

策略發展委員會  
管治及政治發展委員會  
2006年9月22日第六次會議

席上意見摘要

主席歡迎委員出席委員會的第六次會議。

續議事項

有關《進一步發展政治委任制度諮詢文件》的工作坊

2. 秘書處將於9月25日就「進一步發展政治委任制度諮詢文件」舉辦工作坊。

有關普選行政長官可能模式的工作坊

3. 委員於第五次會議上，同意應繼續研究有關普選行政長官可能模式的具體細節，特別是提名委員會的組成和提名機制等，並就個別方案作更深入討論。秘書處已於9月14日舉辦第一個有關普選行政長官可能模式的工作坊。第二個工作坊將於10月3日舉行，秘書處已通知委員有關工作坊的詳情。

有關立法會普選的可能模式的討論

4. 在委員進行討論前，主席就立法會普選這議題發表了以下意見：

- (a) 特區政府一直以來是認真和嚴格地按照《基本法》的規定處理政制發展議題。無論採取何種普選模式，都必須符合《基本法》的規定。特區政府是完全明白市民對普選的訴求。與此同時，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。只有在各方達

成共識的基礎下，才可以根據《基本法》的規定務實地推動政制向前邁進。

(b) 就立法會選舉而言，目前在立法會六十個議席中，有三十席是由功能界別所產生的。而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。委員會有一個重要的職責，就是盡量找出能顧及香港的特別需要、訴求及歷史現實，以及社會各階層的利益的普選模式，在這方面，委員須考慮《基本法》所規定的原則，例如“均衡參與”，及考慮立法會功能界別歷來在這方面所擔當的角色。

(c) 特區政府就立法會普選模式這議題沒有既定立場。

5. 有關立法會普選的可能模式，委員發表了以下意見。

(a) 全部議席由地區直選產生，取消全部功能界別議席

6. 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。他表示不傾向全部議席以分區直選產生，認為選區太細，選出的議員視野會較窄，不利議會運作。有委員表示贊同此方案，認為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。

7. 有委員認為與其採納一些複雜的普選模式(例如由功能界別提名，然後由普選選出)，不如乾脆取消所有功能界別議席，況且，最終的普選模式根本不應存在功能界別。不過，有委員對這方案有保留，原因包括：

- (a) 基於選舉制度的改變須取得立法會三分之二多數通過，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，毋須一次過取消。他並認為工商界較難透過直選取得議席，建議分三屆才取消全部功能界別議席。
- (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。

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

8. 就如何改變功能界別的選舉方式以達至普選，委員討論了不同方案。

(i) 把目前在功能界別無投票權的選民納入功能界別

9. 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，即每名選民將有兩票，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。

10. 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，再在日後分階段取消功能界別。

11. 有委員提出可先從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。

(ii) 由功能界別成員提名代表，然後讓全港選民投票選出

12. 有委員贊同此方案，認為這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，這可符合普選及均衡參與兩項原則。

13. 部分委員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會太過複雜。此外，選民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很大，一些界別的候選人可能以低票當選。

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。
- (c) 建議會限制選民的提名權，不算得是普選，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。

(c) 推行兩院制

14. 有委員認為兩院制是合適的最終普選模式，因為此方案能顧及界別及中央的利益，較有機會為功能界別議員所接受；而下議院由普選產生，符合普選的原則。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。

15. 有委員則認為兩院制應作為過渡安排。在達至所有立法會議員由普選產生之前，可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。

16. 有委員贊同兩院制作為中長期的過渡安排，認為可讓界別精英繼續作出貢獻。若社會認為值得討論這方案，在不違反普選最終目標的前提下，是可以因應香港的情況修改《基本法》。

17. 不過，部分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，例如須修改《基本法》附件二，甚至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。
- (b) 兩院制假設了直選議員不能保障中央或界別利益，這只會分化兩院議員，影響他們之間的溝通。另一方面，在兩院制下，政府提出的法案和議案須同時獲兩院通過，增加了通過法案/議案的難度，對政府的管治有負面影響。
- (c) 兩院制在法律上不能符合《基本法》第 68 條中“全體議員由普選產生”的要求，要推行必須修改《基本法》。不過，從政治現實的角度來看，社會很難就修改《基本法》達成共識。

## 過渡安排

18. 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。

## 總結

19. 主席就委員的討論作了以下總結：

- (a) 委員就立法會普選的可能模式，有一個基本共識，就是須按照《基本法》，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。
- (b) 就立法會普選可能模式的具體細節方面，委員提出了不少建議。有委員建議全部立法會議席由地區直選產生，取消全部功能界別議席。但亦有委員指出功能界別議員對香港社會作出很大貢獻，擔心直選議員未必能反映界別的關注；委員就這方面未能達成共識。
- (c) 有委員提議除由地區直選產生的議席外，亦須以某種形式保留功能界別議席，但功能界別議席不能繼續按照現有的選舉方式產生，以免與最終達至全部議員由普選產生的目標相違背。有委員建議其中一個方法是由功能界別成員提名代表，然後讓全港選民投票選出；就提名方式等技術問題，則須作進一步討論。
- (d) 有關推行兩院制的建議，委員提出了不同的看法。部份委員覺得這不一定是達到最終普選的安排。亦有委員認為，在實行普選的情況下，兩院制較能保障社會上不同界別的利益在議會上得到反映，因而值得進一步考慮。

不過，委員大多認為兩院制涉及修改《基本法》，加上操作困難，以及未必能符合普選原則，因此傾向不支持此建議。雖然有意見認為可進一步研究如何處理這些問題，但委員普遍抱存疑的態度。

秘書處在 11 月 6 日會舉辦一個工作坊，讓委員進一步討論立法會普選模式。建議再次邀請香港工商專業聯會參與工作坊，讓委員在決定是否繼續討論兩院制前，再有一次機會就方案作充分討論。

至於有關推行兩院制是否須修改《基本法》的問題十分複雜，就算尋求法律意見也可能沒有肯定的答案。

- (e) 建議委員會繼續討論有關立法會普選可能模式的具體細節，特別是立法會議會制度及功能界別應如何演變等具體議題。
- (f) 政府的目標是在明年歸納委員會的討論及作報告，並會把報告提交中央及向市民公開。倘若委員會屆時未能就普選路線圖達成共識，亦希望報告可點出明確的方向，作為進一步處理有關問題的基礎。期望委員能持包容的態度，願意作出妥協，共同尋求一個各方都可接受的方案。

20. 主席告知委員，下次會議將於 11 月 23 日（星期四）舉行。

21. 出席會議人士名單載於附件。

策略發展委員會秘書處  
2006 年 11 月

策略發展委員會  
管治及政治發展委員會第六次會議  
2006年9月22日

Sixth Meeting of  
the Committee on Governance and Political Development  
of the Commission on Strategic Development  
22 September 2006

出席人士

Attendance List

主席 :

Chairman :

The Chief Executive

行政長官

官方委員 :

Official Members :

Head, Central Policy Unit

中央政策組首席顧問

Director, Chief Executive's Office

行政長官辦公室主任

非官方委員 :

Non-Official Members :

Mr CHAN Chung-bun, Bunny, B.B.S., J.P.

陳振彬先生, B.B.S., J.P.

Mr CHAN Tak-lam, Norman, S.B.S., J.P.

陳德霖先生, S.B.S., J.P.

Mr CHAU How-chen, G.B.S., J.P.

周厚澄先生, G.B.S., J.P.

Prof CHEN Hung-yee, Albert, J.P.

陳弘毅教授, J.P.

Mr CHEN Nan-lok, Philip, S.B.S., J.P.

陳南祿先生, S.B.S., J.P.

Prof CHENG Kwok-hon, Leonard

鄭國漢教授

Mr CHEUNG Chi-kong

張志剛先生

Ms CHOW, Wendy

周君倩女士

Mr CHOW Yick-hay, B.B.S., J.P.

周奕希先生, B.B.S., J.P.

Mr CHOW Yung, Robert, B.B.S.

周融先生, B.B.S.

Ms FONG, Janie

方文靜女士

Mr FUNG, Daniel R., S.B.S., J.P.

馮華健先生, S.B.S., J.P.

Mr HOO, Alan, S.B.S., J.P.

胡漢清先生, S.B.S., J.P.

Ms KO Po-ling, M.H.

高寶齡女士, M.H.



Prof KUAN Hsin-chi  
Mr LAU Nai-keung  
The Hon LEE Cheuk-yan  
The Hon LEE Wing-tat  
Dr LEUNG Mei-fun, Priscilla  
Mr LIE-A-CHEONG Tai-chong, David, J.P.  
Dr LO Chi-kin, J.P.  
Mr LUI Tim-leung, Tim, J.P.  
Mr MOK Hon-fai  
Mr NG Sze-fuk, George, S.B.S., J.P.  
The Hon SHEK Lai-him, Abraham, J.P.  
Mr SZE Chin-hung, Jerome, J.P.  
Mr TAM Kwok-kiu, M.H., J.P.  
Miss TAM Wai-chu, Maria, G.B.S., J.P.  
The Hon TIEN Pei-chun, James, G.B.S., J.P.  
Dr WANG Xiao-qiang  
Mr WONG Wai-yin, Zachary  
Mr WONG Ying-ho, Kennedy, B.B.S., J.P.  
Mr YU Kwok-chun, G.B.S., J.P.  
Dr ZHOU Ba-jun

關信基教授  
劉迺強先生  
李卓人議員  
李永達議員  
梁美芬博士  
李大壯先生, J.P.  
盧子健博士, J.P.  
雷添良先生, J.P.  
莫漢輝先生  
吳仕福先生, S.B.S., J.P.  
石禮謙議員, J.P.  
施展熊先生, J.P.  
譚國僑先生, M.H., J.P.  
譚惠珠女士, G.B.S., J.P.  
田北俊議員, G.B.S., J.P.  
王小強博士  
黃偉賢先生  
黃英豪先生, B.B.S., J.P.  
余國春先生, G.B.S., J.P.  
周八駿博士

## 列席

### In Attendance

Secretary for Constitutional Affairs  
Permanent Secretary for Constitutional Affairs  
Deputy Secretary for Constitutional Affairs (1)

政制事務局局長  
政制事務局常任秘書長  
政制事務局副秘書長(1)

## 因事未能出席

### Apologies

The Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, S.B.S., J.P.  
Mr CHOW Charn-ki, Kenneth  
Prof LEE Chack-fan, S.B.S., J.P.  
The Hon MA Lik, G.B.S., J.P.  
Mr WONG Kong-hon, S.B.S., J.P.

張學明議員, S.B.S., J.P.  
鄒燦基先生  
李焯芬教授, S.B.S., J.P.  
馬力議員, G.B.S., J.P.  
黃光漢先生, S.B.S., J.P.

**Summary of the views expressed at  
the Sixth Meeting of  
the Committee on Governance and Political Development  
of the Commission on Strategic Development  
held on 22 September 2006**

(Translation)

The Chairman welcomed Members to the sixth meeting of the Committee.

**Matters arising from the last meeting**

Workshop on the consultation document on further development of the political appointment system

2. Members noted that the Secretariat would organize a workshop on the consultation document on further development of the political appointment system on 25 September 2006.

Workshops on possible models for selecting the Chief Executive by universal suffrage

3. At the fifth meeting of the Committee, it was agreed that Members should continue to examine the details of individual proposals on possible models for selecting the Chief Executive by universal suffrage, particularly the composition of the Nominating Committee, the method of nomination etc. The Secretariat had organized the first workshop on possible models for selecting the Chief Executive by universal suffrage on 14 September 2006. The second workshop would be held on 3 October 2006. The Secretariat had already informed Members of the detailed arrangements.

**Discussion on possible models for forming the Legislative Council by universal suffrage**

4. Before discussion, the Chairman made the following remarks about the issue of forming the Legislative Council by universal suffrage:

- (a) The SAR Government had been handling the issue of constitutional development seriously, and in strict accordance with the requirements of the Basic Law. Regardless of

which model for universal suffrage was to be adopted, it should conform to the requirements of the Basic Law. While the SAR Government was fully alive to the public's aspirations for universal suffrage, Hong Kong's constitutional development had to be promoted in a pragmatic manner so that a consensus could be reached within the community. The consensus would provide the required basis for constitutional developments to be taken forward pragmatically in accordance with the Basic Law.

- (b) Regarding the election of the Legislative Council, 30 out of the 60 Legislative Council seats were currently returned by functional constituencies. As any amendment to the election method for the Legislative Council required the endorsement of a two-thirds majority of all the members of the Legislative Council, this meant in practice that the endorsement and support of members returned by functional constituencies as well as those returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections would be required. The Committee had an important duty to do its best to identify a model for universal suffrage that would have addressed the special needs, aspirations and historical background of Hong Kong, as well as the interests of the various sectors. To this end, Members had to consider the principles stipulated in the Basic Law, such as "balanced participation", and the role which the functional constituencies had been playing.

- (c) The SAR Government did not have any established position on the models for forming the Legislative Council by universal suffrage.

5. Regarding possible models for forming the Legislative Council by universal suffrage, Members expressed the following views.

- (a) *To return all seats by geographical constituencies through direct elections and to abolish all functional constituency seats.*

6. A member proposed that all seats should be returned by geographical constituencies 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. He was not inclined to support the idea of having all seats returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections. He considered that individual constituencies were too small to return members of broad vision and this would not be conducive to the operation of the Legislative Council. Another Member supported the above proposal, maintaining that it could balance the interests of different districts through a “single-seat-single-vote” system on one hand, and ensure the representation of different sectors and political parties/groups in the Legislative Council through a proportional representation system on the other.

7. A Member took the view that instead of adopting some complicated models for universal suffrage (for example, functional constituencies to nominate candidates for election by universal suffrage), we should consider abolishing functional constituency seats completely as he considered functional constituencies should not exist at all in the ultimate model for universal suffrage. However, a Member had reservation against this proposal for reasons which 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 Legislative Council, it would not be possible to secure sufficient support in Legislative Council for a proposal to abolish all functional constituency seats.
- (b) As opinion polls had indicated that the public did not object to retaining the functional constituency seats, complete abolition at one go would not be necessary. Pointing out that it might be more difficult for the business sectors to win seats through direct elections, he proposed that all functional constituency seats be phased out over three terms of the Legislative Council.
- (c) At the current early stage of political development in Hong Kong, abolishing all functional constituency seats could not meet the interests of different sectors of society.

*(b) To return seats by geographical constituencies through direct elections, and to preserve functional constituency seats. However, the functional constituency seats would not continue to be returned by the existing election method.*

8. As to how the election method for functional constituency seats should be amended to achieve universal suffrage, different proposals were discussed.

(i) To include voters who are currently not entitled to vote at functional constituencies in the functional constituencies

9. Some members proposed including voters who were currently not entitled to vote at functional constituencies in the functional constituencies. In other words, each voter would elect Legislative Council Members on the basis of “one-person-two-votes”: one vote to return directly elected geographical constituency Members, and the other to return functional constituency Members. As long as every voter would be entitled to vote for functional constituency Members, the principles of universal and equal suffrage would be complied with.

10. Another Member opined that it was politically impossible to abolish all functional constituency seats at one go. He suggested to first expand the electorate base of functional constituencies, (e.g. by adding new sectors for housewives, retirees and students etc) and to phase out the functional constituency seats thereafter.

11. A Member suggested that the democratic element of the Legislative Council election could be progressively enhanced by phases on the basis of the current arrangements. One possibility was to increase the proportion of geographical constituency seats and expand the electorate base of functional constituencies in 2012, and to abolish the functional constituency seats by phases thereafter. He proposed that, in the first phase, consideration could be given to re-delineate the electorate of the functional constituencies and to include all voters in the functional constituencies, who would then be entitled to vote in their respective functional constituencies. In the second phase, voters could be allowed to vote in all functional constituencies to ensure that functional constituency candidates would have to safeguard both sectoral and public interests. Elections conducted in such a way would contain an element of universal suffrage. Functional constituency seats could be abolished only in the third phase,

and all Legislative Council Members could then be elected by “one-person-one-vote”. Some members expressed the view that this proposal could be further considered.

(ii) To allow members of functional constituencies to nominate candidates for election by universal suffrage

12. A Member supported this proposal, maintaining that it could ensure 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.

13. In relation to this proposal, some Members highlighted the following issues for further examination:

- (a) Whether the proposal was practicable. For example, if every voter could cast one vote to return directly elected geographical constituency Members and multiple votes to return 30 functional constituency 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 functional constituencies which were more familiar to them. Hence, there could be great disparity in the number of votes received by Members elected in different functional constituencies, and candidates might be returned by a low number of votes in some constituencies.

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 functional constituencies into several groups for election by a list system.

- (b) In the election of functional constituency 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.

- (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, Legislative Council Members should ultimately be elected on a "one-person-one-vote" basis.

*(c) To implement a bicameral system.*

14. A Member opined that a bicameral system was an appropriate model for universal suffrage because it could meet the interests of the sectors and the Central Authorities and therefore stood a greater chance of being accepted by functional constituency members. Besides, forming the lower house by universal suffrage would be consistent with the principle of universal suffrage. From the legal perspective, the Legislative Council could still be regarded as a single legislature, and no amendment to the principal provisions of the Basic Law should be necessary.

15. A Member considered that a bicameral system should be put in place as a transitional arrangement before attaining the aim of forming the Legislative Council by universal suffrage. Through providing the lower house returned by universal suffrage with more power, functional constituency 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 Legislative Council. 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.

16. A Member supported the implementation of a bicameral system as a medium to long-term transitional arrangement, maintaining that this would enable elites from different sectors to continue to make contribution. If the proposal was considered worth discussion by the community, as long as the ultimate aim of universal suffrage was upheld, amendment to the Basic Law could be made with due regard to the situation of Hong Kong.

17. However, some Members had reservation about the implementation of a bicameral system, and there were views that discussion about this proposal should be suspended for the time being for reasons which included 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.
- (b) A bicameral system assumed that directly elected geographical constituency 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. Moreover, under a bicameral system, 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.
- (c) From the legal perspective, a bicameral system did not meet the requirement specified in Article 68 of the Basic Law, which provided for “the election of all members of Legislative Council by universal suffrage”. The implementation of a bicameral system would necessitate amendment to the Basic Law. However, in view of the political reality, it would be difficult to forge a consensus within the community on making amendment to the Basic Law.

### **Transitional Arrangements**

18. 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.

## **Conclusion**

19. The Chairman drew the following conclusions on Members' discussions:

- (a) Regarding possible models for forming the Legislative Council by universal suffrage, Members had a broad consensus that the method for forming the Legislative Council should be in accordance with the Basic Law. It should be devised in the light of the actual situation in the Hong Kong SAR and in accordance with the principle of gradual and orderly progress. The ultimate aim was the election of all the members of the Legislative Council by universal suffrage.
- (b) Members put forward a number of detailed proposals on possible models for forming the Legislative Council by universal suffrage. There was a proposal to return all Legislative Council seats by geographical constituencies through direct elections and to abolish all functional constituency seats. Some Members, however, pointed out that functional constituency members had significant contribution to the community and worried that directly elected members might not be able to reflect the concerns of the sectors. A consensus had yet to be reached on the issue.
- (c) There was a proposal to return seats by geographical constituencies through direct elections and to preserve functional constituency seats in a particular manner. However, the functional constituency seats should not be returned by the existing election method so as to avoid contradicting the ultimate aim of electing all Legislative Council members by universal suffrage. One of the proposed methods was to allow functional constituency members to nominate candidates for election by universal

suffrage. Technical issues like method of nomination would need further discussion.

- (d) Members put forward different views regarding the proposal of implementing a bicameral system. Some Members considered that the proposal might not necessarily be the ultimate implementation of universal suffrage. A Member considered that since a bicameral system would better guarantee the reflection of interests of different sectors of society in the legislature, it warrants further consideration in the context of universal suffrage.

However, Members were generally not inclined to support a bicameral system as they considered that it would entail amendment to the Basic Law. Besides, it has operational difficulties and might contravene the principle of universal suffrage. Though there were views in support of further examination of this option, Members were in general doubtful about this option.

A workshop would be organised by the Secretariat on 6 November 2006 when Members might further discuss possible models for forming the Legislative Council by universal suffrage. It was proposed that the Business and Professionals Federation of Hong Kong be invited to participate in the workshop again. Members would have another opportunity to discuss thoroughly the issue before deciding whether to continue discussions on bicameral system.

Whether the implementation of a bicameral system would necessitate amendment to the Basic Law was too complicated an issue to have a definite answer, even if legal advice had been sought.

- (e) He suggested that the Committee should continue to discuss the specific details of possible models for forming the Legislative Council by universal suffrage, in particular specific issues such as how the system of the Legislative Council and functional constituencies should evolve.

- (f) The Government aimed to conclude the discussions of the Committee and prepare a report next year. The report would be submitted to the Central Authorities and made public. If the Committee had not reached a consensus on the roadmap for universal suffrage by then, it was hoped that the report would provide a clear way forward to serve as the basis for further consideration of the related issues. It was hoped that Members would adopt an accommodating attitude and be prepared to make compromises so as to come up with a proposal acceptable to all the parties concerned.

20. The Chairman informed Members that the next meeting would be held on 23 November (Thursday).

21. The attendance list is attached at Annex.

Secretariat to the Commission on Strategic Development  
November 2006