

選舉管理委員會

ELECTORAL AFFAIRS COMMISSION

香港灣仔港灣道 25 號
海港中心 10 樓

10/F, Harbour Centre
25 Harbour Road
Wan Chai
Hong Kong

本函檔號 OUR REF.: REO 14/5/LC-08
來函檔號 YOUR REF.:

圖文傳真 Fax: 2507 5810
電話 Tel.: 2827 7017
網址 Web Site: <http://www.eac.gov.hk/>

11 September 2007

The Honourable Donald Tsang, GBM
The Chief Executive
Hong Kong Special Administrative Region
of the People's Republic of China
Chief Executive's Office
Hong Kong

Dear Mr Tsang,

Pursuant to section 18 of the Electoral Affairs Commission Ordinance, we have the pleasure in submitting to you a report containing our recommendations on the delineation of the Legislative Council geographical constituencies for the purpose of the general election in respect of the Legislative Council to be held in 2008.

For the coming election, we recommend to adopt the boundaries of the existing five geographical constituencies, and to allocate the 30 seats for the geographical constituencies as follows:

<u>Geographical Constituency</u>	<u>No. of seats</u>
Hong Kong Island	6
Kowloon West	5
Kowloon East	4
New Territories West	8
New Territories East	7
Total:	<u>30</u>

Yours sincerely,

PANG Kin-kee,
Chairman

Lawrence LOK Ying-kam,
Member

Andrew CHAN Chi-fai,
Member

ABBREVIATIONS

CMAB	Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau
DCCA, DCCAs	District Council constituency area, District Council constituency areas
EAC	Electoral Affairs Commission
EACO	Electoral Affairs Commission Ordinance
GC, GCs	geographical constituency, geographical constituencies
HAD	Home Affairs Department
HKI	Hong Kong Island
KE	Kowloon East
KW	Kowloon West
LandsD	Lands Department
LegCo	Legislative Council
LCO	Legislative Council Ordinance
NTE	New Territories East
NTW	New Territories West
PlanD	Planning Department
REO	Registration and Electoral Office
the AHSG	the Ad Hoc Subgroup formed under the Working Group on Population Distribution Projections set up in the Planning Department
the Commission	the Electoral Affairs Commission

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Section 1 : The Electoral Affairs Commission

1.1 The Electoral Affairs Commission (“EAC” or “Commission”) is an independent and apolitical body established under section 3 of the Electoral Affairs Commission Ordinance (“EACO”) (Chapter 541 of the Laws of Hong Kong), with the primary objective of upholding openness, honesty and fairness in public elections.

Section 2 : Responsibility of the Commission

1.2 Under section 4(a) of the EACO, one of the functions of the Commission is to consider or review the boundaries of geographical constituencies (“GCs”) for the purpose of making recommendations as to the boundaries and names of GCs for a Legislative Council (“LegCo”) general election.

1.3 Under section 18 of the EACO, the EAC is required to submit to the Chief Executive of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region a report on the recommendations for the delineation of the GCs and the names proposed for each constituency not more than 36 months from the preceding

general election. As the previous general election was held on 12 September 2004, the EAC is required to submit the report for the 2008 LegCo Election by 11 September 2007.

Section 3 : Scope of the Report

1.4 The scope and content of this report are based on the requirements stipulated under section 18 of the EACO. The report is published in two volumes. **Volume 1** primarily describes the process of drawing up the delineation proposals of GC boundaries and sets out the Commission's recommendations on the boundaries and the names of the GCs with the reasons for its recommendations. It also includes a complete record of all the written and oral representations made to the Commission. **Volume 2** contains the list of recommended GCs and maps showing the recommended boundaries and names of the GCs.

CHAPTER 2

DELINEATION OF CONSTITUENCIES

Section 1 : Statutory Criteria

Criteria stipulated under the Legislative Council Ordinance

2.1 In making the recommendations in respect of the delineation of GC boundaries, the EAC is required to adhere to the following statutory criteria stipulated under the Legislative Council Ordinance (Cap. 542) (“LCO”):

- (a) there are to be **5 GCs** for the purpose of returning Members at elections for those constituencies [section 18(1) of the LCO];
- (b) at a general election, **30 Members** are to be returned for all GCs [section 19(1) of the LCO]; and
- (c) the number of Members to be returned for each GC is to be a number, **not less than 4 nor greater than 8** [section 19(2) of the LCO].

Criteria stipulated under the Electoral Affairs Commission Ordinance

2.2 In accordance with the EACO, the EAC shall -

- (a) **ensure** that the extent of each proposed GC is such that the population in that constituency is **as near as practicable** to the number which results (i.e. “ the **resulting number**”) when the population quota is multiplied by the number of Members to be returned to the LegCo by that GC pursuant to any electoral law [section 20(1)(a) of the EACO];
- (b) where it is not practicable to comply with paragraph (a) in respect of a proposed GC, ensure that the extent of the constituency is such that the population in that constituency does not exceed or fall short of the resulting number applicable to that constituency, by more than 15% thereof [section 20(1)(b) of the EACO]; and
- (c) ensure that each proposed GC is to be constituted by 2 or more contiguous whole District Council constituencies [section 20(2) of the EACO].

2.3 In making such recommendations, the EAC shall also **have regard to –**

- (a) community identities and the preservation of local ties
[section 20(3)(a) of the EACO];
- (b) physical features such as size, shape, accessibility and
development of the relevant area or any part thereof
[section 20(3)(b) of the EACO];
- (c) existing boundaries of Districts [section 20(4)(a) of the
EACO]; and
- (d) existing boundaries of GCs [section 20(4)(b) of the
EACO].

2.4 The EAC may depart from the strict application of the requirements set out in paragraph 2.2 (a) and (b) above only where it appears that a consideration referred to in paragraph 2.3 (a) or (b) above renders such a departure necessary or desirable [section 20(5) of the EACO].

Section 2 : Working Principles

2.5 Apart from the statutory criteria set out above, the Commission also adopted the following working principles for the current demarcation exercise -

- (a) the boundaries of the existing 5 GCs should form the basis of consideration in the current demarcation exercise;
- (b) for those existing GCs where the population falls within the permissible range of the population quota requirement, their boundaries will be adopted as far as possible;
- (c) Hong Kong Island, Kowloon and the New Territories are to be treated separately, as these areas have been regarded as distinct from one another;
- (d) splitting of Districts by District Council Constituency Areas (“DCCAs”) should be avoided unless there are very strong reasons. Where splitting is necessary, it should affect the least number of Districts; and
- (e) factors with political implications will not be taken into consideration.

2.6 The working principles mentioned above have been adopted for the demarcation exercises for the LegCo Elections since 1998.

Section 3 : Name and Code of Constituencies

2.7 In determining the name and code reference for the GCs, the Commission considers that the name of GCs should comprise two easily distinguished components – the name of the area in which the GC is situated and a directional reference similar to those employed for the existing GCs (Hong Kong Island, Kowloon West, Kowloon East, the New Territories West and the New Territories East). The GCs are also distinguished by a code and numbering system starting from “LC 1” and ending at “LC 5”, being arranged from south to north and from west to east. The Commission hopes that by adopting this naming and coding system, anyone who consults the maps will find it easier to understand them and locate the constituencies. These methods have also been adopted in the demarcation exercises for the LegCo Elections since 1998.

Section 4 : Changes to Boundaries between Districts

2.8 During the last demarcation exercise of the GC boundaries for the 2004 LegCo Election, the EAC found that a recently built private residential development named Nob Hill had straddled the boundaries between Sham Shui Po and Kwai Tsing Districts (and also the boundaries of Kowloon West and the New Territories West GCs). This affected the Commission’s demarcation work. The EAC is pleased to note that the Administration has, taking into account the Commission’s recommendation

and views of local residents and relevant parties concerned, realigned the boundaries of Sham Shui Po District and Kwai Tsing District to put the entire Nob Hill within Sham Shui Po District. The amendment was stipulated in the District Councils Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2006, which was endorsed by the LegCo on 21 June 2006.

Section 5 : Population Forecasts

2.9 Section 20(6) of the EACO provides that the Commission shall endeavour to estimate the total population of Hong Kong or any proposed GC in the year in which a LegCo general election is to be held for the purpose of making recommendations on the delineation of GCs. If it is not practicable to do so, the Commission shall estimate the population of Hong Kong or the GC having regard to the available information which is the best possible in the circumstances.

2.10 An Ad Hoc Subgroup (“AHSG”), formed under the Working Group on Population Distribution Projections chaired by the Planning Department (“PlanD”), took up the task of providing the Commission with the necessary population forecasts. The AHSG was chaired by an Assistant Director of the PlanD and comprised representatives from a number of bureaux and departments, including the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau (“CMAB”), Census and Statistics Department, Home Affairs Department (“HAD”), Housing Department, Lands

Department (“LandsD”), Rating and Valuation Department and the Registration and Electoral Office (“REO”). To make the best estimation as close to the election date as practicable, the AHSG has used the statistics of the 2006 population by-census recently released by the Census and Statistics Department as the basis for projection in this demarcation exercise. The AHSG has produced a report with population forecast as at **30 June 2008**.

2.11 The report prepared by the AHSG, which provides forecasts of population of Hong Kong down to DCCA level, estimates that the total population of the territory will be 6,975,100 as at 30 June 2008. The population figures in the report were adopted by the Commission for delineation of GC boundaries. The **population quota** (defined in section 17(1) of the EACO as meaning the total population of Hong Kong divided by the total number of Members to be returned for all GCs, i.e. $6,975,100 \div 30$) is **232,503** for the purpose of this demarcation exercise.

Section 6 : The Process of Delineation

2.12 Upon receipt of the forecast population figures from the AHSG in May 2007, the REO started to draw up preliminary proposed delineations of GCs, by grouping DCCAs, being the building blocks of GCs, in an appropriate manner to form each of the required 5 GCs. The REO then presented the preliminary proposals to the Commission for consideration.

2.13 The Commission considers that the best way to start is to adopt the boundaries of the existing GCs to see if the results satisfy the statutory criteria and the working principles stated in paragraphs 2.1 – 2.5 above. This approach has the benefit of maintaining the existing boundaries to which electors have long grown accustomed since 1998. Electors will not have to adjust themselves to a new GC.

2.14 The forecast population provided in the AHSG's report for the 5 existing GCs are as follows –

<u>Existing GC and Code</u>	<u>Forecast Population</u>
Hong Kong Island ¹ (LC 1)	1,267,900
Kowloon West ² (LC 2)	1,030,000
Kowloon East ³ (LC 3)	1,018,700
New Territories West ⁴ (LC 4)	2,030,300
New Territories East ⁵ (LC 5)	1,628,200
Total:	6,975,100

¹ The GC of Hong Kong Island comprises the Districts of Central & Western, Wan Chai, Eastern and Southern.

² The GC of Kowloon West comprises the Districts of Yau Tsim Mong, Sham Shui Po and Kowloon City.

³ The GC of Kowloon East comprises the Districts of Wong Tai Sin and Kwun Tong.

⁴ The GC of the New Territories West comprises the Districts of Tsuen Wan, Tuen Mun, Yuen Long, Kwai Tsing and Islands.

⁵ The GC of the New Territories East comprises the Districts of North, Tai Po, Sha Tin and Sai Kung.

2.15 The number of seats to be allocated to each GC is derived by dividing the above forecast population with the population quota, i.e. 232,503 (paragraph 2.11 refers), and the details are as follows –

<u>GC</u>	<u>Number of Seats</u>
Hong Kong Island (LC 1)	5.453
Kowloon West (LC 2)	4.430
Kowloon East (LC 3)	4.381
New Territories West (LC 4)	8.732
New Territories East (LC 5)	7.003
Total: 28 (excluding decimal places)	

2.16 Excluding the decimal places in the number of seats for each GC, the 5 GCs take up a total of 28 seats. The 2 remaining seats are then allocated to the 2 GCs with the largest remainders, in order to meet the statutory requirement of ensuring that the extent of each proposed GC is such that the population in that constituency is **as near as practicable** to the resulting number as set out in paragraph 2.2(a) above. However, the New Territories West (LC 4), which has the largest remainder, has already been allocated with 8 seats, i.e. the maximum number of seats for a GC under the law (this was also the situation for the New Territories West in 2004). Therefore, the 2 remaining seats have to be allocated to the 2 GCs with the second and third largest remainders, which are Hong Kong Island (LC 1) and Kowloon West (LC 2). The resulting distribution is as follows –

<u>GC</u>	<u>Proposed Number of Seats</u>	<u>Deviation from the resulting number</u>
Hong Kong Island (LC 1)	6	-9.11%
Kowloon West (LC 2)	5	-11.40%
Kowloon East (LC 3)	4	+9.54%
New Territories West (LC 4)	8	+9.15%
New Territories East (LC 5)	7	+0.04%
Total:	30	

Details of the calculation are shown in **Appendix I**.

2.17 The Commission finds that by adopting the boundaries of the existing GCs as the boundaries for the 2008 GCs, all the statutory criteria and the working principles in paragraphs 2.1 - 2.5 above are fulfilled. Compared with the number of seats allocated to each GC for the 2004 LegCo Election, Kowloon West will have one additional seat, while Kowloon East will have one fewer seat. The number of seats allocated to the other GCs will remain the same.

2.18 The Commission also suggests retaining the existing names and codes for the 5 GCs, since no change in their boundaries is proposed⁶.

⁶ Except the minor rectification of district boundary between Sham Shui Po and Kwai Tsing Districts, and hence the boundary between Kowloon West and the New Territories West GCs, referred to in paragraph 2.8 above.

Section 7 : Other Options

Delineation of GC boundaries by Districts

2.19 Apart from the proposed delineation above, the Commission has explored other possible options for delineation but considered them not viable or desirable.

2.20 For example, the Commission considered the option of reallocating Kwai Tsing District from the New Territories West (LC 4) to Kowloon West (LC 2). Under this option, the New Territories West (LC 4) (with a population of 1,505,900; deviation -7.47%) and Kowloon West (LC 2) (with a population of 1,554,400; deviation -4.49%) will each be allocated seven seats, Hong Kong Island (LC 1) will have five seats and the number of seats in other GCs will be the same as in the provisional recommendations. This option will yield a range of deviation of (+9.54% to -7.47%), which is slightly smaller than that of the proposed delineations (i.e. +9.54% to -11.40%). It will also bring about a more even population distribution among the GCs. However, despite the geographical proximity, Kwai Tsing District and other Districts in Kowloon West belong to different communities. The Commission considers it undesirable for a GC to comprise Districts of both the New Territories and Kowloon, and it contradicts the working principle at paragraph 2.5(c) above. In addition, the improvement in deviation figures is too small to justify redrawing the

boundaries and thus requiring electors to adjust themselves to the new delineations.

2.21 The Commission also considered the option of moving Sai Kung District from the New Territories East (LC 5) to Kowloon East (LC 3). Under this option, Kowloon East (LC 3) (with a population of 1,434,800; deviation +2.85%) and the New Territories East (LC 5) (with a population of 1,212,100; deviation +4.27%) will have six and five seats respectively, and the number of seats in other GCs will be the same as in the provisional recommendations. This option will yield a range of deviation of +9.15% to -11.40%, which is about the same as that of the provisional recommendations. Such a marginal improvement in deviation figures does not justify redrawing the boundaries. Under this option, Sai Kung District of the New Territories will be allocated to the GC of Kowloon East, which is also not desirable.

2.22 The Commission also explored a number of other alternative delineations along the district boundaries, but all of them were either not viable (see **Appendix II**), as they did not comply with the relevant statutory requirements, or not desirable (see **Appendix III**), as they did not give due regard to community integrity or existing GC boundaries, did not improve upon the deviation figures, or otherwise did not comply with EAC's working principles as set out in paragraph 2.5.

Delineation of GC boundaries by DCCAs

2.23 Although the Commission may come up with numerous options of delineation by splitting the existing Districts along the DCCA boundaries, it does not consider it desirable to do so having regard to the requirement to preserve community identities and local ties in the Districts.

Section 8 : The Provisional Recommendations

2.24 Having explored the alternatives and consulted District Officers of the HAD, the Commission considers that the proposal suggested in paragraph 2.16 above is the best option, and that the same names and codes of the existing GCs should be adopted, as they have been well received and accepted by the community. Details of the provisional recommendations, including the population and component DCCAs of each GC are set out in **Appendix IV**. These provisional recommendations were then put forth by the Commission for public consultation.

CHAPTER 3

THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Section 1 : The Consultation Period and Public Forum

3.1 In compliance with the requirement of section 19 of the EACO, the Commission conducted a public consultation exercise on its provisional recommendations from 5 July to 3 August 2007 for a period of 30 days. During this period, members of the public were invited to submit representations to the Commission to express their views on the provisional recommendations on the delineation and names of the GCs.

3.2 A list of the provisionally recommended GCs, together with the component Districts and DCCAs, and maps showing the boundaries of the GCs were exhibited for public inspection at District Offices, public housing estate offices, post offices, public libraries and the REO during the consultation period. The public may also browse such information on the EAC's website.

3.3 An open letter from the Chairman of the EAC was attached to each set of consultation document to explain to the public the statutory criteria and working principles adopted by the Commission in delineating GCs.

3.4 The public consultation was widely publicised through the electronic and print media as well as the EAC's website on the Internet and the government gazette.

3.5 On the first day of the consultation period, i.e. 5 July 2007, the Commission held a press conference to launch the public consultation exercise and invited the public to give their views on the Commission's provisional recommendations. The Commission also appealed to the public that not only those who had different views should speak up, but also those who supported the provisional recommendations should do likewise. This was to enable the EAC to more accurately gauge the public's views and degree of acceptance of the provisional recommendations.

3.6 The REO also briefed the LegCo Panel on Constitutional Affairs on 16 July 2007, where Members expressed their views on the provisional recommendations.

3.7 A public forum was held at 2:30 pm on 26 July 2007 at the Conference Room of the EAC in Wan Chai, where members of the public could personally attend and make oral representations to the Commission direct. Audio-visual aids were used to facilitate understanding of the representations by making reference to maps.

Section 2 : Number of Representations Received

3.8 The EAC received one proposal from the public concerning the delineation exercise before commencement of the public consultation. During the consultation period, the Commission received a total of 219 written representations. At the forum, 51 persons turned up and 14 of them expressed their views on the provisional recommendations.

3.9 The original texts of the written representations are contained in Part II of this volume. Summaries of the written and oral representations are shown in **Appendix V** of this volume.

CHAPTER 4

CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS

Section 1 : Deliberations on the Representations

4.1 As soon as the public consultation period ended, the EAC went through all the written and oral representations on the provisional recommendations (including the views expressed by LegCo Members at the meeting of the LegCo Panel on Constitutional Affairs held on 16 July 2007) and considered whether they should be accepted. The Commission also considered a representation received before the consultation period.

4.2 The Commission examined each of the representations received in detail, considered the viability of the proposals suggested and the reasons put forward. General views provided in the representations were also noted. A summary of all written and oral representations and the EAC's views on each representation is at **Appendix V**. The EAC noted that most representations concerned about the boundaries and number of seats of Kowloon West ("KW"), Kowloon East ("KE") and the New Territories West ("NTW") GCs. In considering the representations, the Commission has noticed the following issues.

(a) Adherence to Statutory Requirements

4.3 Among the representations received, some of them offered counter-proposals which would affect the number of GCs to be delineated (e.g. to combine KW and KE GCs) or would cause the number of seats in a GC to fall outside the range allowed (i.e. from four to eight) in the statutory provisions (e.g. to increase the maximum number of seats in a GC from eight to nine). As the LCO stipulates that there are to be **5 GCs with 4 to 8 Members for each GC** (see paragraph 2.1 in Chapter 2), such proposals cannot be accepted (items 3, 10, 15, 20, 22 and 23 of **Appendix V**).

(b) Anticipated Changes in Population

4.4 Some representations suggested that the future population trend in the KW and KE constituencies would justify maintaining the current number of seats for the 2 GCs (put up by items 1, 2 and 18 of **Appendix V**). For reason of fairness and consistency, the EAC considers it essential to adhere to the population forecasts projected as at 30 June 2008 in delineating the five GCs in this demarcation exercise. In line with the established practice, the EAC considers it not appropriate to take future population trend into consideration. Future changes in population after the said cut-off date would be catered for in the next demarcation exercise, taking into account the latest development at that time.

(c) Maintaining the Status Quo

4.5 It is noted that a majority of the representations suggested to maintain the status quo for all 5 GCs, i.e. to maintain the existing boundaries so as to preserve community ties and avoid confusion, as well as to maintain the existing number of seats for KW (four seats) and KE (five seats). One of the justifications put forward in these representations was that if the number of seats in KE was reduced, there would be fewer LegCo Members who were familiar with the needs of KE residents for them to seek help, and this would hamper social stability in the community. They also argued that under the status quo, the projected population of KW and KE would still fall within $\pm 15\%$ of the relevant resulting number.

4.6 The EAC agrees that maintaining the existing boundaries for all GCs would comply with the statutory requirement that the EAC shall have regard to existing GC boundaries as provided in section 20(4) of the EACO, and would be in line with the EAC's working principle to use the existing GC boundaries as the basis of consideration in the current demarcation exercise. The EAC has also proposed to maintain the existing GC boundaries in its provisional recommendations.

4.7 As regards the suggestion of maintaining the existing number of seats for KW and KE, it cannot be accepted because the GC of KW has a larger projected population than KE. Although the difference is relatively

small, it would be unfair to KW if it is allocated fewer seats than KE. In addition, according to section 20(1)(a) of the EACO, the EAC shall ensure that the extent of each proposed GC is such that the population in that constituency is **as near as is practicable** to the **resulting number**. Under the proposal to maintain the status quo, the deviations from the resulting numbers for KW and KE would still fall within the $\pm 15\%$ statutory limit (+10.75% and -12.37% respectively). However, they would not be as close to the resulting numbers as compared with those under the provisional recommendations (-11.40% and +9.54%). **The status quo suggestion would contravene the statutory criterion in section 20(1)(a) of the EACO** which stipulates that the population in a GC should be as near as is practicable to the resulting number. The EAC would not be able to fully comply with the law if it accepts the suggestion to maintain the status quo.

(d) Fairness in Representation

4.8 A number of representations considered that the population difference between KE and KW constituencies was so small that it would be unfair to the residents in KE if KW was to be allocated one more seat than KE (see items 2, 4, 18 and 23 of **Appendix V**).

4.9 As mentioned before in paragraph 4.7, the EAC considers that if the GC boundaries are to remain unchanged, it would not be appropriate to maintain the current number of seats in KW and KE GCs. On the other

hand, with a view to achieving a better population distribution, the EAC has explored the options of allowing the KE constituency to take in a contiguous district from the New Territories East (“NTE”) or KW, as detailed in Section 7 of Chapter 2. The resultant population in these options, however, either would only yield a very marginal improvement in the range of deviation and could not justify redrawing the GC boundaries, or would cause the number of seats in one of the GCs to fall outside the permissible range of four to eight (options 3, 12 and 13 in **Appendices II and III**). Some representations proposed to adjust the boundary between KW and KE, so as to give a small part of a District to KE in order to increase the population of KE and thus justify maintaining the current number of seats. The EAC considers such proposals to be undesirable, and this would be further discussed in paragraph 4.14.

4.10 Some representations considered it unfair for NTW GC to be allocated 8 seats, as its population entitled 8.732 seats, and the figure should be rounded up to 9. They considered that NTW would be “under-represented” in this case (items 4, 15, 24, 25 and 26 of **Appendix V**). If NTW was to be allocated 8 seats, to bring the population of NTW closer to the resulting number for 8 seats, some suggested to move part of NTW to other GCs.

4.11 The Commission understands the concern expressed in these representations, but it should be emphasized that the deviation from the

resulting number for NTW is +9.15%, which is within the permissible deviation limit of $\pm 15\%$ under the law. Furthermore, under the existing statutory criteria stipulated in the LCO, the maximum number of seats to be allocated to a GC is 8, hence it will not be legally in order for EAC to allocate 9 seats to NTW. The EAC has also explored alternative options in delineating NTW (see paragraph 2.20 in Chapter 2 and **Appendices II and III**), but has found those options not desirable.

4.12 The EAC also considers that if the population of a GC is within the permissible range, to remove part of it to another GC (or to take in a part from another GC) with the sole aim of maintaining the existing number of seats for the GC may run a risk of placing undue emphasis on the number of seats and jeopardising the established community ties.

4.13 Some representations at the LegCo Panel on Constitutional Affairs raised issues relating to the list system of proportional representation. The Commission would like to stress that such issues are outside the jurisdiction of the Commission, and, as always, matters of maintaining political influence or advantage will not be considered by the EAC.

(e) Preservation of Community Identities and Local Ties

4.14 A number of representations proposed to re-delineate the boundaries of the KW and KE GCs by transferring some DCCAs of

Kowloon City District from the KW constituency to the KE constituency, so as to even out the population in these two GCs and to maintain the current number of seats for them (items 1, 3 and 23 of **Appendix V**). In considering such proposals, the EAC is under a statutory duty to pay due regard to the preservation of community identities and local ties, as well as the existing boundaries of the districts and GCs, as provided under section 20(3) and (4) of the EACO (see paragraph 2.3 in Chapter 2). Also, under the EAC's working principles (as set out in paragraph 2.5 in Chapter 2), splitting of Districts among two or more GCs is to be avoided. The EAC believes it would not be appropriate to accept those proposals to transfer some parts of a District from KW to KE, in order to preserve community identities and local ties, and to comply with its working principles.

4.15 A number of representations suggested moving part of NTW to other GCs to bring down the population of NTW. While some representations had not specified the relevant part to be removed, some proposed to move the Islands District to Hong Kong Island ("HKI") GC (items 4 and 24 in **Appendix V**). On paper, the suggestion seemed to generate smaller deviation figures, but it would result in the combination of a District to a GC with distinctly different local characteristics and community ties. Islands District is generally regarded as part of the New Territories, and according to EAC's working principles (see paragraph 2.5 in Chapter 2), should be treated differently from HKI. Moreover, the EAC had received supporting views to keep the boundary of NTW GC intact, so

as to preserve its community identity (items 11 and 19 of **Appendix V**). The residents of Islands District had also objected to moving out their district from NTW GC (item 19 in **Appendix V**). The EAC is thus of the view that the proposal to move Islands District to HKI should not be accepted.

Section 2 : The Recommendations

4.16 Section 20(5) of the EACO stipulates that the Commission shall only depart from the resulting number population requirement stipulated under section 20(1)(a)-(b) of the EACO where it is necessary or desirable when having regard to the considerations listed in section 20(3) of the EACO (i.e. community identities, preservation of local ties, physical features such as size, shape, accessibility and development of the relevant area or any part thereof). Save where one or more of such considerations made it impracticable or undesirable, the Commission should adhere to the resulting number as far as possible in the demarcation of GCs. This is in fact achieved under the provisional recommendations. As the EAC's provisional recommendations did not propose any change in the existing GC boundaries⁷, the community integrity of the 5 GCs would not be affected. The EAC's provisional recommendations have given due regard to the preservation of community identity and local ties.

⁷ save the minor rectification of district boundary between Sham Shui Po and Kwai Tsing Districts, and hence the boundary between Kowloon West and the New Territories West GCs.

4.17 The EAC has taken into account all the public representations (including supporting and objecting views, and counter-proposals offered) received concerning the delineation and number of seats for the 5 GCs. On balance, the EAC considers that the suggestions proposing change of boundaries or number of seats of GCs from the provisional recommendations cannot be accepted.

4.18 The Commission decides that it is not necessary or appropriate to make any alteration to the provisional recommendations, which now remain as its final recommendations. The final recommendations in respect of the 5 GCs, including the number of seats allocated to each GC, their names and reference code numbers, the component DCCAs and their population details as well as the maps showing the boundaries of the recommended GCs are contained in **Volume 2** of this report.

CHAPTER 5

A CONCLUDING NOTE

Section 1 : Acknowledgements

5.1 With the completion of this demarcation exercise, the Commission would like to express its gratitude towards the following parties for their contributions: the AHSG, for its provision of the population forecasts; the District Offices of the HAD, for their input on the basis of their local knowledge; the LandsD, for their production of the various maps for the conduct of the consultation exercise and production of the report; the Information Services Department for their contribution to the publicity programme relating to the consultation exercise, the Government Logistics Department for the printing of the consultation materials and this report, and the CMAB for their advice.

5.2 The REO, being the executive arm of the Commission, has provided the manpower required for carrying out the exercise. The Commission is particularly thankful to the staff of the REO for their dedicated and concerted efforts in the preparation work.

5.3 Last but not least, the Commission is most grateful to those members of the public who put forth their representations in writing or

voiced them personally at the public forum.

Section 2 : The Important Principle

5.4 As in previous demarcation exercises, the EAC has adhered to the statutory requirements and its working principles as far as practicable. The EAC has made every effort to strike a balance between observing the population quota requirement and at the same time accommodating suggestions from the public with reference to the community considerations. As always, the Commission has paid no regard to any suggestions with political implications.

5.5 Delineation of constituencies is an integral part of an election. The Commission is committed to conducting each and every election under its supervision in an open, fair and honest manner. The Commission has faithfully held on to this important principle in this demarcation exercise.

Calculations on the Proposed Delineation

Total Population (projected as at 30 June 2008) : 6,975,100

Population Quota (PQ) per GC Seat = Total Population ÷ 30 seats = 232,503

Geographical Constituency (GC)	Component District	(A) Projected population as at 30 June 2008	(B) Number of seats in 2004	(C) Number of entitled seats in 2008 (C)=(A)÷PQ	(D) Number of seats for integer	(E) Additional seat for largest remainders	(F) Total number of seats in 2008 (F)=(D)+(E)	(G) Deviation (%) (G)=[(A)-RN [#]]÷RNx100%
HONG KONG ISLAND (LC 1)	Central & Western	250,300						(1,267,900 – 1,395,018) ÷ 1,395,018 × 100% = -9.11%
	Wan Chai	155,000						
	Eastern	586,400						
	Southern	276,200						
	Sub-total :	1,267,900	6	5.453*	5	1	6	
KOWLOON WEST (LC 2)	Yau Tsim Mong	294,300						(1,030,000 – 1,162,515) ÷ 1,162,515 × 100% = -11.40%
	Sham Shui Po	373,500						
	Kowloon City	362,200						
	Sub-total :	1,030,000	4	4.430*	4	1	5	
KOWLOON EAST (LC 3)	Wong Tai Sin	425,900						(1,018,700 – 930,012) ÷ 930,012 × 100% = +9.54%
	Kwun Tong	592,800						
	Sub-total :	1,018,700	5	4.381	4	0	4	
NEW TERRITORIES WEST (LC 4)	Tsuen Wan	295,200						(2,030,300 – 1,860,024) ÷ 1,860,024 × 100% = +9.15%
	Tuen Mun	508,900						
	Yuen Long	554,200						
	Kwai Tsing	524,400						
	Islands	147,600						
	Sub-total :	2,030,300	8	8.732	8	0	8	
NEW TERRITORIES EAST (LC 5)	North	294,100						(1,628,200 – 1,627,521) ÷ 1,627,521 × 100% = +0.04%
	Tai Po	297,900						
	Sha Tin	620,100						
	Sai Kung	416,100						
	Sub-total :	1,628,200	7	7.003	7	0	7	
TOTAL :		6,975,100	30	-	28	2	30	

Note :

* GCs with the largest remainders for additional seats

(except LC 4 which has already been allocated with the maximum number of seats)

Resulting number (RN) is obtained by multiplying the number of seats and the population quota (i.e. 232,503)

Resulting Numbers and Permissible Limits

No. of Seats		Population Quota		Resulting Number	Lower Limit (85%)	to	Upper limit (115%)
4	×	232,503	=	930,012	790,510	to	1,069,514
5	×	232,503	=	1,162,515	988,138	to	1,336,892
6	×	232,503	=	1,395,018	1,185,765	to	1,604,271
7	×	232,503	=	1,627,521	1,383,393	to	1,871,649
8	×	232,503	=	1,860,024	1,581,020	to	2,139,028

Analysis of Other Options:
Non-viable options[#]

Option 1

(LC 2 (KW) + Wong Tai Sin from the existing LC 3 (KE))

<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>No. of Seats</i>	<i>Deviation</i>
LC 1 (HKI)	1,267,900	6	-9.11%
LC 2 (KW)	1,455,900	6	+4.36%
LC 3 (KE)	592,800	[3]	[-15.01%]
LC 4 (NTW)	2,030,300	8	+9.15%
LC 5 (NTE)	1,628,200	7	+0.04%

Option 2

(LC 2 (KW) + Kwun Tong from the existing LC 3 (KE))

<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>No. of Seats</i>	<i>Deviation</i>
LC 1 (HKI)	1,267,900	6	-9.11%
LC 2 (KW)	1,622,800	7	-0.29%
LC 3 (KE)	425,900	[2]	-8.41%
LC 4 (NTW)	2,030,300	8	+9.15%
LC 5 (NTE)	1,628,200	7	+0.04%

Option 3

(LC 3 (KE) + Kowloon City from the existing LC 2 (KW))

<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>No. of Seats</i>	<i>Deviation</i>
LC 1 (HKI)	1,267,900	6	-9.11%
LC 2 (KW)	667,800	[3]	-4.26%
LC 3 (KE)	1,380,900	6	-1.01%
LC 4 (NTW)	2,030,300	8	+9.15%
LC 5 (NTE)	1,628,200	7	+0.04%

Option 4

(LC 5 (NTE) + Yuen Long from the existing LC 4 (NTW))

<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>No. of Seats</i>	<i>Deviation</i>
LC 1 (HKI)	1,267,900	6	-9.11%
LC 2 (KW)	1,030,000	5	-11.40%
LC 3 (KE)	1,018,700	4	+9.54%
LC 4 (NTW)	1,476,100	6	+5.81%
LC 5 (NTE)	2,182,400	[9]	+4.29%

Option 5

(LC 5 (NTE) + Kwai Tsing from the existing LC 4 (NTW))

<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>No. of Seats</i>	<i>Deviation</i>
LC 1 (HKI)	1,267,900	6	-9.11%
LC 2 (KW)	1,030,000	4	+10.75%
LC 3 (KE)	1,018,700	4	+9.54%
LC 4 (NTW)	1,505,900	7	-7.47%
LC 5 (NTE)	2,152,600	[9]	+2.87%

Option 6

(LC 5 (NTE) + Sham Shui Po from the existing LC 2 (KW))

<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>No. of Seats</i>	<i>Deviation</i>
LC 1 (HKI)	1,267,900	6	-9.11%
LC 2 (KW)	656,500	[3]	-5.88%
LC 3 (KE)	1,018,700	5	-12.37%
LC 4 (NTW)	2,030,300	8	+9.15%
LC 5 (NTE)	2,001,700	8	+7.62%

Option 7

(LC 5 (NTE) + Kowloon City from the existing LC 2 (KW))

<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>No. of Seats</i>	<i>Deviation</i>
LC 1 (HKI)	1,267,900	6	-9.11%
LC 2 (KW)	667,800	[3]	-4.26%
LC 3 (KE)	1,018,700	5	-12.37%
LC 4 (NTW)	2,030,300	8	+9.15%
LC 5 (NTE)	1,990,400	8	+7.01%

Option 8

(LC 5 (NTE) + Wong Tai Sin from the existing LC 3 (KE))

<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>No. of Seats</i>	<i>Deviation</i>
LC 1 (HKI)	1,267,900	6	-9.11%
LC 2 (KW)	1,030,000	5	-11.40%
LC 3 (KE)	592,800	[3]	[-15.01%]
LC 4 (NTW)	2,030,300	8	+9.15%
LC 5 (NTE)	2,054,100	8	+10.43%

Option 9

(LC 5 (NTE) + Kwun Tong from the existing LC 3 (KE))

<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>No. of Seats</i>	<i>Deviation</i>
LC 1 (HKI)	1,267,900	6	-9.11%
LC 2 (KW)	1,030,000	5	-11.40%
LC 3 (KE)	425,900	[2]	-8.41%
LC 4 (NTW)	2,030,300	8	+9.15%
LC 5 (NTE)	2,221,000	[9]	+6.14%

These options are *not viable* either because the number of seats of the resultant GCs would exceed or fall short of the permissible range of 4 to 8, or the deviation figures would fall outside the $\pm 15\%$ limit. Such figures are square-bracketed for ease of reference.

Note:

- HKI : Hong Kong Island
- KW : Kowloon West
- KE : Kowloon East
- NTW : New Territories West
- NTE : New Territories East

Analysis of Other Options:
Viable but not desirable options*

Option 10

(LC 2 (KW) + Kwai Tsing from the existing LC 4 (NTW))

<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>No. of Seats</i>	<i>Deviation</i>
LC 1 (HKI)	1,267,900	5	+9.07%
LC 2 (KW)	1,554,400	7	-4.49%
LC 3 (KE)	1,018,700	4	+9.54%
LC 4 (NTW)	1,505,900	7	-7.47%
LC 5 (NTE)	1,628,200	7	+0.04%

Option 11

(LC 2 (KW) + Sha Tin from the existing LC 5 (NTE))

<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>No. of Seats</i>	<i>Deviation</i>
LC 1 (HKI)	1,267,900	6	-9.11%
LC 2 (KW)	1,650,100	7	+1.39%
LC 3 (KE)	1,018,700	5	-12.37%
LC 4 (NTW)	2,030,300	8	+9.15%
LC 5 (NTE)	1,008,100	4	+8.40%

Option 12

(LC 3 (KE) + Sha Tin from the existing LC 5 (NTE))

<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>No. of Seats</i>	<i>Deviation</i>
LC 1 (HKI)	1,267,900	6	-9.11%
LC 2 (KW)	1,030,000	5	-11.40%
LC 3 (KE)	1,638,800	7	+0.69%
LC 4 (NTW)	2,030,300	8	+9.15%
LC 5 (NTE)	1,008,100	4	+8.40%

Option 13

(LC 3 (KE) + Sai Kung from the existing LC 5 (NTE))

<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>No. of Seats</i>	<i>Deviation</i>
LC 1 (HKI)	1,267,900	6	-9.11%
LC 2 (KW)	1,030,000	5	-11.40%
LC 3 (KE)	1,434,800	6	+2.85%
LC 4 (NTW)	2,030,300	8	+9.15%
LC 5 (NTE)	1,212,100	5	+4.27%

Option 14

(LC 5 (NTE) + Tsuen Wan from the existing LC 4 (NTW))

<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>No. of Seats</i>	<i>Deviation</i>
LC 1 (HKI)	1,267,900	6	-9.11%
LC 2 (KW)	1,030,000	4	+10.75%
LC 3 (KE)	1,018,700	4	+9.54%
LC 4 (NTW)	1,735,100	8	-6.72%
LC 5 (NTE)	1,923,400	8	+3.41%

* These options are *viable* (i.e. with resultant number of seats and deviation within the statutory requirement), *but not desirable* as the resultant population figures are not closer to the resulting numbers than the proposed delineation, or the marginal improvement in deviation figures does not justify redrawing the GC boundaries.

Note:

HKI : Hong Kong Island
 KW : Kowloon West
 KE : Kowloon East
 NTW : New Territories West
 NTE : New Territories East

暫定地方選區議席數目
Number of Seats for the Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	暫定的議席數目 Proposed Number of Seats	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)	偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
LC 1	香港島 Hong Kong Island	6	1,267,900	- 9.11%
LC 2	九龍西 Kowloon West	5	1,030,000	- 11.40%
LC 3	九龍東 Kowloon East	4	1,018,700	+ 9.54%
LC 4	新界西 New Territories West	8	2,030,300	+ 9.15%
LC 5	新界東 New Territories East	7	1,628,200	+ 0.04%

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
LC 1	香港島 Hong Kong Island (包括中西區、 灣仔、東區及 南區四區) (Including the 4 Districts of Central & Western, Wan Chai, Eastern and Southern)	中西區 Central & Western		1,267,900	-9.11%
		中環	Chung Wan	16,000	
		半山東	Mid Levels East	18,700	
		衛城	Castle Road	18,100	
		山頂	Peak	20,400	
		大學	University	18,000	
		堅摩	Kennedy Town & Mount Davis	15,900	
		觀龍	Kwun Lung	14,200	
		西環	Sai Wan	15,400	
		寶翠	Belcher	21,300	
		石塘咀	Shek Tong Tsui	16,100	
		西營盤	Sai Ying Pun	16,600	
		上環	Sheung Wan	16,900	
		東華	Tung Wah	13,600	
		正街	Centre Street	14,700	
		水街	Water Street	14,400	
				250,300	

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	<u>灣仔</u>	<u>Wan Chai</u>			
	軒尼詩	Hennessy		13,000	
	愛群	Oi Kwan		14,300	
	鵝頸	Canal Road		16,200	
	銅鑼灣	Causeway Bay		13,800	
	大坑	Tai Hang		14,300	
	渣甸山	Jardine's Lookout		15,400	
	樂活	Broadwood		13,900	
	跑馬地	Happy Valley		13,400	
	司徒拔道	Stubbs Road		14,300	
	修頓	Southorn		13,300	
	大佛口	Tai Fat Hau		13,100	
				155,000	
	<u>東區</u>	<u>Eastern</u>			
	太古城西	Tai Koo Shing West		17,100	
	太古城東	Tai Koo Shing East		18,100	
	鯉景灣	Lei King Wan		19,200	
	筲箕灣	Shaukeiwan		13,400	
	愛秩序灣	Aldrich Bay		29,100	
	阿公岩	A Kung Ngam		12,300	

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	杏花邨	Heng Fa Chuen		18,900	
	翠灣	Tsui Wan		12,200	
	欣藍	Yan Lam		16,700	
	小西灣	Siu Sai Wan		13,400	
	景怡	King Yee		16,800	
	環翠	Wan Tsui		15,700	
	翡翠	Fei Tsui		12,800	
	柏架山	Mount Parker		13,800	
	寶馬山	Braemar Hill		15,900	
	天后	Tin Hau		14,500	
	炮台山	Fortress Hill		16,400	
	維園	Victoria Park		14,700	
	城市花園	City Garden		14,900	
	和富	Provident		18,900	
	堡壘	Fort Street		14,700	
	錦屏	Kam Ping		16,500	
	丹拿	Tanner		15,400	
	健康村	Healthy Village		15,400	
	鯪魚涌	Quarry Bay		15,200	
	南豐	Nam Fung		13,500	
	康怡	Kornhill		14,700	
	康山	Kornhill Garden		13,800	
	興東	Hing Tung		19,700	

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	西灣河	Sai Wan Ho		18,900	
	下耀東	Lower Yiu Tung		16,800	
	上耀東	Upper Yiu Tung		13,500	
	興民	Hing Man		19,100	
	樂康	Lok Hong		13,000	
	翠德	Tsui Tak		12,900	
	漁灣	Yue Wan		14,300	
	佳曉	Kai Hiu		14,200	
				586,400	
	南區	Southern			
	香港仔	Aberdeen		20,100	
	鴨脷洲邨	Ap Lei Chau Estate		14,100	
	鴨脷洲北	Ap Lei Chau North		18,700	
	利東一	Lei Tung I		14,100	
	利東二	Lei Tung II		10,700	
	海怡東	South Horizons East		15,500	
	海怡西	South Horizons West		15,200	
	華貴	Wah Kwai		16,000	
	華富一	Wah Fu I		13,300	

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	華富二	Wah Fu II		15,500	
	薄扶林	Pokfulam		20,700	
	置富	Chi Fu		16,100	
	田灣	Tin Wan		18,000	
	石漁	Shek Yue		17,800	
	黃竹坑	Wong Chuk Hang		15,200	
	海灣	Bays Area		14,400	
	赤柱及石澳	Stanley & Shek O		20,800	
				276,200	

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)	
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC		
LC 2	九龍西 Kowloon West (包括油尖旺、 深水埗及九龍城 三區) (Including the 3 Districts of Yau Tsim Mong, Sham Shui Po and Kowloon City)	油尖旺	Yau Tsim Mong		1,030,000	-11.40%
		尖沙咀西	Tsim Sha Tsui West	23,200		
		佐敦西	Jordan West	19,400		
		佐敦東	Jordan East	22,100		
		油麻地	Yau Ma Tei	16,600		
		富榮	Charming	19,200		
		旺角西	Mong Kok West	18,200		
		富柏	Fu Pak	18,500		
		櫻桃	Cherry	22,200		
		大角咀南	Tai Kok Tsui South	18,500		
		大角咀北	Tai Kok Tsui North	17,200		
		大南	Tai Nan	19,300		
		旺角北	Mong Kok North	15,900		
		旺角東	Mong Kok East	14,200		
		旺角南	Mong Kok South	14,100		
		京士柏	King's Park	17,900		
		尖沙咀東	Tsim Sha Tsui East	17,800		
				294,300		

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	<u>深水埗</u>	<u>Sham Shui Po</u>			
	寶麗	Po Lai	12,800		
	長沙灣	Cheung Sha Wan	15,400		
	南昌北	Nam Cheong North	20,100		
	石硤尾及 南昌東	Shek Kip Mei & Nam Cheong East	20,400		
	南昌南	Nam Cheong South	19,000		
	南昌中	Nam Cheong Central	20,000		
	南昌西	Nam Cheong West	12,800		
	富昌	Fu Cheong	17,100		
	麗閣	Lai Kok	16,100		
	元州	Un Chau	28,300		
	荔枝角南	Lai Chi Kok South	21,600		
	美孚南	Mei Foo South	16,900		
	美孚中	Mei Foo Central	13,500		
	美孚北	Mei Foo North	17,000		
	荔枝角北	Lai Chi Kok North	20,000		
	蘇屋	So Uk	12,900		
	李鄭屋	Lei Cheng Uk	14,600		
	下白田	Ha Pak Tin	19,200		
	又一村	Yau Yat Tsuen	15,300		

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
			區議會 選區 <u>DCCA</u>	地方選區 <u>GC</u>	
		南山、大坑東及 大坑西	Nam Shan, Tai Hang Tung & Tai Hang Sai	21,800	
		龍坪及上白田	Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin	18,700	
				373,500	
		九龍城	<u>Kowloon City</u>		
		馬頭圍	Ma Tau Wai	17,000	
		馬坑涌	Ma Hang Chung	21,400	
		馬頭角	Ma Tau Kok	13,700	
		樂民	Lok Man	13,600	
		常樂	Sheung Lok	17,100	
		何文田	Ho Man Tin	21,800	
		嘉道理	Kadoorie	18,200	
		太子	Prince	16,600	
		九龍塘	Kowloon Tong	18,600	
		龍城	Lung Shing	13,500	
		啓德	Kai Tak	17,000	
		海心	Hoi Sham	15,800	
		土瓜灣北	To Kwa Wan North	13,100	
		土瓜灣南	To Kwa Wan South	14,700	
		鶴園海逸	Hok Yuen Laguna Verde	19,300	
		黃埔東	Whampoa East	15,600	

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	黃埔西	Whampoa West		19,600	
	紅磡灣	Hung Hom Bay		17,400	
	紅磡	Hung Hom		14,400	
	家維	Ka Wai		15,500	
	愛民	Oi Man		14,200	
	愛俊	Oi Chun		14,100	
				362,200	

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
LC 3	九龍東 Kowloon East (包括黃大仙 及觀塘兩區) (Including the 2 Districts of Wong Tai Sin and Kwun Tong)	黃大仙 Wong Tai Sin		1,018,700	+9.54%
	龍趣	Lung Tsui	13,200		
	龍下	Lung Ha	14,100		
	龍上	Lung Sheung	19,800		
	鳳凰	Fung Wong	15,400		
	鳳德	Fung Tak	17,600		
	龍星	Lung Sing	19,700		
	新蒲崗	San Po Kong	22,700		
	東頭	Tung Tau	12,800		
	東美	Tung Mei	14,600		
	樂富	Lok Fu	15,000		
	橫頭磡	Wang Tau Hom	18,800		
	天強	Tin Keung	16,100		
	翠竹及鵬程	Tsui Chuk & Pang Ching	18,900		
	竹園南	Chuk Yuen South	16,500		
	竹園北	Chuk Yuen North	17,400		
	慈雲西	Tsz Wan West	20,500		
	正愛	Ching Oi	18,500		
	正安	Ching On	19,800		
	慈雲東	Tsz Wan East	21,400		

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
		瓊富	King Fu	20,100	
		彩雲東	Choi Wan East	15,100	
		彩雲南	Choi Wan South	13,400	
		彩雲西	Choi Wan West	12,000	
		池彩	Chi Choi	16,600	
		彩虹	Choi Hung	15,900	
				425,900	
		觀塘	Kwun Tong		
		觀塘中心	Kwun Tong Central	14,500	
		九龍灣	Kowloon Bay	13,500	
		啓業	Kai Yip	12,400	
		麗晶	Lai Ching	16,200	
		坪石	Ping Shek	19,100	
		佐敦谷	Jordan Valley	14,400	
		順天	Shun Tin	20,200	
		雙順	Sheung Shun	19,600	
		安利	On Lee	13,100	
		寶達	Po Tat	25,600	
		秀茂坪北	Sau Mau Ping North	19,900	
		曉麗	Hiu Lai	19,500	
		秀茂坪南	Sau Mau Ping South	18,200	

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	興田	Hing Tin		19,300	
	藍田	Lam Tin		14,500	
	廣德	Kwong Tak		20,500	
	平田	Ping Tin		17,500	
	栢雅	Pak Nga		14,200	
	油塘東	Yau Tong East		21,000	
	油塘中	Yau Tong Central		22,300	
	油塘西	Yau Tong West		17,500	
	麗港城	Laguna City		23,800	
	景田	King Tin		21,700	
	翠屏南	Tsui Ping South		14,500	
	翠屏北	Tsui Ping North		12,300	
	寶樂	Po Lok		15,400	
	月華	Yuet Wah		13,800	
	協康	Hip Hong		16,400	
	康樂	Hong Lok		17,100	
	定安	Ting On		17,300	
	牛頭角	Ngau Tau Kok		19,600	
	淘大	To Tai		17,800	
	樂華北	Lok Wah North		14,900	
	樂華南	Lok Wah South		15,200	
				592,800	

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
LC 4	新界西 New Territories West			2,030,300	+9.15%
	(包括荃灣、 屯門、元朗、 葵青及離島 五區) (Including the 5 Districts of Tsuen Wan, Tuen Mun, Yuen Long, Kwai Tsing and Islands)	<u>荃灣</u> 德華 楊屋道 海濱 祈德尊 福來 愉景 荃灣中心 荃威 麗濤 麗興 荃灣郊區西 荃灣郊區東 綠楊 梨木樹東 梨木樹西 石圍角 象石	<u>Tsuen Wan</u> Tak Wah Yeung Uk Road Hoi Bun Clague Garden Fuk Loi Discovery Park Tsuen Wan Centre Allway Lai To Lai Hing Tsuen Wan Rural West Tsuen Wan Rural East Luk Yeung Lei Muk Shue East Lei Muk Shue West Shek Wai Kok Cheung Shek	 18,600 18,300 19,500 15,400 13,600 17,200 11,400 22,300 22,100 14,600 22,200 21,900 15,500 21,200 14,000 13,600 13,800	
				295,200	

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
		<u>屯門</u>	<u>Tuen Mun</u>		
		屯門市中心	Tuen Mun Town Centre	20,100	
		兆置	Siu Chi	20,800	
		兆翠	Siu Tsui	16,300	
		安定	On Ting	16,800	
		友愛南	Yau Oi South	12,600	
		友愛北	Yau Oi North	17,100	
		翠興	Tsui Hing	17,200	
		山景	Shan King	19,400	
		景興	King Hing	15,900	
		興澤	Hing Tsak	16,700	
		新墟	San Hui	21,200	
		三聖	Sam Shing	19,900	
		恆福	Hanford	24,500	
		富新	Fu Sun	14,800	
		悅湖	Yuet Wu	13,000	
		兆禧	Siu Hei	13,000	
		湖景	Wu King	15,400	
		蝴蝶	Butterfly	18,500	
		樂翠	Lok Tsui	14,600	
		龍門	Lung Mun	18,800	
		新景	San King	15,500	

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
		良景	Leung King	15,100	
		田景	Tin King	18,100	
		寶田	Po Tin	19,500	
		建生	Kin Sang	17,400	
		兆康	Siu Hong	16,100	
		景峰	Prime View	20,200	
		富泰	Fu Tai	19,500	
		屯門鄉郊	Tuen Mun Rural	20,900	
				508,900	
		元朗	<u>Yuen Long</u>		
		豐年	Fung Nin	19,700	
		水邊	Shui Pin	22,800	
		南屏	Nam Ping	13,800	
		北朗	Pek Long	13,900	
		元朗中心	Yuen Long Centre	19,000	
		鳳翔	Fung Cheung	19,400	
		十八鄉北	Shap Pat Heung North	23,500	
		十八鄉南	Shap Pat Heung South	19,700	
		屏山南	Ping Shan South	15,100	
		屏山北	Ping Shan North	20,000	
		廈村	Ha Tsuen	13,200	

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	天盛	Tin Shing		22,200	
	瑞愛	Shui Oi		19,700	
	瑞華	Shui Wah		19,200	
	頌華	Chung Wah		19,700	
	悅恩	Yuet Yan		26,300	
	富恩	Fu Yan		26,300	
	逸澤	Yat Chak		20,300	
	天恒	Tin Heng		23,400	
	宏景	Wang King		18,200	
	嘉湖北	Kingswood North		22,300	
	嘉湖南	Kingswood South		23,100	
	天耀	Tin Yiu		22,100	
	慈祐	Tsz Yau		22,600	
	錦綉花園	Fairview Park		15,800	
	新田	San Tin		18,400	
	錦田	Kam Tin		10,100	
	八鄉北	Pat Heung North		10,500	
	八鄉南	Pat Heung South		13,900	
				554,200	
	葵青	<u>Kwai Tsing</u>			
	葵興	Kwai Hing		21,000	

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	葵盛東邨	Kwai Shing East Estate	19,100		
	上大窩口	Upper Tai Wo Hau	14,100		
	下大窩口	Lower Tai Wo Hau	15,200		
	葵涌邨	Kwai Chung Estate	30,900		
	石蔭	Shek Yam	23,700		
	安蔭	On Yam	16,100		
	新石籬	Shek Lei Extension	22,200		
	石籬	Shek Lei	21,800		
	大白田	Tai Pak Tin	19,900		
	葵芳	Kwai Fong	20,200		
	華麗	Wah Lai	17,600		
	荔華	Lai Wah	15,000		
	祖堯	Cho Yiu	17,900		
	興芳	Hing Fong	17,900		
	荔景	Lai King	13,600		
	葵盛西邨	Kwai Shing West Estate	20,200		
	安灝	On Ho	21,800		
	偉盈	Wai Ying	19,900		
	青衣邨	Tsing Yi Estate	14,900		
	翠怡	Greenfield	19,300		
	長青	Cheung Ching	19,800		
	長康	Cheung Hong	18,900		
	盛康	Shing Hong	14,800		

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
		青衣南		19,900	
		長亨		14,500	
		青發		19,200	
		長安		15,000	
				524,400	
		離島	Islands		
		大嶼山	Lantau	17,000	
		逸東邨北	Yat Tung Estate North	20,300	
		逸東邨南	Yat Tung Estate South	19,000	
		東涌北	Tung Chung North	19,600	
		東涌南	Tung Chung South	18,800	
		愉景灣	Discovery Bay	15,900	
		坪洲及喜靈洲	Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau	7,200	
		南丫及蒲台	Lamma & Po Toi	5,400	
		長洲南	Cheung Chau South	12,200	
		長洲北	Cheung Chau North	12,200	
				147,600	

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
LC 5	新界東 New Territories East			1,628,200	+0.04%
	(包括北區、 大埔、沙田 及西貢四區) (Including the 4 Districts of North, Tai Po, Sha Tin and Sai Kung)	北區	North		
		聯和墟	Luen Wo Hui	20,600	
		粉嶺市	Fanling Town	20,200	
		祥華	Cheung Wah	19,200	
		華都	Wah Do	19,200	
		華明	Wah Ming	18,300	
		欣盛	Yan Shing	20,800	
		盛福	Shing Fuk	19,000	
		上水鄉郊	Sheung Shui Rural	18,900	
		御太	Yu Tai	19,900	
		彩園	Choi Yuen	20,100	
		石湖墟	Shek Wu Hui	19,600	
		天平西	Tin Ping West	12,200	
		鳳翠	Fung Tsui	13,900	
		沙打	Sha Ta	14,000	
		天平東	Tin Ping East	15,300	
		皇后山	Queen's Hill	22,900	
				294,100	

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
			區議會 選區 <u>DCCA</u>	地方選區 <u>GC</u>	
	大埔	<u>Tai Po</u>			
	大埔墟	Tai Po Hui	13,900		
	大埔中	Tai Po Central	14,200		
	頌汀	Chung Ting	15,600		
	大元	Tai Yuen	16,100		
	富亨	Fu Heng	17,900		
	怡富	Yee Fu	17,800		
	富明新	Fu Ming Sun	14,700		
	廣福及寶湖	Kwong Fuk & Plover Cove	15,200		
	宏福	Wang Fuk	12,800		
	大埔滘	Tai Po Kau	13,900		
	運頭塘	Wan Tau Tong	17,500		
	新富	San Fu	16,000		
	林村谷	Lam Tsuen Valley	19,700		
	寶雅	Po Nga	16,200		
	太和	Tai Wo	17,200		
	舊墟及太湖	Old Market & Serenity	16,800		
	康樂園	Hong Lok Yuen	15,000		
	船灣	Shuen Wan	15,800		
	西貢北	Sai Kung North	11,600		
			297,900		

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	沙田	Sha Tin			
	沙田市中心	Sha Tin Town Centre		20,900	
	瀝源	Lek Yuen		14,100	
	禾輦邨	Wo Che Estate		20,100	
	第一城	City One		16,100	
	愉城	Yue Shing		15,100	
	王屋	Wong Uk		18,700	
	沙角	Sha Kok		15,800	
	博康	Pok Hong		17,700	
	乙明	Jat Min		12,800	
	秦豐	Chun Fung		16,300	
	新田圍	Sun Tin Wai		17,700	
	翠田	Chui Tin		16,800	
	顯嘉	Hin Ka		14,800	
	下城門	Lower Shing Mun		21,700	
	徑口	Keng Hau		21,400	
	田心	Tin Sum		16,800	
	新翠	Sun Chui		11,600	
	大圍	Tai Wai		19,800	
	松田	Chung Tin		20,700	
	穗禾	Sui Wo		14,000	
	火炭	Fo Tan		15,400	

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	駿馬	Chun Ma		11,300	
	頌安	Chung On		22,200	
	錦濤	Kam To		19,600	
	新港城	Sunshine City		21,500	
	利安	Lee On		18,400	
	富龍	Fu Lung		17,800	
	錦英	Kam Ying		19,100	
	耀安	Yiu On		17,200	
	恒安	Heng On		19,600	
	鞍泰	On Tai		20,100	
	大水坑	Tai Shui Hang		13,500	
	愉欣	Yu Yan		17,300	
	碧湖	Bik Woo		16,300	
	廣康	Kwong Hong		12,800	
	廣源	Kwong Yuen		15,100	
				620,100	
	西貢	Sai Kung			
	西貢市中心	Sai Kung Central		12,700	
	白沙灣	Pak Sha Wan		14,900	
	西貢離島	Sai Kung Islands		10,500	
	坑口東	Hang Hau East		14,500	

暫定地方選區範圍
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed GC Code	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name for GC Area	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	估計人口 Estimated Population (as at 30 June 2008)		偏離標準人口基數 百分比 % of Deviation from Population Quota (232,503)
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	坑口西	Hang Hau West		16,900	
	環保	Wan Po		15,300	
	維都	Wai Do		19,600	
	健明	Kin Ming		17,400	
	彩健	Choi Kin		19,300	
	澳唐	O Tong		17,000	
	富軍	Fu Kwan		23,800	
	南安	Nam On		23,200	
	康景	Hong King		19,500	
	翠林	Tsui Lam		19,900	
	寶林	Po Lam		18,000	
	欣英	Yan Ying		19,800	
	運亨	Wan Hang		18,900	
	景林	King Lam		19,400	
	厚德	Hau Tak		19,000	
	富藍	Fu Nam		17,400	
	德明	Tak Ming		20,200	
	尚德	Sheung Tak		20,500	
	廣明	Kwong Ming		18,400	
				416,100	

Summary of Written Representations

Representation Received Before Commencement of Public Consultation
on 5 July 2007

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>Representation</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
1	<p>One representation proposes to:</p> <p>(a) maintain the existing boundaries of 5 geographical constituencies (“GCs”) so as to preserve community ties and avoid confusion;</p> <p>(b) maintain the existing number of seats for Hong Kong Island (“HKI”) (6 seats), Kowloon region (9 seats in total) and the New Territories region (15 seats in total) as the population changes should not be great; and</p> <p>(c) maintain the existing number of seats for Kowloon West (“KW”) (4 seats) and Kowloon East (“KE”) (5 seats). To bring the population of these 2 GCs closer to the population requirement, the EAC may consider moving some District Council Constituency Areas (“DCCAs”) from Kowloon City District in KW to KE because:</p> <p>(i) reducing the number of seats for a particular GC means reduction in the degree of its representation in the LegCo, and residents would have less chance to seek help from LegCo Members;</p>	<p><u>For (a):</u> The supporting views are noted.</p> <p><u>For (b):</u> The suggestion is accepted. In the EAC’s provisional recommendations, the number of seats for HKI, Kowloon region and the New Territories region remains unchanged.</p> <p><u>For (c):</u> The suggestion is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) factors with political implications will not be taken into consideration;</p> <p>(ii) although under the status quo, the deviations from the resulting numbers for KW and KE are still within the $\pm 15\%$ statutory limit (+10.75% and -12.37% respectively), they are not as close to the resulting numbers as compared with those under the provisional recommendations (-11.40% and +9.54%). <i>The proposal to maintain the status quo may contravene the statutory criterion in s 20(1)(a) of the EACO which stipulates that the population in a GC should be as near as is practicable to the resulting number;</i></p> <p>(iii) for reason of fairness and consistency,</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>Representation</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<p>(ii) if the status quo is maintained, the projected population of KW and KE will still fall within $\pm 15\%$ of the relevant resulting number under the statutory criteria; and</p> <p>(iii) it is estimated that there will be an increase in population in KE in the coming five years.</p>	<p>the EAC considers it essential to adhere to the population forecast projected as at 30 June 2008 for this demarcation exercise. In line with established practice, it is considered not appropriate to take future population trend into consideration; and</p> <p>(iv) splitting the existing districts along the DCCA boundaries is considered to be undesirable having regard to the statutory requirement to preserve community identities and local ties in the districts. It will also cause confusion to electors concerned.</p>

Representations Received During Consultation Period

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>Representation</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
2	<p>202 representations propose to:</p> <p>(a) maintain the existing boundaries of the 5 GCs so as to preserve community ties and avoid confusion; and</p> <p>(b) maintain the existing number of seats for KW (4 seats) and KE (5 seats), because:</p> <p>(i) the difference in the forecast population between the 2 GCs is small;</p> <p>(ii) reducing the number of seats for a particular GC means reduction in the degree of its representation in the LegCo, and residents can only seek help from fewer LegCo Members who are familiar with their needs. These will hamper social stability in the community and adversely affect voter turnout rate;</p> <p>(iii) if the status quo is maintained, the projected population of KW and KE will still fall within $\pm 15\%$ of the relevant resulting number under the statutory criteria;</p> <p>(iv) the workload of KE LegCo Members will become heavier, and with no increase</p>	<p><u>For (a):</u> The supporting views are noted.</p> <p><u>For (b):</u> The suggestion of maintaining the existing number of seats for KW and KE is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) although the projected population difference between the 2 GCs is small, it will be unfair to KW if it is allocated fewer seats than KE despite a larger population;</p> <p>(ii) factors with political implications (such as the delineation's effect on incumbent and prospective LegCo Members and political parties) will not be taken into consideration;</p> <p>(iii) the EAC's provisional recommendations do not propose any change in the existing GC boundaries, hence the community integrity of the 5 GCs will not be affected. The EAC's provisional recommendations have given due regard to the preservation of community identity and local ties;</p> <p>(iv) there is no strong reason in support of the argument that community ties will be hampered in the KE GC with the reduction of one seat in the LegCo;</p> <p>(v) although under the status quo, the deviations from the resulting numbers for KW and KE are still within the $\pm 15\%$</p>

Item no.	Representation	EAC's Views
	<p>in honorarium, their service for residents will be adversely affected;</p> <p>(v) the provision of an extra seat for KW may attract candidates who seldom serve the GC previously to contest in the area (i.e. 空降). With limited prior communication with electors, their quality of services will not be good. Being unfamiliar with such candidates, electors may refuse to vote or cast their votes in ignorance, which will be harmful to the electoral development of Hong Kong;</p> <p>(vi) the EAC's provisional recommendations are unfair to prospective candidates who have been working for residents concerned all along;</p> <p>(vii) although the number of seats for KW is increased for the 2008 LegCo Election, it may be reduced in the next term, and residents will need to adapt to frequent changes of LegCo Members in their GCs;</p> <p>(viii) it is anticipated that there will be an increase in population in KE in the coming five years;</p> <p>(ix) not only the population in KW GC increases, but also that in the New Territories West</p>	<p>statutory limit (+10.75% and -12.37% respectively), they are not as close to the resulting numbers as compared with those under the provisional recommendations (-11.40% and +9.54%). <i>The proposal to maintain the status quo may contravene the statutory criterion in s 20(1)(a) of the EACO which stipulates that the population in a GC should be as near as is practicable to the resulting number;</i></p> <p>(vi) for reason of fairness and consistency, the EAC considers it essential to adhere to the population forecast projected as at 30 June 2008 for this demarcation exercise. In line with established practice, it is considered not appropriate to take future population trend into consideration;</p> <p>(vii) although the population in NTW also increases, it has already been allocated the maximum number of 8 seats under the law and cannot be allocated one more seat, while this does not apply to KW GC; and</p> <p>(viii) there are views supporting the provisional recommendations.</p> <p><u>For (c):</u> The population forecasts used by the EAC were provided by the AHSG, which was set up solely for the demarcation exercise. It has conducted comprehensive researches before compiling the relevant data by a systematic methodology. It has also taken into account the latest results of the 2006 population by-census. The EAC therefore holds that the official data provided by the AHSG should remain as the sole and</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>Representation</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<p>(“NTW”) GC;</p> <p>(x) little information on the future development of Kowloon is available; and</p> <p>(xi) the EAC should maintain the status quo until the constitutional reform is in place.</p> <p>(broadly similar to item 18)</p> <p>(c) one of the representations queries the validity of the population forecasts for KW and KE GCs.</p> <p>(d) one of the representations considers that the one-month consultation period is too short.</p> <p>(e) one representation is the same as item 11, but adds that the boundaries and seats of all GCs should remain unchanged because the population difference of KE and KW GCs is relatively small, and they are within the $\pm 15\%$ permissible limit.</p>	<p>authoritative basis for the demarcation work.</p> <p><u>For (d):</u> It has been the EAC's established practice to conduct one-month consultation on its demarcation proposals. This is in line with the minimum requirement as set out in the law.</p> <p><u>For (e):</u> See also item 11.</p>
3	<p>(a) One representation proposes to give 4 seats to KW GC and 5 seats to KE GC by transferring Kowloon City and To Kwa Wan from KW to KE.</p> <p>(b) One representation proposes to move some small DCCAs in KW to KE so as to maintain the existing number of seats for these two GCs, so that the population of</p>	<p>The representations are not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) under (a), by transferring the whole Kowloon City District (population: 362,200) from KW to KE, KE will have a revised population of 1,380,900 and will be entitled to 6 seats, but KW will have a revised population of 667,800 and will only be entitled to 3 seats. This will contravene the statutory requirement that</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>Representation</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<p>the 2 GCs can be closer to the resulting numbers, residents can be served by the same LegCo Members and electors will not be confused.</p>	<p>each constituency should have 4 to 8 seats (section 19(2) of Legislative Council Ordinance) and thus cannot be accepted; and</p> <p>(ii) although representation (a) has not specified the boundary of “To Kwa Wan” area and representation (b) has not specified the name of DCCAs to be transferred, the area concerned falls within the boundary of Kai Tak DCCA in Kowloon City District. The Kai Tak DCCA has a population of 17,000 and is adjacent to Kwun Tong District. By transferring it from KW to KE, the revised population of the two GCs (1,013,000 and 1,035,700 respectively) will entitle them to have 4 and 5 seats respectively, resulting in population deviations of +8.92% for KW and -10.91% for KE (rather than -11.40% and +9.54% as in the provisional recommendations). The marginal improvement in the range of deviation does not justify redrawing the boundaries and the suggestion of splitting a District will not be conducive to preserving community integrity and will be against the EAC’s working principles.</p> <p>(please also see item 2)</p>
4	<p>One representation:</p> <p>(a) objects to the reduction of 1 seat in KE GC because:</p> <p>(i) there is only marginal difference in population</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because:</p> <p><u>For (a):</u></p> <p>(i) although the projected population difference between KW and KE is</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>Representation</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<p>between KE and KW GCs (11,300); and</p> <p>(ii) it would affect those who have served the KE GC for a long time and intended to take part in the election.</p> <p>It suggests moving Sai Kung District from New Territories East (“NTE”) to KE in order to maintain 5 seats in KE.</p> <p>(b) suggests moving some districts from NTW to KW; and</p> <p>(c) suggests moving Islands District from NTW to HKI.</p>	<p>relatively small, it will be unfair to KW if it is allocated fewer seats than KE;</p> <p>(ii) factors with political implications will not be taken into consideration; and</p> <p>(iii) the option of allowing KE to take in Sai Kung District from NTE has been considered (see option 13 in Appendix III). However, the suggestion is considered undesirable because the revised deviation (+9.15% and –11.40%) is just more or less the same as that of the provisional recommendations (+9.54% and –11.40%), and the marginal improvement does not justify redrawing the GC boundaries.</p> <p><u>For (b) and (c):</u> The suggestion is not accepted because it would result in the combination of a district to a GC with distinctly different local characteristics and community ties.</p> <p>According to the EAC’s working principle, Hong Kong Island, Kowloon and the New Territories are to be treated separately, as these areas have been regarded as distinct from one another.</p> <p>(Same as (a) under item 24)</p>
5	<p>One representation supports the provisional recommendations because:</p> <p>(a) it adheres to the legal requirements;</p> <p>(b) the EAC does not take political factors into consideration, and thus</p>	<p>The supporting view is noted.</p>

Item no.	Representation	EAC's Views
	<p>can make a fair proposal; and (c) electors are not required to adapt to new changes, thus minimizing the impact on them.</p>	
6	<p>One representation supports the EAC's provisional recommendations on the delineation of 5 GCs and the number of seats for HKI GC.</p>	<p>The supporting view is noted.</p>
7	<p>One representation supports the EAC's provisional recommendations on the delineation of 5 GCs and the number of seats for HKI, NTE and NTW GCs. The representation also comments that changing the existing GC boundaries may affect the voter turnout rate.</p>	<p>The supporting view is noted.</p>
8	<p>One representation: (a) supports the provisional recommendations (including boundary, name and number of seats for each GC); and (b) proposes to reduce the permissible percentage of deviation from $\pm 15\%$ to $\pm 10\%$ (which is more internationally recognized) in future.</p>	<p><u>For (a):</u> The supporting view is noted. <u>For (b):</u> The suggestion involves amendment to the EACO, which is beyond the EAC's jurisdiction.</p>
9	<p>Two representations support the EAC's provisional recommendations on the number of seats for KE and KW GCs.</p>	<p>Supporting views are noted.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>Representation</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
10	<p>One representation:</p> <p>(a) supports giving 5 seats to KW GC as more LegCo Members are required to handle the various problems in KW;</p> <p>(b) objects to the reduction in the number of seats in KE GC; and</p> <p>(c) proposes to:</p> <p>(i) increase the total number of GC seats;</p> <p>(ii) carry out constitutional reforms with initiative;</p> <p>(iii) amend the district boundaries between Sham Shui Po and Kwai Tsing Districts and hence the GC boundaries between KW and NTW; and</p> <p>(iv) set up an integrated office of LegCo Members in each district to serve residents who require assistance.</p> <p>(same as item 20)</p>	<p><u>For (a):</u> The supporting view is noted.</p> <p><u>For (b):</u> The suggestion is not accepted because the total number of seats will then become 31, which exceeds the statutory limit of 30.</p> <p><u>For (c):</u> The subjects raised are outside the EAC's jurisdiction.</p>
11	<p>One representation supports maintaining Islands District in NTW GC as in the provisional recommendations. It objects to some suggestions to put Islands District in HKI GC because:</p> <p>(i) Islands District is a part of the New Territories; and</p> <p>(ii) it has close ties with the New Territories in terms of residents'</p>	<p>The supporting view is noted.</p>

Item no.	Representation	EAC's Views
	<p>living habits and traditional cultures.</p>	
<p>12</p>	<p>One representation:</p> <p>(a) proposes that the existing statutory criteria regarding the total number of GCs and the number of seats to be allocated for each GC should be reviewed according to changes in population and the community development, regardless of the progress in constitutional development;</p> <p>(b) opines that the number of seats allocated to NTW, KW and KE GCs is not desirable in view of the former's large population and the small difference in population between the latter 2 GCs; and</p> <p>(c) suggests to streamline the procedure of seeking relief for any inadvertent omission or mistakes in the election expenses returns submitted by the candidates.</p>	<p><u>For (a):</u> The suggestion involves amendment to the Legislative Council Ordinance, which is beyond the EAC's jurisdiction.</p> <p><u>For (b):</u> See items 2, 4, 15, 24-26.</p> <p><u>For (c):</u> The suggestion involves amendment to the Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Conduct) Ordinance, which is beyond the EAC's jurisdiction.</p>
<p>13</p>	<p>One representation:</p> <p>(a) proposes to adopt the "first past the post" method for LegCo elections and elect all LegCo Members from universal suffrage;</p> <p>(b) comments that sufficient time should be given to LegCo Members to discuss the Bills submitted by the government; and</p>	<p>The subjects raised are outside the EAC's jurisdiction.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>Representation</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	(c) objects that no public consultation was conducted regarding the "Interception of Communications and Surveillance Ordinance".	
14	<p>One representation supports the provisional recommendations. It also considers that:</p> <p>(a) in future, if the total number of seats for GCs is increased, the number of seats allocated to NTW GC should be increased in view of its rising population; and</p> <p>(b) the functional constituencies should be cancelled and their seats should be allocated to the GCs in the year 2012 according to the population ratio.</p>	<p>The supporting view is noted.</p> <p><u>For (a):</u> The number of seats allocated to each GC in future will base on the future population projection.</p> <p><u>For (b):</u> The subject falls outside the EAC's jurisdiction.</p>
15	<p>One representation proposes to:</p> <p>(a) divide NTW into 2 GCs and allocate 5 and 4 seats for them respectively, while KW and KE will each have 4 seats and HKI will have 6 seats; or</p> <p>(b) divide the New Territories into 3 GCs, and allocate 5, 5 and 6 seats to them respectively, while KW and KE will each have 4 seats and HKI will have 6 seats.</p> <p>The arguments are:</p>	<p>The representation is not accepted because the proposal will produce 6 GCs, thereby contravening the statutory requirement to delineate 5 GCs as stipulated in the LCO.</p>

Item no.	Representation	EAC's Views
	<p>(i) the difference in population and seats among the GCs is great and this is unfair to LegCo Members;</p> <p>(ii) NTW has an increasing population, but is only allocated the same number of seats as in the previous election;</p> <p>(iii) the geographical area of NTW is very extensive; and</p> <p>(iv) it is difficult for the government to coordinate with 8 LegCo Members on matters about NTW.</p>	
16	<p>One representation:</p> <p>(a) supports the EAC's provisional recommendations to keep the boundaries unchanged and allocate 4 and 5 seats to KE and KW GCs respectively, because the provisional recommendations complies with the legal requirements and the number of seats allocated to each GC is based on their population projection.</p> <p>(b) suggests that the EAC may disclose more details on the population forecasts to the public; and</p> <p>(c) the EAC may consider distributing reference materials such as statutory requirements and working principles during the public forum, and to ensure that the participants of the public</p>	<p><u>For (a):</u> The supporting view is noted.</p> <p><u>For (b) to (c):</u> The comments are noted for future review. The statutory requirements and working principles have in fact been included in the consultation materials which can be downloaded from the EAC's website and inspected at the Registration and Electoral Office, all District Offices, post offices, public housing estate offices and public libraries.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>Representation</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	forum should focus their discussion on the demarcation exercise only.	
17	One representation thought that 6 additional seats were transferred from the Election Committee to the GCs for the 2008 LegCo Election, and suggests the following two options regarding allocation of these seats: (a) allocate to each GC an additional seat; or (b) allocate the additional seats on the basis of the number of registered electors of a GC.	The suggestion is not accepted because there is no additional GC seat for the 2008 LegCo Election.

**Summary of Oral Representations
made at the Public Forum on 26 July 2007**

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>Representation</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
18	<p>Ten representations:</p> <p>(a) propose to maintain the existing boundaries of the 5 GCs so as to preserve community ties and avoid confusion; and</p> <p>(b) propose to maintain the existing number of seats for KW (4 seats) and KE (5 seats), because:</p> <p>(i) the difference in the forecast population between the 2 GCs is small;</p> <p>(ii) reducing the number of seats for a particular GC means reduction in the degree of its representation in the LegCo and residents can only seek help from fewer LegCo Members who are familiar with their needs, which will hamper social stability in the community;</p> <p>(iii) if the status quo is maintained, the projected population of KW and KE will still fall within $\pm 15\%$ of the relevant resulting number under the statutory criteria; and</p> <p>(iv) it is anticipated that there will be an increase in population in KE in the coming five to ten years.</p>	<p><u>For (a):</u></p> <p>The supporting views are noted.</p> <p><u>For (b):</u></p> <p>The suggestion of maintaining the existing number of seats for KW and KE is not accepted because:</p> <p>(i) although the projected population difference between the 2 GCs is small, it will be unfair to KW if it is allocated fewer seats than KE despite a larger population;</p> <p>(ii) factors with political implications (such as the delineation's effect on incumbent and prospective LegCo Members and political parties) will not be taken into consideration;</p> <p>(iii) the EAC's provisional recommendations do not propose any change in the existing GC boundaries, hence the community integrity of the 5 GCs will not be affected. The EAC's provisional recommendations have given due regard to the preservation of community identity and local ties;</p> <p>(iv) there is no strong reason in support of the argument that community ties will be hampered in the KE GC, with the reduction of one seat in the</p>

Item no.	Representation	EAC's Views
	<p>(c) one of the representations opines that if the EAC's provisional recommendations involve a change to the existing allocation of seats, a longer public consultation period should be provided to allow more time for the public to consider the proposal.</p> <p>(broadly similar to item 2)</p>	<p>LegCo;</p> <p>(v) although under the status quo, the deviations from the resulting numbers for KW and KE are still within the $\pm 15\%$ statutory limit (+10.75% and -12.37% respectively), they are not closer to the resulting numbers as compared with those under the provisional recommendations (-11.40% and +9.54%). <i>The proposal to maintain the status quo may contravene the statutory criterion in s 20(1)(a) of the EACO which stipulates that the population in a GC should be as near as is practicable to the resulting number;</i></p> <p>(vi) for reason of fairness and consistency, the EAC considers it essential to adhere to the population forecast projected as at 30 June 2008 for this demarcation exercise. In line with established practice, it is considered not appropriate to take future population trend into consideration; and</p> <p>(vii) there are views supporting the provisional recommendations.</p> <p><u>For (c):</u> It has been the EAC's established practice to conduct one-month consultation on its demarcation proposals. This is in line with the minimum requirement as set out in the law.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>Representation</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
19	<p>One representation:</p> <p>(a) proposes to keep the boundaries and seats of all GCs unchanged because the deviations are within the permissible limit; and</p> <p>(b) supports not putting Islands District in HKI GC because the residents' living habits and customs are different.</p>	<p><u>For (a):</u> See item 2.</p> <p><u>For (b):</u> The supporting view is noted.</p>
20	<p>One representation:</p> <p>(a) supports giving 5 seats to KW GC as more LegCo Members are required to handle the various problems in KW;</p> <p>(b) objects to the reduction in the number of seats in KE GC; and</p> <p>(c) proposes to:</p> <p>(i) increase the total number of GC seats;</p> <p>(ii) carry out constitutional reforms with initiative;</p> <p>(iii) amend the district boundaries between Sham Shui Po and Kwai Tsing Districts and hence the GC boundaries between KW and NTW; and</p> <p>(iv) set up an integrated office of LegCo Members in each district to serve residents who required assistance.</p> <p>(same as item 10)</p>	<p><u>For (a):</u> The supporting view is noted.</p> <p><u>For (b):</u> The suggestion is not accepted because the total number of seats will then become 31, which exceeds the statutory limit of 30.</p> <p><u>For (c):</u> The subjects are outside the EAC's jurisdiction.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>Representation</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
21	One representation proposes to increase the total number of GC seats.	The subject falls outside the EAC's jurisdiction.
22	One representation proposes to merge the KW GC and the KE GC to form a single GC, so that there is no imbalance and residents in Kowloon can seek help from more LegCo Members.	The representation is not accepted because there will only be 4 GCs in the whole territory, and this would contravene the legal requirement of delineating 5 GCs. (same as item 23(b))

**Views Expressed by Legislative Council Members
at the Constitutional Affairs Panel Meeting on 16 July 2007**

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
23	<p>One representation suggests:</p> <p>(a) to re-delineate the boundaries of KE and KW GCs to maintain the existing allocation of seats for these two GCs, in view of the marginal difference in population between these GCs; and</p> <p>(b) to combine KE and KW to form a single GC, taking into account that the whole Hong Kong Island was also treated as a GC.</p>	<p><u>For (a):</u></p> <p>The suggestion is not accepted because if the whole of Kowloon City District (population: 362,200) is transferred from KW to KE, KE will have a revised population of 1,380,900 and will be entitled to 6 seats, but KW will have a revised population of 667,800 and will only be entitled to 3 seats. This will contravene the statutory requirement that each constituency should have 4 to 8 seats (section 19(2) of Legislative Council Ordinance) and thus cannot be accepted. If only part of a district is transferred to KE, it would involve splitting a District, and that will not be conducive to preserving community integrity and will be against the EAC's working principles.</p> <p><u>For (b):</u></p> <p>The suggestion is not accepted because if KE and KW are combined as one GC, there would only be 4 GCs in the whole territory, and this would contravene the legal requirement of delineating 5 GCs.</p>

<i>Item no.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
24	<p>One representation suggests:</p> <p>(a) to adjust the existing GC boundaries of NTW, so that the excess population could be transferred to other GCs, e.g. the Islands District can be moved from NTW to HKI; and</p> <p>(b) Tseung Kwan O area can be moved from Sai Kung District of NTE to KE.</p>	<p><u>For (a):</u></p> <p>The suggestion is not accepted because it would result in the combination of a District to a GC with distinctly different local characteristics and community ties.</p> <p>According to the EAC's working principle, Hong Kong Island, Kowloon and the New Territories are to be treated separately, as these areas have been regarded as distinct from one another.</p> <p><u>For (b):</u></p> <p>The suggestion is not accepted because it would involve splitting a District, and that will not be conducive to preserving community integrity and will be against the EAC's working principles.</p>
25	<p>One representation is broadly similar to item 24(a), but also points out that EAC has, in the past, considered to put Yuen Long District in two GCs.</p>	<p>The suggestion of splitting Yuen Long District is not accepted because that will not be conducive to preserving community integrity and will be against the EAC's working principles.</p>
26	<p>Four representations suggest to make amendments to the legislation so that NTW would be treated more fairly by having 9 seats. The Government and the EAC should adopt a more flexible approach in the delineation exercise.</p>	<p>The subject falls outside the EAC's jurisdiction.</p>