed various options as to how FC seats could be retained when universal suffrage was implemented.

- (1) To include voters who are currently not entitled to vote at FCs in the FCs

15. Some members proposed including voters who were currently not entitled to vote at FCs in the FCs. In other words, each voter would elect LegCo Members on the basis of “one-person-two-votes”: one vote to return directly elected GC Members, and the other to return FC Members. As long as every voter would be entitled to vote for FC Members, the principles of universal and equal suffrage would be complied with. Also, a member considered that given the political reality, it would not be possible to abolish all FC seats in one go. He suggested to first expand the electorate base of the FCs (e.g. by adding new sectors for housewives, retirees and students etc) and to phase out the FC seats thereafter. However, a member considered that under this kind of proposals, there would be great disparity in the number of voters among different FCs, leading to inequality in the “value” of each vote.

(2) To allow Members of the FCs to nominate candidates for election by universal suffrage

16. Some members proposed allowing FC Members to nominate candidates for election by all voters through “one-person-multiple-votes” i.e. one vote to return directly elected GC Members, and multiple votes to return FC Members. The arguments for this proposal included the following:

- (a) this could help ensure that candidates would not only look after the interests of individual sectors, but would also strive to gain the support of the community at large. This would be consistent with the principles of universal suffrage and balanced participation, and would be conducive to maintaining the long-term prosperity and stability of Hong Kong; and
- (b) a legislature with half of its members returned by GCs through direct election and half by FCs would be more representative. As a matter of fact, such a legislature had helped maintain Hong Kong’s long term social stability, and had helped ensure that Government policies would take fuller account of the interests of different sectors.

17. However, some members pointed out that this proposal would require further consideration in the following respects:

- (a) whether the proposal was practicable. For example, if every voter could cast one vote to return directly elected GC Members and multiple votes to return 30 FC Members, this would mean that each voter would have 31 votes. The voting system might be too complicated for voters. Moreover, voters might tend to vote only in those FCs which were more familiar to them. Hence, there could be great disparity in the number of votes received by Members elected in different FCs. A member, however, suggested that a decision should first be made as to whether the proposal could comply with the principle of universal suffrage before looking into the specific arrangements. If it was decided to adopt the proposal, consideration could be given to merging the existing FCs into several groups for election by a list system;

- (b) in the election of FC Members by universal suffrage, candidates would likely rely on the support of political parties. Hence, the election results would hinge on the degree of people's acceptance of the political parties, and might not necessarily reflect the preference of different sectors; and
- (c) as the proposal would restrict voters' right to nominate, it could not be regarded to be consistent with the principles of universal and equal suffrage. At most, it could only be a transitional arrangement. When the political pre-conditions in Hong Kong were ready, LegCo Members should ultimately be elected on a "one-person-one-vote" basis.

18. A member suggested that the democratic element of the LegCo election could be progressively enhanced by phases on the basis of the current arrangements. One possibility was to increase the proportion of GC seats and expand the electorate base of FCs in 2012, and to abolish the FC seats by phases thereafter. He proposed that, in the first phase, consideration could be given to re-delineate the electorate of the FCs and to include all voters in the FCs, who would then be entitled to vote in their respective FCs. In the second phase, voters could be allowed to vote in all FCs to ensure that FC candidates would have to safeguard both sectoral and public interests. Elections conducted in such a way would contain an element of universal suffrage. FC seats could be abolished only in the third phase, and all LegCo Members could then be elected by "one-person-one-vote". Some members expressed the view that this proposal could be further considered.

19. Moreover, a member proposed that consideration could be given to returning half of the seats by "occupational constituencies" through direct elections (i.e. eligibility for candidature for these seats would be defined by occupation, and the seats would be returned by universal suffrage). This could ensure that candidates would have regard to both the interests of the sectors and of Hong Kong as a whole.

(iii) Bicameral system

20. A member considered that a bicameral system (i.e. under which the first chamber would be constituted by directly elected GC Members, and the second chamber constituted by FC Members) was an appropriate model for implementing universal suffrage for reasons including the following:

- (a) in view of the political reality that it would be difficult to persuade FC Members to agree to abolishing their own LegCo seats, this proposal could meet the interests of the sectors and should stand a better chance of being accepted by FC Members;
- (b) forming the lower house by universal suffrage would be consistent with the principle of universal suffrage;
- (c) a bicameral system would be conducive to achieving “balanced participation”, and would enable the legislature to perform checks and balances over the executive authorities more effectively; and
- (d) from a legal perspective, LegCo could still be considered a single legislature, and no amendment to the principal provisions of the Basic Law should be necessary.

21 However, quite a number of members had reservations about implementing a bicameral system. There were views that further discussion on this proposal should be put aside for the time being for reasons including the following:

- (a) the implementation of a bicameral system would entail complicated procedures. Not only would it involve amendments to Annex II to the Basic Law, the principal provisions of the Basic Law might also need to be amended. If the proposal was meant to be only a transitional arrangement, it would not be worth the effort politically. On the other hand, if it was meant to be the ultimate model, it might not be consistent with the principle of universal suffrage. In any event, in view of the political reality, it would not be easy to forge consensus within the community on amending the Basic Law;
- (b) a bicameral system assumed that directly elected GC Members could not safeguard the interests of the Central Authorities or different sectors in the community. This would only divide the members of the two chambers and undermine their communication;

- (c) it would not be easy to decide on the division of power between the two chambers. If the upper house was only provided with the power to delay, but not to veto, bills, it would not be able to exercise adequate checks and balances over the lower house. Conversely, if the upper and lower houses were provided with similar powers, this would imply that bills and motions introduced by the Government would need to be passed by both houses. This would add to the difficulties in getting bills and motions passed, and undermine governance and the efficiency of the executive authorities; and
- (d) a bicameral system as a possible model for LegCo had been examined in detail during the drafting of the Basic Law, and had not been adopted eventually. Hence, this option should not be examined again now.

Transitional arrangements before attaining the ultimate aim of universal suffrage

22. Some members suggested that, in the process of attaining the ultimate aim of forming the LegCo by universal suffrage, consideration could be given to putting in place some transitional arrangements. Proposals put forth by members included the following:

- (a) to introduce reforms before abolishing the FCs, including to expand the electorate base of FCs, replace corporate voting by individual voting, and abolish or merge some of the existing FCs;
- (b) to return directly elected Members by GCs and, at the same time, to allow FC Members to nominate candidates for election by universal suffrage. This would enable experienced and competent leaders in the legislature to continue to participate in the work of the legislature during the transitional period, thereby ensuring some degree of stability in the process of policy formulation; and
- (c) a bicameral system. Before attaining the aim of electing all LegCo Members by universal suffrage, a bicameral system could be put in place. Through providing the lower house

returned by universal suffrage with more power, FC Members would have an incentive to participate in elections by universal suffrage. To implement this model, it would be sufficient to amend only Annex II to the Basic Law concerning the procedures for voting on bills and motions in LegCo. For example, by requiring bills introduced by Government to get passed both chambers could achieve the effect similar to a bicameral system without the need to amend the principal provisions of the Basic Law. If and when the lower house performed in a mature manner and established partnership with the executive-led government, universal suffrage could then be implemented.

23. Moreover, a member expressed the view that while consideration could be given to putting in place transitional arrangements before attaining the ultimate aim of universal suffrage, it was imperative that an ultimate model for universal suffrage and a timetable for implementing universal suffrage were first determined. Only by so doing could the arrangements be implemented in an orderly manner during the transitional period, and disputes within the community minimized. A member considered that the Central Authorities and certain people in Hong Kong would find such arrangements more acceptable. However, a member considered that attaining universal suffrage in phases would only prolong the existing problems (e.g. the long-term future of the FCs).

24. A member suggested examining possible models for attaining universal suffrage on the basis of the proposed package for the 2007/08 elections put forth by the Government last year (i.e. to increase the number of LegCo seats returned by DCs).

Summary of Views

25. In sum, regarding possible models for forming LegCo by universal suffrage, members generally agreed that the FC seats should no longer be returned by the existing election method when universal suffrage was attained because this would not be consistent with the ultimate aim of attaining universal suffrage under the Basic Law.

26. Moreover, members were inclined to put aside for the time being further discussion on a bicameral system as an option for implementing universal suffrage.

27. However, members had yet to form a mainstream view on the following issues, which would require further deliberation:

- (a) whether FC seats should be abolished altogether or retained in some form;
- (b) depending on how the existing election method for FCs would be replaced, the model to be adopted for implementing universal suffrage; and
- (c) whether transitional arrangements should be put in place in the process of attaining the ultimate aim of universal suffrage, and if so, the model to be adopted.

Constitutional Affairs Bureau
November 2006