

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 CR/14/5/LC-16

圖文傳真 Fax: 2507 5810

來函檔號 YOUR REF.:

電話 Tel.: 2827 7017

網址 Web Site: <http://www.eac.gov.hk>

28 August 2015

The Honourable C Y Leung, GBM, GBS, JP  
The Chief Executive  
Hong Kong Special Administrative Region  
of the People's Republic of China  
Chief Executive's Office  
Hong Kong

Dear Mr Leung,

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 Legislative Council geographical constituencies for the purpose of the general election in respect of the Legislative Council to be held in 2016.

For the coming election, we recommend that the boundaries of the existing 5 geographical constituencies be adopted and that the 35 seats for the geographical constituencies be allocated as follows:

<u>Geographical Constituency</u>	<u>No. of Seats</u>
Hong Kong Island	6
Kowloon West	6
Kowloon East	5
New Territories West	9
New Territories East	9
Total:	<hr/> 35

Yours sincerely,

Barnabas Wah FUNG,  
Chairman

Arthur Yee-shun LUK,  
Member

Fanny Mui-ching CHEUNG,  
Member

## ABBREVIATIONS

CE	Chief Executive
CMAB	Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau
C&SD	Census and Statistics Department
DCCA	District Council constituency area
EAC	Electoral Affairs Commission
EACO	Electoral Affairs Commission Ordinance
GC, GCs	geographical constituency, geographical constituencies
HAD	Home Affairs Department
HKI	Hong Kong Island Geographical Constituency
KE	Kowloon East Geographical Constituency
KW	Kowloon West Geographical Constituency
LandsD	Lands Department
LegCo	Legislative Council
LCO	Legislative Council Ordinance
NTE	New Territories East Geographical Constituency
NTW	New Territories West Geographical Constituency
PlanD	Planning Department
REO	Registration and Electoral Office
the AHSG	the Ad Hoc Subgroup formed under the Working Group on Population Distribution Projections led by the Planning Department

# CONTENTS

		<u>Page</u>
<b>CHAPTER 1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
Section 1	The Electoral Affairs Commission	1
Section 2	Responsibility of the Electoral Affairs Commission	1
Section 3	Scope of the Report	2
<b>CHAPTER 2</b>	<b>DELINEATION OF GEOGRAPHICAL CONSTITUENCIES</b>	<b>3</b>
Section 1	Statutory Requirements	3
Section 2	Working Principles	5
Section 3	Name and Code of Geographical Constituencies	6
Section 4	Population Forecasts	7
Section 5	The Process of Delineation	8
Section 6	The Provisional Recommendations	12
<b>CHAPTER 3</b>	<b>THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION</b>	<b>13</b>
Section 1	The Consultation Period and Public Forum	13
Section 2	Number of Representations Received	15

<b>CHAPTER 4</b>	<b>CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS</b>	<b>16</b>
Section 1	Deliberations and Observations	16
Section 2	The Recommendations	24
<b>CHAPTER 5</b>	<b>A CONCLUDING NOTE</b>	<b>26</b>
Section 1	Acknowledgements	26
Section 2	Conclusion	27
<i>Appendices</i>		
Appendix I	Method for Allocation of Seats	28
Appendix II	Details of the Provisional Recommendations	30
Appendix III	Summary of Written/Oral Representations	56

\*\*\*\*\*

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **Section 1 : The Electoral Affairs Commission**

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

#### **Section 2 : Responsibility of the EAC**

1.2 Under section 4(a) of the EACO, one of the functions of the EAC is to consider or review the boundaries of geographical constituencies (“GCs”) for the purpose of making recommendations on 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 (“CE”) a report on the recommendations for the delineation of the GCs and the names proposed for each GC in relation to a LegCo general election not more than 36 months from the preceding general election. As the last general election of the LegCo was held on 9 September 2012, the EAC is required to submit the report for the 2016 LegCo General Election to the CE by 8 September 2015.

### **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 proposals of GC boundaries and sets out the EAC's recommendations on the boundaries and the names of the GCs with the reasons for its recommendations. It also contains a summary of all written and oral representations made to the EAC and reproduces all the written representations. **Volume 2** contains a summary of the recommendations on GCs and maps showing the boundaries and names of the recommended GCs.

## CHAPTER 2

### DELINEATION OF GEOGRAPHICAL CONSTITUENCIES

#### Section 1 : Statutory Requirements

##### *Provisions 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 provisions stipulated under the Legislative Council Ordinance (Chapter 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, **35 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 5 nor greater than 9** [section 19(2) of the LCO].

*Criteria stipulated under the EACO*

2.2 In accordance with the EACO, the EAC shall:

- (a) ensure that the population in each proposed GC 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 [section 20(1)(a) of the EACO];
- (b) where it is not practicable to comply with paragraph (a) above in respect of a proposed GC, ensure that the population in that GC does not exceed or fall short of the resulting number applicable to that GC by more than 15% [section 20(1)(b) of the EACO]; and
- (c) ensure that each proposed GC is to be constituted by two 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<sup>1</sup> [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) and (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 requirements and criteria set out above, the EAC also adopted a set of long-established working principles (as shown below) for the current delineation exercise:

- (a) the boundaries of the existing 5 GCs should form the basis of consideration in the current delineation exercise;

---

<sup>1</sup> “Districts” means the 18 Districts as set out in Part II of Schedule 1 to the District Councils Ordinance (Chapter 547).

- (b) for those existing GCs where the population falls within the permissible range of the population quota requirement, their boundaries would be adopted as far as possible to form new GCs;
- (c) Hong Kong Island, Kowloon and the New Territories are to be treated separately, as these areas have been traditionally regarded as distinct from one another;
- (d) splitting of Districts by District Council constituencies 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 are not considered.

### **Section 3 : Name and Code of GCs**

2.6 In determining the name and code reference for the GCs, the EAC considers that the name of GCs should comprise two easily distinguished components, namely the name of the area in which the GC is situated and a directional reference similar to those adopted for the existing GCs, i.e. Hong Kong Island (“HKI”), Kowloon West (“KW”), Kowloon East (“KE”), the New Territories West (“NTW”) and the New Territories East (“NTE”). 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 EAC hopes that with the adoption of this naming and coding system, anyone who consults the maps would find it easier to understand them and locate the GCs concerned. These methods have also been adopted in the delineation exercises for the LegCo general elections since 1998.

#### **Section 4 : Population Forecasts**

2.7 Section 20(6) of the EACO requires that the EAC 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 EAC shall estimate the population of Hong Kong or the GC having regard to the available information which is the best possible in the circumstances.

2.8 An Ad Hoc Subgroup (“AHSG”), formed under the Working Group on Population Distribution Projections led by the Planning Department (“PlanD”), took up the task of providing the EAC with the necessary population forecasts. The AHSG was chaired by an Assistant Director of the PlanD and comprised representatives from the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau (“CMAB”), Census and Statistics Department (“C&SD”), Housing Department, Lands Department (“LandsD”) and Registration and Electoral Office (“REO”). Following the established

practice, the AHSB used the statistics of the latest official population projections (2011-based projected figures) released by the C&SD as the basis and provided a report to the EAC on population forecasts of each District Council Constituency Area (“DCCA”) in Hong Kong as at **30 June 2016**.

2.9 The report estimated that the total population of Hong Kong would be **7 370 500** as at 30 June 2016. The population projections in the report were adopted by the EAC for the delineation of GC boundaries. The **population quota** (defined in section 17(1) of the EACO as the total population of Hong Kong divided by the total number of Members to be returned for all GCs, i.e.  $7\,370\,500 \div 35$ ) was **210 586** for the purpose of this delineation exercise.

## **Section 5 : The Process of Delineation**

2.10 Based on the population forecasts mentioned in paragraph 2.9 above and adhering to the statutory requirements, relevant criteria and the established working principles as set out in paragraphs 2.1 to 2.5 above, the EAC drew up its provisional recommendations on the boundaries and names of GCs for the 2016 LegCo General Election.

2.11 The delineation exercise was basically composed of two parts. The first part concerned determination of the boundaries of GCs. According to the LCO, the number of GCs would remain at 5 for the purpose of returning Members at the 2016 LegCo General Election and the

total number of Members to be returned for all GCs would be maintained at 35. The EAC noted that the existing GC boundaries had been adopted since the first term of LegCo in 1998 and members of the public were generally well accustomed to them in elections. Any suggestion to re-delineate their boundaries would definitely cause unnecessary confusion to electors and risk upsetting the long-established identities and community ties within each of the GCs. Moreover, there had not been a major shift in the territorial population ratio<sup>2</sup> of the 5 GCs since the last LegCo general election. Therefore, in the absence of any obvious and fundamental change in circumstances justifying alteration of the boundaries, the EAC recommended that the existing boundaries of the 5 GCs should be maintained.

2.12 The second part concerned allocation of seats among the proposed GCs having regard to their projected populations. Following the established process of delineation, the EAC had adopted a two-step method to allocate the 35 seats among the 5 proposed GCs with a view to ensuring that the population in each proposed GC was as near as practicable to the resulting number as required under section 20(1)(a) of the EACO (see paragraph 2.2(a) above). This was to ensure that the important principle of “equal representation” could be complied with in the delineation of GC boundaries. Details of the steps on allocating the seats are shown below:

- (a) Step One: Seats were allocated among the 5 GCs by dividing the projected population of each GC by the population quota (see paragraph 2.9 above) and,

---

<sup>2</sup> The change of territorial population ratio among the 5 GCs is between 0.01% and 0.85%.

thereafter, allocating seats according to the integer of the calculated number subject to the statutory limits (see paragraph 2.1 (c) above). Accordingly, 33 seats were first allocated to the 5 GCs. For details of the allocation of seats, please refer to the table at paragraph 2.13 below.

- (b) Step Two: There were 2 remaining seats after Step One. As to the allocation of the remaining 2 seats, all the six possible options for seat allocation were set out in the “Summary of the Provisional Recommendations on GCs” of the consultative document. The relevant table is shown at **Appendix I**. Having considered the six options, the EAC adopted the option which gives the smallest range of the percentage deviations of the population from the resulting number in the individual GCs (i.e. Option E). In general, this option ensured that the variation between individual GCs in terms of the number of persons represented by a LegCo seat was reduced to a minimum.

2.13 Under the provisional recommendations, the number of seats allocated to each GC in accordance with the aforesaid method is as follows:

<b>Proposed Name and Code of GC</b>	<b>Projected Population</b>	<b>Seats allocated in Step One</b>	<b>Seats allocated in Step Two</b>	<b>Proposed Number of Seats</b>
Hong Kong Island (LC 1)	1 268 000	6	0	6
Kowloon West (LC 2)	1 141 900	5	1	6
Kowloon East (LC 3)	1 084 600	5	0	5
New Territories West (LC 4)	2 100 400	9	0	9
New Territories East (LC 5)	1 775 600	8	1	9
<b>Total:</b>	<b>7 370 500</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>35</b>

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

2.14 The provisional recommendations of the EAC fulfilled all the statutory requirements, relevant criteria and the established working principles set out in paragraphs 2.1 to 2.5 above. As the EAC recommended that the existing boundaries of the 5 GCs should be maintained, the existing names and codes for the 5 GCs were also recommended to be kept unchanged.

2.15 In drawing up the provisional recommendations on the boundaries of the GCs, the EAC had in accordance with the established practice invited the Home Affairs Department (“HAD”) to provide views on the provisional recommendations of maintaining the existing boundaries and

names of the 5 GCs from the perspectives of community identities, local ties and physical features and developments of the GCs.

## **Section 6 : The Provisional Recommendations**

2.16 The EAC considered that the provisional recommendations (i.e. maintaining the existing boundaries and names of the 5 GCs and allocating the 35 seats among the 5 GCs as set out in paragraph 2.13 above) were the most appropriate option, and proceeded to prepare for the launch of a public consultation exercise on the provisional recommendations. Details of the EAC's provisional recommendations, including the population and component DCCAs of each GC are set out in **Appendix II**. These provisional recommendations were then put forth by the EAC 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 EAC conducted a public consultation exercise on its provisional recommendations from 21 May to 19 June 2015 for a period of 30 days. During this period, members of the public could send in their representations, in writing, to the EAC to express their views on the EAC's provisional recommendations on the boundaries and names of the GCs.

3.2 During the public consultation period, summary of the provisional recommendations on GCs, together with the method for the allocation of seats, component Districts and DCCAs, and maps showing the boundaries of the GCs were available for public inspection at all District Offices, management offices of all public housing estates, all Post Offices, major and district public libraries and the REO. Such information was also made available to the public on the EAC's website.

3.3 Each set of the consultative document contained the Message from the EAC Chairman, which explained to the public the statutory requirements, relevant criteria and the working principles adopted by the EAC in delineating the GC boundaries, and also the justifications for the

provisional recommendations.

3.4 The public consultation was widely publicised through Announcements in the Public Interest on radio and TV, press releases, newspaper advertisements, posters, the EAC's website and the government gazette.

3.5 On the first day of the consultation period, i.e. 21 May 2015, the EAC held a press conference to launch the public consultation exercise and invited the public to give their views on the EAC's provisional recommendations. To ensure that the final recommendations of the EAC could fully take into account public opinions, the EAC appealed to the public to come forward and express their support or otherwise for the provisional recommendations. This was to enable the EAC to more accurately gauge the public's views and degree of acceptance of the provisional recommendations.

3.6 A public forum was held from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. on 11 June 2015 at the Lai Chi Kok Community Hall, 863 Lai Chi Kok Road, Sham Shui Po, Kowloon, where members of the public could attend and express their views to the EAC directly. Audio-visual aids were used to facilitate understanding of the representations by making reference to maps and other relevant information.

3.7 The REO also attended a meeting of the LegCo Panel on

Constitutional Affairs on 15 June 2015 to brief LegCo Members and listen to their views on the EAC's provisional recommendations.

## **Section 2 : Number of Representations Received**

3.8            During the consultation period, the EAC received a total of 18 written representations. In addition, nine persons turned up at the public forum held on 11 June 2015. All written representations are reproduced in Part II of this volume. Summaries of the written and oral representations are shown in **Appendix III** of this volume.

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS**

#### **Section 1 : Deliberations and Observations**

4.1 As soon as the public consultation period ended, the EAC went through each of the written and oral representations (including the views expressed by LegCo Members at the meeting of the LegCo Panel on Constitutional Affairs held on 15 June 2015) to consider whether they should be accepted.

4.2 As with past delineation exercises, the EAC examined each of the representations received in detail. In the course of deliberation, the EAC adopted broadly the same approaches as with previous delineation exercises. Regarding the views expressed in the representations, the EAC continued to adopt the statutory requirements, relevant criteria and working principles to examine the grounds put forward in the representations in a prudent manner.

4.3 The EAC has received both supporting and opposing representations on its provisional recommendations. For views opposing the provisional recommendations, the EAC noted that they were mainly related to the following issues. In this regard, the EAC would like to set out its factors of consideration so that the public can fully understand the

EAC's recommendations:

**(a) *Requests for Re-delineation of Boundaries***

4.4 The principle of “equal representation” (i.e. equal number of people should have equal number of representatives) is an important consideration in the delineation of GC boundaries. Therefore, according to the statutory criteria under the EACO for making recommendations on the delineation of GC boundaries for a LegCo general election, the projected population in each GC should be as near as practicable to the resulting number. However, given the unique situation of Hong Kong being a small and compact place with a dense population, which is distributed vertically, the EACO, at the same time, allows the population of a GC to deviate from its resulting number by not more than  $\pm 15\%$  and requires that the EAC shall have regard to the criteria of community identities, the preservation of localities and the physical features of the relevant area in the course of delineation of the GC boundaries. Besides, the EACO also requires the EAC to have regard to the existing GC boundaries in making recommendations in relation to a general election. Therefore, this is reasonable and practical to formulate proposals on the basis of the existing GC boundaries.

4.5 During the consultation period, the EAC received a number of representations relating to the delineation of NTW. These representations pointed out that after dividing the projected population of NTW by the

population quota, its entitled number of seats reached 9.97. However, due to the limit stipulated in the LCO that the maximum number of seats to be returned for each GC is 9, only 9 seats could be allocated to NTW. As a result, the percentage deviation from the resulting number of the NTW has reached +10.82% and for this reason the representors consider that the GC has insufficient seats of representation. Some representations considered that the population of NTW would be on an increasing trend in future and estimated that its percentage deviation of population would be getting larger. Many representations proposed re-delineation of the boundaries of NTW and other GCs so as to achieve a more even population distribution among the GCs.

4.6 The EAC understands the concern raised by the public regarding NTW. In the past delineation exercises, the EAC also received similar representations. In view of this, the EAC had reviewed the situation of NTW afresh before reaching the provisional recommendations and had considered four possible options of transferring a single District adjacent to NTE from NTW to NTE (as set out below). However, these four options were either not viable or not desirable.

- (i) By transferring the Islands District to NTE – under this option, the new NTE would cover an extremely large area and the Islands District would be far away from the other Districts in NTE. Moreover, currently, the northern part of Lantau Island falls within the Tsuen Wan District while

the rest of it belongs to the Islands District. This option would split Lantau Island into two parts and, therefore, would adversely affect the long-established community identities of the area. Although the percentages of deviation of the 5 GCs would be improved (-9.63% to +3.01%) compared with those in the provisional recommendations (-9.63% to +10.82%), this option was considered not desirable in view of the aforementioned factors of consideration;

- (ii) By transferring the Tsuen Wan District to NTE – this option would similarly split Lantau Island into two parts and, therefore, would adversely affect the long-established community identities of the area. Besides, the shape of the new GC would be undesirable and there was no significant improvement on the deviation range (-9.63% to +10.00%) among the 5 GCs. Therefore, this option was also considered not desirable;
- (iii) By transferring the Kwai Tsing District to NTE – this option was not viable because it would increase the population of the NTE significantly but only 9 seats could be allocated to the GCs in accordance with the statutory requirement. Under such circumstances, the percentage of deviation would be +20.64% for NTE, which exceeded

the statutory permissible upper limit;

- (iv) By transferring the Yuen Long District to NTE – this option was not viable because it would increase the population of the NTE significantly but only 9 seats could be allocated to the GC in accordance with the statutory requirement. Under such circumstances, the percentage of deviation would be +26.89% for NTE, which exceeded the statutory permissible upper limit.

4.7 Given the consideration that there has not been a major shift in the territorial population ratio across the 5 GCs since the last LegCo general election, the EAC recommended to keep the existing boundaries of the 5 GCs intact in its provisional recommendations. The percentage deviation of the projected population from the resulting number of the 5 individual GCs was within the 15% permissible range stipulated under section 20(1)(b) of the EACO. As for NTW, its percentage of deviation from the resulting number was similar to that of the last LegCo general election.

4.8 Moreover, some representations put forward grounds of continuing urbanisation and gradual development of community infrastructure and transportation in the New Territories in support of their proposals to re-delineate the existing GC boundaries to form GCs comprising some areas of the New Territories and the Hong Kong Island or Kowloon.



4.9 The EAC agrees that the gradual development of the community infrastructure and transportation network might better connect the related districts in the long run. However, these developments will not necessarily change the long-established community identities and local ties of the relevant areas. When considering these representations, there is a need for the EAC to have a fair and objective assessment on whether there are incontrovertible grounds in support of re-delineating the existing boundaries given that the percentages of deviation from the resulting number of the existing 5 GCs are all within the statutory permissible range. The existing boundaries of the 5 GCs have come into existence since 1998 and the community identities and local ties within each of the GCs have been long established. Any suggestion to re-delineate the GC boundaries would unavoidably risk upsetting the long-established community identities and local ties and would not bring about substantial improvement in the delineation exercise. In fact, these proposals are not incontrovertible and there is no wide consensus in the society. The EAC notes that many of the representations received during the consultation period are in support of maintaining the existing boundaries of the 5 GCs intact.

4.10 After prudent consideration, the EAC is of the view that in order to preserve the long-established community identities and local ties in the existing GCs and avoid causing unnecessary confusion to electors, the delineation exercise should be based on the boundaries of the existing GCs. Given that the percentages of deviation from the resulting number of the existing GCs all fall within the statutory permissible range, and in the

absence of any obvious change in community identities and local ties justifying alteration of the boundaries, it is considered that re-delineating the GC boundaries simply to reduce the population difference among the GCs would not be appropriate and should not be recommended.

***(b) Number of Geographical Constituencies***

4.11 The LCO stipulates that there are to be 5 GCs for the purpose of returning Members at elections for those constituencies. Some representations proposed increasing the number of GCs to 6 and re-delineating the New Territories into 3 GCs on grounds of the growing population of NTE and NTW. There were also representations suggesting merging the existing 5 GCs into 1 GC.

4.12 In making the recommendations on the delineation of GC boundaries, the EAC is required to adhere to the statutory requirement in the LCO, which stipulates that there are to be 5 GCs. As the aforesaid proposals involve amendment to the LCO, the EAC has referred these views to the CMAB for reference.

***(c) Number of Seats***

4.13 As the percentage of deviation from the resulting number of NTW has reached +10.82%, some representations proposed amending the maximum number of Members to be returned for each GC so that more

seats could be allocated to NTW. Some representations proposed that the total number of seats of both GCs and functional constituencies should each be increased to 40. As explained above, the EAC should adhere to the statutory requirements stipulated in the LCO in drawing up the provisional recommendations. At present, the law requires that 35 Members are to be returned for all GCs and the number of Members to be returned for each GC is to be a number, not less than 5 nor greater 9. The EAC has referred these views to the CMAB for reference.

4.14 Moreover, some representations proposed that the number of seats of each GC should be the same. Given that the population is unevenly distributed among the existing 5 GCs, there would be substantial changes to the boundaries of the existing GCs if on one hand, an even distribution of the 35 seats among GCs is to be achieved and on the other hand, the existing statutory criteria concerning the percentage of deviation from the resulting number of each GC have to be complied with. Besides, the existing GC boundaries have been adopted since the first term of LegCo in 1998, members of the public are generally well accustomed to them in elections. Any suggestions to re-delineate their boundaries would definitely risk upsetting the long-established identities and community ties within each of the GCs and cause unnecessary confusion to electors in the coming election.

4.15 The existing legislation does not require that the seats should be equally allocated among the GCs. The EAC has allocated the seats

among the proposed GCs having regard to their projected population in accordance with the established calculation procedures with a view to ensuring that the population in each proposed GC is as near as practicable to the resulting number as required under section 20(1)(a) of the EACO.

## **Section 2 : The Recommendations**

4.16 At its meeting on 30 July 2015, the EAC, having considered the representations received, drew up its final recommendations. Its views on the representations are recorded in the last column of **Appendix III**.

4.17 As explained in Section 5 of Chapter 2 above, the EAC's provisional recommendations have fulfilled all the statutory requirements, relevant criteria and established working principles. The EAC has taken into account all the public representations (including supporting and opposing views as well as the specific proposals given in the representations) received during the consultation period. After weighing and balancing all relevant considerations, the EAC considers that the present recommendation to maintain the existing boundaries of the 5 GCs represents the most appropriate and practicable way forward.

4.18 The EAC decides that it is not necessary or appropriate to make any alteration to its 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 recommended GC,

their names and reference code numbers, the component DCCAs and their projected population details as well as the maps showing the boundaries and names 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 delineation exercise, the EAC would like to express its gratitude towards the following government departments/units for their contributions: the AHSG for its provision of the population forecasts, the LandsD for its production of maps for the consultation exercise and production of this report, the Information Services Department for its 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 HAD for the provision of venue for holding the public forum.

5.2 The EAC is particularly thankful to the EAC Secretariat for their dedicated and concerted efforts in the preparation work.

5.3 The EAC is also grateful to those members of the public for their representations put forth in writing or orally at the public forum.

## **Section 2 : Conclusion**

5.4 As in previous delineation exercises, the EAC has adhered to the statutory requirements, relevant criteria and its working principles in this delineation exercise. Factors with political implications are not considered.

5.5 Delineation of GC boundaries is an integral part of a general election. The EAC is committed to conducting each and every election under its supervision in an open, fair and honest manner. The EAC has all the time held on to this important principle in this delineation exercise.

**Method for Allocation of Seats**

Proposed Geographical Constituency ("GC")	Component District	(A) Projected population as at 30 June 2016	(B) Allocated number of seats (according to the integer of the calculated number) = population of GC ÷ population quota	(C) Entitled number of seats subject to the statutory limits <sup>Note 1</sup>	(D) Allocation of remaining seats <sup>Note 2</sup>	(E) Total number of seats in 2016 = (C)+(D)	(F) Resulting number (RN) <sup>Note 3</sup>	(G) % of Deviation from RN = {[ (A)-(F) ] ÷ (F) } x100%
HONG KONG ISLAND (LC 1)	Central & Western	254 300						
	Wan Chai	184 200						
	Eastern	554 300						
	Southern	275 200						
	<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>1 268 000</b>	6	6	0	6	1 263 516	+0.35%
KOWLOON WEST (LC 2)	Yau Tsim Mong	323 300						
	Sham Shui Po	406 100						
	Kowloon City	412 500						
	<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>1 141 900</b>	5	5	1	6	1 263 516	-9.63%
KOWLOON EAST (LC 3)	Wong Tai Sin	427 000						
	Kwun Tong	657 600						
	<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>1 084 600</b>	5	5	0	5	1 052 930	+3.01%
NEW TERRITORIES WEST (LC 4)	Tsuen Wan	309 200						
	Tuen Mun	500 900						
	Yuen Long	629 400						
	Kwai Tsing	510 900						
	Islands	150 000						
	<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>2 100 400</b>	9	9	0	9	1 895 274	+10.82%
NEW TERRITORIES EAST (LC 5)	North	314 500						
	Tai Po	314 900						
	Sha Tin	676 600						
	Sai Kung	469 600						
	<b>Sub-total:</b>	<b>1 775 600</b>	8	8	1	9	1 895 274	-6.31%
<b>TOTAL:</b>		<b>7 370 500</b>	-	33	2	35		



**Note:**

1. In accordance with section 19(2) of the Legislative Council Ordinance (Chapter 542) (“LCO”), the number of Members to be returned for each GC is to be a number, not less than 5 nor greater than 9.
2. Since New Territories West has been allocated the maximum number of seats for a GC (i.e. 9) as permitted under the statutory requirement of the LCO, the remaining 2 seats can only be allocated to the other 4 GCs. There are six options for allocation.

Option	A	B	C	D	E	F
HONG KONG ISLAND (LC 1)	[6]+(1) {-13.98%}	[6]+(1) {-13.98%}	[6]+(1) {-13.98%}	[6] {+0.35%}	[6] {+0.35%}	[6] {+0.35%}
KOWLOON WEST (LC 2)	[5]+(1) {-9.63%}	[5] {+8.45%}	[5] {+8.45%}	[5]+(1) {-9.63%}	[5]+(1) {-9.63%}	[5] {+8.45%}
KOWLOON EAST (LC 3)	[5] {+3.01%}	[5]+(1) {-14.16%}	[5] {+3.01%}	[5]+(1) {-14.16%}	[5] {+3.01%}	[5]+(1) {-14.16%}
NEW TERRITORIES WEST (LC 4)	[9] {+10.82%}	[9] {+10.82%}	[9] {+10.82%}	[9] {+10.82%}	[9] {+10.82%}	[9] {+10.82%}
NEW TERRITORIES EAST (LC 5)	[8] {+5.40%}	[8] {+5.40%}	[8]+(1) {-6.31%}	[8] {+5.40%}	[8]+(1) {-6.31%}	[8]+(1) {-6.31%}

Among the six options, Option E has the smallest range of the percentage deviations of the population from the resulting number in the individual GCs, i.e. the variations between individual GCs in terms of the number of persons represented by a Legislative Council seat is reduced to a minimum. Accordingly, the remaining 2 seats are allocated to Kowloon West and New Territories East.

- [ ] number of entitled seats
- ( ) number of remaining seat to be allocated
- { } percentage of deviation of the population from the resulting number

3. Resulting number is obtained by multiplying the number of seats allocated to the GC and the population quota (i.e. 210 586).

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number	
			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)	<u>中西區</u>	<u>Central &amp; Western</u>		1 268 000	+0.35%
		中環	Chung Wan	14 200		
		半山東	Mid Levels East	19 000		
		衛城	Castle Road	18 500		
		山頂	Peak	20 700		
		大學	University	19 100		
		堅摩	Kennedy Town & Mount Davis	16 900		
		觀龍	Kwun Lung	16 300		
		西環	Sai Wan	14 800		
		寶翠	Belcher	21 100		
		石塘咀	Shek Tong Tsui	17 200		
		西營盤	Sai Ying Pun	14 400		
		上環	Sheung Wan	17 600		
		東華	Tung Wah	13 000		
		正街	Centre Street	16 200		
		水街	Water Street	15 300		
				254 300		

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	<b>灣仔</b>	<b>Wan Chai</b>			
	軒尼詩	Hennessy	13 300		
	愛群	Oi Kwan	14 400		
	鵝頸	Canal Road	13 300		
	維園	Victoria Park	14 700		
	天后	Tin Hau	14 500		
	銅鑼灣	Causeway Bay	13 600		
	大坑	Tai Hang	13 700		
	渣甸山	Jardine's Lookout	15 200		
	樂活	Broadwood	14 500		
	跑馬地	Happy Valley	14 000		
	司徒拔道	Stubbs Road	14 300		
	修頓	Southorn	15 500		
	大佛口	Tai Fat Hau	13 200		
			184 200		

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	<b>東區</b>	<b>Eastern</b>			
	太古城西	Tai Koo Shing West	18 000		
	太古城東	Tai Koo Shing East	19 200		
	鯉景灣	Lei King Wan	20 600		
	愛秩序灣	Aldrich Bay	19 000		
	筲箕灣	Shaukeiwan	13 100		
	阿公岩	A Kung Ngam	19 200		
	杏花邨	Heng Fa Chuen	19 000		
	翠灣	Tsui Wan	13 000		
	欣藍	Yan Lam	16 800		
	小西灣	Siu Sai Wan	13 200		
	景怡	King Yee	15 900		
	環翠	Wan Tsui	14 600		
	翡翠	Fei Tsui	15 700		
	柏架山	Mount Parker	13 800		
	寶馬山	Braemar Hill	16 700		
	炮台山	Fortress Hill	15 600		
	城市花園	City Garden	15 400		
	和富	Provident	20 800		
	堡壘	Fort Street	15 400		
	錦屏	Kam Ping	16 500		

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	丹拿	Tanner	15 400		
	健康村	Healthy Village	14 400		
	鯽魚涌	Quarry Bay	13 800		
	南豐	Nam Fung	13 900		
	康怡	Kornhill	14 500		
	康山	Kornhill Garden	14 900		
	興東	Hing Tung	18 900		
	西灣河	Sai Wan Ho	19 000		
	下耀東	Lower Yiu Tung	16 600		
	上耀東	Upper Yiu Tung	12 700		
	興民	Hing Man	14 600		
	樂康	Lok Hong	12 400		
	翠德	Tsui Tak	13 600		
	漁灣	Yue Wan	14 800		
	佳曉	Kai Hiu	13 300		
			554 300		
	<b>南區</b>	<b>Southern</b>			
	香港仔	Aberdeen	19 200		
	鴨脷洲邨	Ap Lei Chau Estate	12 500		
	鴨脷洲北	Ap Lei Chau North	13 000		

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	利東一	Lei Tung I	17 100		
	利東二	Lei Tung II	13 300		
	海怡東	South Horizons East	14 900		
	海怡西	South Horizons West	15 400		
	華貴	Wah Kwai	14 800		
	華富南	Wah Fu South	12 800		
	華富北	Wah Fu North	14 400		
	薄扶林	Pokfulam	19 900		
	置富	Chi Fu	15 800		
	田灣	Tin Wan	17 000		
	石漁	Shek Yue	18 200		
	黃竹坑	Wong Chuk Hang	17 100		
	海灣	Bays Area	18 000		
	赤柱及石澳	Stanley & Shek O	21 800		
			275 200		

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
LC 2	<b>九龍西</b> <b>Kowloon West</b> (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)	<b>油尖旺</b>  尖沙咀西 佐敦南 佐敦西 油麻地南 富榮 旺角西 富柏 奧運 櫻桃 大角咀南 大角咀北 大南 旺角北 旺角東 旺角南 油麻地北 尖東及京士柏	<b><u>Yau Tsim Mong</u></b>  Tsim Sha Tsui West Jordan South Jordan West Yau Ma Tei South Charming Mong Kok West Fu Pak Olympic Cherry Tai Kok Tsui South Tai Kok Tsui North Tai Nan Mong Kok North Mong Kok East Mong Kok South Yau Ma Tei North East Tsim Sha Tsui & King's Park	<b>1 141 900</b>	<b>-9.63%</b>
			22 100	18 300	
			14 600	19 500	
			17 500	15 700	
			18 600	18 300	
			16 300	16 200	
			18 200	20 100	
			17 800	15 800	
			15 600	12 800	
			15 200		

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
		尖沙咀中	Tsim Sha Tsui Central	17 000	
		佐敦北	Jordan North	13 700	
				323 300	
		<b><u>深水埗</u></b>	<b><u>Sham Shui Po</u></b>		
		寶麗	Po Lai	19 400	
		長沙灣	Cheung Sha Wan	17 100	
		南昌北	Nam Cheong North	19 700	
		石硤尾	Shek Kip Mei	20 700	
		南昌東	Nam Cheong East	18 500	
		南昌南	Nam Cheong South	20 500	
		南昌中	Nam Cheong Central	18 100	
		南昌西	Nam Cheong West	19 900	
		富昌	Fu Cheong	19 900	
		麗閣	Lai Kok	14 500	
		幸福	Fortune	15 500	
		荔枝角南	Lai Chi Kok South	17 300	
		美孚南	Mei Foo South	17 200	
		美孚中	Mei Foo Central	14 600	
		美孚北	Mei Foo North	16 700	
		荔枝角中	Lai Chi Kok Central	19 800	



暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
		荔枝角北	Lai Chi Kok North	14 000	
		元州及蘇屋	Un Chau & So Uk	25 900	
		李鄭屋	Lei Cheng Uk	13 100	
		下白田	Ha Pak Tin	14 700	
		又一村	Yau Yat Tsuen	16 300	
		南山、大坑東 及大坑西	Nam Shan, Tai Hang Tung & Tai Hang Sai	16 200	
		龍坪及上白田	Lung Ping & Sheung Pak Tin	16 500	
				406 100	
		<b>九龍城</b>	<b><u>Kowloon City</u></b>		
		馬頭圍	Ma Tau Wai	19 400	
		馬坑涌	Ma Hang Chung	19 800	
		馬頭角	Ma Tau Kok	14 800	
		樂民	Lok Man	16 000	
		常樂	Sheung Lok	16 200	
		何文田	Ho Man Tin	20 500	
		嘉道理	Kadoorie	18 900	
		太子	Prince	16 700	
		九龍塘	Kowloon Tong	19 400	
		龍城	Lung Shing	15 900	

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	宋皇臺	Sung Wong Toi	20 100		
	啓德北	Kai Tak North	15 800		
	啓德南	Kai Tak South	14 000		
	海心	Hoi Sham	15 600		
	土瓜灣北	To Kwa Wan North	13 300		
	土瓜灣南	To Kwa Wan South	15 400		
	鶴園海逸	Hok Yuen Laguna Verde	19 600		
	黃埔東	Whampoa East	17 900		
	黃埔西	Whampoa West	20 400		
	紅磡灣	Hung Hom Bay	19 300		
	紅磡	Hung Hom	14 600		
	家維	Ka Wai	20 000		
	愛民	Oi Man	15 300		
	愛俊	Oi Chun	13 600		
			412 500		

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
LC 3	<b>九龍東</b> <b>Kowloon East</b> (包括黃大仙 及觀塘兩區) (Including the 2 Districts of Wong Tai Sin and Kwun Tong)	<b>黃大仙</b> <b>Wong Tai Sin</b>		<b>1 084 600</b>	<b>+3.01%</b>
		龍趣	Lung Tsui	15 700	
		龍下	Lung Ha	13 000	
		龍上	Lung Sheung	20 600	
		鳳凰	Fung Wong	15 700	
		鳳德	Fung Tak	16 300	
		龍星	Lung Sing	19 900	
		新蒲崗	San Po Kong	21 300	
		東頭	Tung Tau	19 900	
		東美	Tung Mei	17 700	
		樂富	Lok Fu	15 000	
		橫頭磡	Wang Tau Hom	17 400	
		天強	Tin Keung	14 500	
		翠竹及鵬程	Tsui Chuk & Pang Ching	18 300	
		竹園南	Chuk Yuen South	15 200	
		竹園北	Chuk Yuen North	16 100	
		慈雲西	Tsz Wan West	18 900	
		正愛	Ching Oi	20 200	

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
		正安	Ching On	20 300	
		慈雲東	Tsz Wan East	20 000	
		瓊富	King Fu	19 500	
		彩雲東	Choi Wan East	13 900	
		彩雲南	Choi Wan South	13 000	
		彩雲西	Choi Wan West	13 700	
		池彩	Chi Choi	16 000	
		彩虹	Choi Hung	14 900	
				427 000	
		<b>觀塘</b>	<b>Kwun Tong</b>		
		觀塘中心	Kwun Tong Central	16 000	
		九龍灣	Kowloon Bay	13 600	
		啓業	Kai Yip	16 200	
		麗晶	Lai Ching	15 800	
		坪石	Ping Shek	13 600	
		雙彩	Sheung Choi	20 600	
		佐敦谷	Jordan Valley	19 400	
		順天	Shun Tin	19 200	
		雙順	Sheung Shun	17 400	
		安利	On Lee	13 600	

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	寶達	Po Tat	34 900		
	秀茂坪北	Sau Mau Ping North	20 600		
	曉麗	Hiu Lai	18 400		
	秀茂坪南	Sau Mau Ping South	13 800		
	秀茂坪中	Sau Mau Ping Central	15 000		
	興田	Hing Tin	17 500		
	藍田	Lam Tin	21 000		
	廣德	Kwong Tak	19 500		
	平田	Ping Tin	18 300		
	栢雅	Pak Nga	13 400		
	油塘東	Yau Tong East	20 400		
	油麗	Yau Lai	18 200		
	翠翔	Chui Cheung	20 500		
	油塘西	Yau Tong West	20 600		
	麗港城	Laguna City	24 100		
	景田	King Tin	20 300		
	翠屏	Tsui Ping	19 600		
	寶樂	Po Lok	14 700		
	月華	Yuet Wah	13 900		
	協康	Hip Hong	16 600		
	康樂	Hong Lok	16 300		
	定安	Ting On	16 300		

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
		牛頭角上邨	Upper Ngau Tau Kok Estate	16 000	
		牛頭角下邨	Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate	19 200	
		淘大	To Tai	16 600	
		樂華北	Lok Wah North	13 500	
		樂華南	Lok Wah South	13 000	
				657 600	

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
<b>LC 4</b>	<b>新界西 New Territories West</b>			<b>2 100 400</b>	<b>+10.82%</b>
	(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)	<b>荃灣</b> 德華 楊屋道 海濱 祈德尊 福來 愉景 荃灣中心 荃威 麗濤 汀深 荃灣西 荃灣郊區 馬灣 綠楊 梨木樹東 梨木樹西 石圍角	<b>Tsuen Wan</b> Tak Wah Yeung Uk Road Hoi Bun Clague Garden Fuk Loi Discovery Park Tsuen Wan Centre Allway Lai To Ting Sham Tsuen Wan West Tsuen Wan Rural Ma Wan Luk Yeung Lei Muk Shue East Lei Muk Shue West Shek Wai Kok	20 600 19 700 19 400 14 400 13 800 17 200 16 400 19 700 19 200 18 600 19 500 19 200 15 400 15 200 19 300 15 800 12 800	

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	象石	Cheung Shek	13 000	309 200	
	<b><u>屯門</u></b>	<b><u>Tuen Mun</u></b>			
	屯門市中心	Tuen Mun Town Centre	20 200		
	兆置	Siu Chi	20 700		
	兆翠	Siu Tsui	19 700		
	安定	On Ting	16 500		
	友愛南	Yau Oi South	15 200		
	友愛北	Yau Oi North	15 000		
	翠興	Tsui Hing	17 900		
	山景	Shan King	17 800		
	景興	King Hing	15 500		
	興澤	Hing Tsak	16 200		
	新墟	San Hui	18 600		
	三聖	Sam Shing	21 100		
	恆福	Hanford	20 400		
	富新	Fu Sun	19 200		
	悅湖	Yuet Wu	13 400		
	兆禧	Siu Hei	13 100		
	湖景	Wu King	13 700		



暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
		蝴蝶	Butterfly	17 100	
		樂翠	Lok Tsui	14 700	
		龍門	Lung Mun	17 400	
		新景	San King	14 700	
		良景	Leung King	14 500	
		田景	Tin King	16 600	
		寶田	Po Tin	18 900	
		建生	Kin Sang	16 400	
		兆康	Siu Hong	15 100	
		景峰	Prime View	19 200	
		富泰	Fu Tai	20 500	
		屯門鄉郊	Tuen Mun Rural	21 600	
				500 900	
	<b>元朗</b>	<b>Yuen Long</b>			
	豐年	Fung Nin		19 300	
	水邊	Shui Pin		19 100	
	南屏	Nam Ping		16 700	
	北朗	Pek Long		16 900	
	元朗中心	Yuen Long Centre		18 200	
	元龍	Yuen Lung		13 700	

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	鳳翔	Fung Cheung	15 800		
	十八鄉東	Shap Pat Heung East	17 400		
	十八鄉中	Shap Pat Heung Central	23 800		
	十八鄉西	Shap Pat Heung West	22 500		
	屏山南	Ping Shan South	27 200		
	屏山中	Ping Shan Central	14 600		
	屏山北	Ping Shan North	13 100		
	廈村	Ha Tsuen	15 500		
	天盛	Tin Shing	21 400		
	瑞愛	Shui Oi	18 400		
	瑞華	Shui Wah	15 300		
	頌華	Chung Wah	15 400		
	悅恩	Yuet Yan	19 300		
	富恩	Fu Yan	19 900		
	逸澤	Yat Chak	18 900		
	天恒	Tin Heng	22 400		
	宏逸	Wang Yat	20 100		
	晴景	Ching King	19 500		
	嘉湖北	Kingswood North	22 700		
	慈祐	Tsz Yau	14 300		
	耀祐	Yiu Yau	14 000		
	天耀	Tin Yiu	14 400		

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
		嘉湖南	Kingswood South	16 800	
		頌栢	Chung Pak	15 800	
		錦綉花園	Fairview Park	16 400	
		新田	San Tin	21 600	
		錦田	Kam Tin	15 100	
		八鄉北	Pat Heung North	13 500	
		八鄉南	Pat Heung South	20 400	
				629 400	
		<b>葵青</b>	<b><u>Kwai Tsing</u></b>		
		葵興	Kwai Hing	17 700	
		葵盛東邨	Kwai Shing East Estate	18 100	
		上大窩口	Upper Tai Wo Hau	12 900	
		下大窩口	Lower Tai Wo Hau	13 300	
		葵涌邨北	Kwai Chung Estate North	19 100	
		葵涌邨南	Kwai Chung Estate South	20 500	
		石蔭	Shek Yam	20 900	
		安蔭	On Yam	16 300	
		石籬南	Shek Lei South	19 700	
		石籬北	Shek Lei North	21 100	
		大白田	Tai Pak Tin	21 500	

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	葵芳	Kwai Fong	17 700		
	華麗	Wah Lai	16 500		
	荔華	Lai Wah	14 400		
	祖堯	Cho Yiu	15 700		
	興芳	Hing Fong	21 000		
	荔景	Lai King	14 100		
	葵盛西邨	Kwai Shing West Estate	18 300		
	安灝	On Ho	20 700		
	偉盈	Wai Ying	19 500		
	青衣邨	Tsing Yi Estate	17 100		
	翠怡	Greenfield	19 500		
	長青	Cheung Ching	18 800		
	長康	Cheung Hong	15 700		
	盛康	Shing Hong	15 400		
	青衣南	Tsing Yi South	19 400		
	長亨	Cheung Hang	13 800		
	青發	Ching Fat	18 300		
	長安	Cheung On	13 900		
			510 900		

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
		<b>離島</b>	<b>Islands</b>		
		大嶼山	Lantau	19 900	
		逸東邨北	Yat Tung Estate North	19 400	
		逸東邨南	Yat Tung Estate South	20 100	
		東涌北	Tung Chung North	24 400	
		東涌南	Tung Chung South	17 100	
		愉景灣	Discovery Bay	13 200	
		坪洲及喜靈洲	Peng Chau & Hei Ling Chau	7 400	
		南丫及蒲台	Lamma & Po Toi	6 300	
		長洲南	Cheung Chau South	11 100	
		長洲北	Cheung Chau North	11 100	
				150 000	

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
<b>LC 5</b>	<b>新界東 New Territories East</b>		<b>1 775 600</b>		<b>-6.31%</b>
	(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)	<b>北區</b>	<b>North</b>		
		聯和墟	Luen Wo Hui	19 500	
		粉嶺市	Fanling Town	13 200	
		祥華	Cheung Wah	17 800	
		華都	Wah Do	19 200	
		華明	Wah Ming	17 200	
		欣盛	Yan Shing	20 100	
		盛福	Shing Fuk	15 000	
		粉嶺南	Fanling South	15 000	
		清河	Ching Ho	20 500	
		御太	Yu Tai	17 800	
		上水鄉郊	Sheung Shui Rural	21 400	
		彩園	Choi Yuen	17 900	
		石湖墟	Shek Wu Hui	19 500	
		天平西	Tin Ping West	15 100	
		鳳翠	Fung Tsui	14 800	
		沙打	Sha Ta	15 000	
		天平東	Tin Ping East	17 300	

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	皇后山	Queen's Hill	18 200	314 500	
	<b>大埔</b>	<b>Tai Po</b>			
	大埔墟	Tai Po Hui	16 800		
	大埔中	Tai Po Central	13 900		
	頌汀	Chung Ting	14 900		
	大元	Tai Yuen	14 400		
	富亨	Fu Heng	16 700		
	怡富	Yee Fu	16 700		
	富明新	Fu Ming Sun	14 300		
	廣福及寶湖	Kwong Fuk & Plover Cove	13 400		
	宏福	Wang Fuk	12 800		
	大埔滘	Tai Po Kau	21 900		
	運頭塘	Wan Tau Tong	17 100		
	新富	San Fu	16 500		
	林村谷	Lam Tsuen Valley	21 800		
	寶雅	Po Nga	15 000		
	太和	Tai Wo	15 700		
	舊墟及太湖	Old Market & Serenity	15 200		
	康樂園	Hong Lok Yuen	20 800		

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
		船灣 西貢北	Shuen Wan Sai Kung North	21 200 15 800	
				314 900	
		<b>沙田</b>	<b>Sha Tin</b>		
		沙田市中心	Sha Tin Town Centre	18 900	
		瀝源	Lek Yuen	16 400	
		禾輦邨	Wo Che Estate	18 300	
		第一城	City One	15 100	
		愉城	Yue Shing	15 000	
		王屋	Wong Uk	16 900	
		沙角	Sha Kok	16 900	
		博康	Pok Hong	16 400	
		乙明	Jat Min	35 500	
		秦豐	Chun Fung	15 800	
		新田圍	Sun Tin Wai	16 800	
		翠田	Chui Tin	15 200	
		顯嘉	Hin Ka	13 300	
		下城門	Lower Shing Mun	18 100	
		雲城	Wan Shing	20 600	
		徑口	Keng Hau	20 600	



暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	田心	Tin Sum	15 000		
	翠嘉	Chui Ka	16 200		
	大圍	Tai Wai	20 600		
	松田	Chung Tin	15 300		
	穗禾	Sui Wo	13 000		
	火炭	Fo Tan	16 700		
	駿馬	Chun Ma	14 000		
	頌安	Chung On	20 500		
	錦濤	Kam To	20 800		
	馬鞍山市中心	Ma On Shan Town Centre	17 600		
	利安	Lee On	16 100		
	富龍	Fu Lung	17 000		
	烏溪沙	Wu Kai Sha	17 800		
	錦英	Kam Ying	17 500		
	耀安	Yiu On	19 500		
	恒安	Heng On	22 100		
	鞍泰	On Tai	21 300		
	大水坑	Tai Shui Hang	20 000		
	愉欣	Yu Yan	18 100		
	碧湖	Bik Woo	16 100		
	廣康	Kwong Hong	17 600		

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	廣源	Kwong Yuen	14 000		
			676 600		
	<b>西貢</b>	<b>Sai Kung</b>			
	西貢市中心	Sai Kung Central	11 700		
	白沙灣	Pak Sha Wan	19 000		
	西貢離島	Sai Kung Islands	13 300		
	坑口東	Hang Hau East	16 300		
	坑口西	Hang Hau West	17 100		
	寶怡	Po Yee	17 900		
	維景	Wai King	14 700		
	都善	Do Shin	16 000		
	健明	Kin Ming	16 400		
	彩健	Choi Kin	19 700		
	澳唐	O Tong	18 000		
	富君	Fu Kwan	19 900		
	軍寶	Kwan Po	13 500		
	南安	Nam On	17 300		
	康景	Hong King	20 500		
	翠林	Tsui Lam	16 400		
	寶林	Po Lam	16 700		

暫定地方選區範圍  
Proposed Geographical Constituency Areas

暫定 地方選區代號 Proposed Code of GC	暫定地方選區名稱 Proposed Name of GC	所包括的 區議會選區 District Council Constituency Areas included	預計人口 (截至二零一六年 六月三十日) Projected Population (as at 30 June 2016)		所得數目 偏離百分比 % of Deviation from Resulting Number
			區議會 選區 DCCA	地方選區 GC	
	欣英	Yan Ying	19 300		
	運亨	Wan Hang	21 000		
	景林	King Lam	18 000		
	厚德	Hau Tak	18 300		
	富藍	Fu Nam	17 500		
	德明	Tak Ming	19 300		
	尚德	Sheung Tak	18 300		
	廣明	Kwong Ming	18 200		
	環保北	Wan Po North	16 200		
	環保南	Wan Po South	19 100		
			469 600		

**Summary of Written/Oral Representations**

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
<i>Suggestions to re-delineate the existing boundaries of GCs</i>				
1	10	-	Support to maintain the existing boundaries of the 5 GCs.	The supporting views are noted.
2	2	1	<p>Propose to transfer the Islands District from NTW to HKI. The reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• agree with the EAC's views that the existing boundaries of the 5 GCs should be maintained as the members of the public are generally well accustomed to them. However, have reservation on the proposal to maintain the existing boundaries of the 5 GCs on grounds of the absence of any obvious and fundamental change in the population structure ;</li> <li>• the population of NTW has been in an excessive level for two consecutive terms and NTW has a higher population growth among the 5 GCs in terms of area development and median age of population. The problems of overpopulation and re-delineation of NTW</li> </ul>	<p><u>Items (2) - (6)</u></p> <p>These proposals <b>are not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) there has not been a major shift in the territorial population ratio across the 5 GCs since the last LegCo general election and the percentage deviation of the projected population from the resulting number of the 5 individual GCs is within the 15% permissible range stipulated under section 20(1)(b) of the EACO. As for NTW, its percentage of deviation from the resulting number is similar to that of the last LegCo general election;</p> <p>(ii) gradual development of the community infrastructure and transportation network may better connect the related districts in the long run. However, these developments will not</p>

\* W: Number of written representation

O: Number of oral representation

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<p>will be even more serious in the next delineation exercise;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• although the EAC recommends to maintain the existing boundaries of the 5 GCs in order to avoid causing unnecessary confusion to electors, there will be even greater confusion and more people will be affected if re-delineation is to be done in the next delineation exercise;</li> <li>• the Islands District's connections with HKI are closer than that with other areas in NTW as Hong Kong Island is the end point of most of outbound traffic of the islands, such as the terminals of Tung Chung Line of Mass Transit Railway ("MTR") are at the Islands District and Hong Kong Island respectively; and</li> <li>• in view of the development in future, the population of the Islands District will continue to increase. If the Islands District remains in NTW, the residents of NTW will not be able to return an appropriate number of LegCo Members and therefore have insufficient</li> </ul>	<p>necessarily change the long-established community identities and local ties of the relevant areas. The existing boundaries of the 5 GCs have come into existence since 1998 and the community identities and local ties within each of the GCs have been long established. Any suggestion to re-delineate the GC boundaries will unavoidably risk upsetting the long-established community identities and local ties and will not bring about substantial improvement in the delineation exercise;</p> <p>(iii) some of the representations involve splitting of Districts which will adversely affect the long-established community identities of the areas;</p> <p>(iv) many of the representations received by the EAC during the consultation period are in support of maintaining the existing boundaries of the 5 GCs (see item (1));</p> <p>(v) there is representation</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<p>number of representatives.</p> <p>Apart from the proposal to transfer the Islands District from NTW to HKI, one of the representations further suggests that the EAC, after the calculation in Step One of seats allocation, to allocate the 2 remaining seats to HKI.</p>	<p>opposing the transfer of the Islands District to HKI (see item (7)); and</p> <p>(vi) regarding the suggestion concerning allocation of seats, the EAC has to allocate the seats having regard to the projected population of the proposed GCs.</p>
3	1	-	Proposes to transfer Tseung Kwan O of the Sai Kung District to KE in view of the population growth and transport development.	
4	1	-	Suggests the EAC to re-delineate the New Territories area into 3 GCs in view of its continuous population growth. Besides, proposes to merge KW and KE into 1 GC and then allocate 9 seats to the new Kowloon GC.	
5	1	-	Proposes to re-delineate the GCs in Kowloon area by re-delineating the areas in the south of Boundary Street as the Kowloon GC, or merging the areas in the south of Boundary Street with HKI to form a larger GC. After the above changes, combine the remaining areas in Kowloon with the New Territories area to form 3 or 4 GCs.	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
6	1	-	<p>Considers that in accordance with the existing legislation, the maximum number of seats to be returned for each GC is 9. After the calculation in Step One, the entitled number of seats of NTW is 9.97 which is reaching 10 seats. However, given that the number of Members to be returned for each GC is to be a number not greater than 9, only 9 seats could be allocated to NTW, making NTW have insufficient seats of representation consecutively in the past four general elections since 2004. It is therefore proposed to re-delineate the boundaries of NTW, NTE, KW and KE. The representation lists out a number of possible options. After consideration, it considers that among the options, the following proposal has the smallest range of the percentage deviations, which is between -1.99% and +1.56%. The component Districts, population and allocated seats of the proposed GCs are as follows:</p> <p><b>HKI</b> (boundary remains unchanged) (Central &amp; Western, Wan Chai, Eastern and Southern) (1 268 000) – 6 seats</p>	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<p><b>KW and New Territories South</b> (Yau Tsim Mong, Sham Shui Po, Tsuen Wan, Kwai Tsing and Islands) (1 699 500) – 8 seats</p> <p><b>KE</b> (Kowloon City, Wong Tai Sin and Kwun Tong) (1 497 100) – 7 seats</p> <p><b>New Territories North</b> (Tuen Mun, Yuen Long and North) (1 444 800) – 7 seats</p> <p><b>NTE</b> (Tai Po, Sha Tin and Sai Kung) (1 461 100) – 7 seats</p> <p>The relevant factors of consideration are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>from the perspective of community ties, the Tsuen Wan District and Kwai Tsing District have been more closely connected with the Sham Shui Po District and Yau Tsim Mong District since the operation of MTR service. Moreover, both the Tsuen Wan District and Kwai Tsing District have been regarded as “metro areas” in the Government’s city planning;</li> </ul>	



<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views</i> <sup>*</sup>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• since the EAC can hardly split the Districts in the delineation exercise, apart from delineating the Islands District and Central &amp; Western District in the same constituency, another appropriate way is to delineate the Islands District, Tsuen Wan District and Kwai Tsing District in the same GC as these three Districts are connected by roads;</li> <li>• to transfer the Kowloon City District from KW to KE because the Kowloon City District is separated from the Sham Shui Po District and Yau Tsim Mong District by the railway track, which forms as obstacle in pedestrian and traffic flow between the Kowloon City District and the latter two Districts. Conversely, it is more reasonable or even better to delineate the Kowloon City District, Wong Tai Sin District and Kwun Tong District in the same GC; and</li> <li>• there are closer traffic ties between the North District, Yuen Long District and Tuen Mun District and these three Districts are near the</li> </ul>	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			border. Therefore, they have similar community background.	
7	-	1	<p>Disagrees to the suggestion of transferring the Islands District to HKI for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the majority of the population of the Islands District resides in Tung Chung, which is connected to other districts by land; and</li> <li>• the population of Hong Kong Island will continue to decrease in the years to come. If the Islands District is transferred to HKI, the sea connection is incompatible with the future development. The link among district councils will also be lost.</li> </ul>	The view is noted. Under the EAC's provisional recommendations, the Islands District will be retained in NTW.
<b>Numbers of GCs</b>				
8	1	-	Proposes to add 1 GC to the New Territories area by re-delineating the 2 existing GCs into 3 GCs, namely NTW, NTE and New Territories North in view of the large area covered by NTW and NTE and that there will be a continuous increase in population in the area. The population and allocated seats of the proposed	<p><u>Items (8) - (11)</u></p> <p>These proposals involve amendment to LCO which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred these views to the CMAB for reference.</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<p>GCs are as follows:</p> <p><b>HKI</b> (boundary remains unchanged) (Central &amp; Western, Wan Chai, Eastern and Southern) (1 268 000) – 6 seats</p> <p><b>KW</b> (boundary remains unchanged) (Yau Tsim Mong, Sham Shui Po and Kowloon City) (1 141 900) – 6 seats</p> <p><b>KE</b> (boundary remains unchanged) (Wong Tai Sin and Kwun Tong) (1 084 600) – 5 seats</p> <p><b>NTW</b> (Tsuen Wan, Tuen Mun, Kwai Tsing and Islands) (1 471 000) – 6 seats</p> <p><b>NTE</b> (Tai Po, Sha Tin and Sai Kung) (1 461 100) – 7 seats</p> <p><b>New Territories North</b> (Yuen Long and North) (943 900) – 5 seats</p>	
9	1	1	Proposes to combine the existing 5 GCs into 1 GC.	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
10	-	1	Considers that the whole territory should be delineated into 6 instead of 5 GCs.	
11	1	-	Objects to the splitting of GCs.	
<b>Number of seats</b>				
12	1	-	<p>(a) Proposes to increase the number of GC seats to 40 with the following distribution:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">HKI - 8 seats KW - 7 seats KE - 7 seats NTW - 9 seats NTE - 9 seats</p> <p>(b) Proposes to increase the number of seats in Functional Constituencies to 40.</p>	<p><u>Items (12) - (14)</u></p> <p>The proposal to increase the total number of seats in GCs and Functional Constituencies involves amendment to Annex II to the Basic Law and LCO. Other proposals also involve amendment to LCO, which falls outside the EAC's purview. The EAC has referred these views to the CMAB for reference.</p>
13	1	-	Opposes to the allocation of seats among the GCs in the EAC's provisional recommendations and considers that the EAC should put forward to the Government proposal to amend the existing provision which stipulates that the number of Members to be returned for each GC should not be greater than 9.	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
14	-	4	<p>Propose that NTW should be allocated with 10 seats. The reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the entitled number of seats of NTW reaches 9.97 after the calculation in Step One. If the population of each GC should be as near as practicable to the resulting number, 10 seats should be allocated to NTW;</li> <li>• the percentage deviation of the population from the resulting number of GCs can be minimised if the upper limit of the number of seats for each GC is increased to 10. Owing to the existing statutory limit, the residents of NTW were short of one Member to provide service for them for eight consecutive years. The EAC should request the Administration to amend the relevant provision;</li> <li>• although the percentage deviation of the population from the resulting number of individual GC is not more than the statutory permissible range of 15% under the EAC's provisional recommendations, there is a large difference between the percentages of deviation from the resulting number of</li> </ul>	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<p>NTW (+10.82%) and KW (-9.63%). The percentage of deviation of NTW can be improved if 10 seats can be allocated to it; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• due to the statutory limit, only 9 seats can be allocated to NTW. This does not comply with the principles of equal right and universal suffrage.</li> </ul>	
15	2	2	<p>Consider that the number of seats allocated to each GC should remain unchanged. The reasons are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an increase or decrease in the number of seats allocated to a GC will have a significant implication on the GC. Under the provisional recommendations, HKI will be reduced by 1 seat as compared with the delineation exercise in 2012 while KW will be allocated one more seat. Even if HKI is to retain the existing 7 seats, its percentage deviation of the population from the resulting number will still fall within the statutory permissible range. Therefore, it is not necessary for HKI to be reduced by 1 seat; and</li> </ul>	<p>The proposals are <b>not accepted</b> because seats are allocated having regard to the projected population of the proposed GCs. The EAC's provisional recommendations has adopted the option which gives the smallest range of the percentage deviations of the population from the resulting number in the individual GCs with a view to ensuring that the population in each proposed GC is as near as practicable to the resulting number as required under section 20(1)(a) of the EACO.</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>given that the number of Members to be returned for all GCs in the 2016 LegCo General Election remains unchanged, the number of seats allocated to each GC should also be maintained.</li> </ul>	
16	-	1	Proposes that the number of seats allocated to each GC should be the same.	<p>The proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) given that the population is unevenly distributed among the existing 5 GCs, substantial changes on the boundaries of the existing GCs will be required if on one hand, the 35 seats have to be distributed evenly among the GCs and on the other hand, the existing statutory criteria concerning the percentage of deviation from the resulting number of GC is to be complied with. The changes will cause unnecessary confusion to electors in the coming election;</p> <p>(ii) the existing legislation does not require that the seats should be equally allocated; and</p> <p>(iii) please see item (15).</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views*</i>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
<b>Percentage of deviation from the resulting number</b>				
17	-	1	Proposes to amend the upper and lower limits of the percentage deviation of a GC's population from the resulting number (i.e. +/-15%) to a smaller range. The current upper and lower limits were enacted in 1998 when there were only 20 seats to be returned for 5 GCs. As the number of seats has been increased to 35, the statutory upper and lower limits of the percentage of deviation should be reduced.	This proposal involves amendment to EACO which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred this view to the CMAB for reference.
<b>Others</b>				
18	-	1	Considers that although the allocation of seats to each GC is calculated by the population quota (i.e. 210 586), there is a difference of over 300 000 population between some GCs making the size of population that a LegCo seat served varies largely between GCs. For example, a candidate of KE has to obtain 20% of the valid votes so as to secure a seat while candidates of other GCs will only need to obtain about 8-10% of the valid votes. This will possibly cause unfairness in the election.	<u>Items (18) and (19)</u> The EAC has adhered to the statutory requirements stipulated in the LCO, the statutory criteria of the EACO and the EAC's established working principles in drawing up the proposals in the delineation exercise. The existing practice ensures that the population in each GC is as near as practicable to the resulting number making the number of persons represented by a LegCo seat nearly the same.



<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No. of Views</i> <sup>*</sup>		<i>Views</i>	<i>EAC's views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
19	1	-	Considers that the EAC should ensure that the population in each proposed GC is as near as practicable to the resulting number.	
20	1	-	Considers that the EAC should not maintain the existing boundaries of the 5 GCs based on irrelevant and unconvincing reasons, such as voting habit of the electors. Besides, the delineation exercise should not be intervened by the Government.	The EAC should adhere to all the statutory requirements, relevant criteria and the established working principles in drawing up the proposals in the delineation exercise. The EAC will not consider factors with political implications.
21	-	1	Considers that the coverage of the New Territories area is very large so the Members cannot take care of all residents in the area. Proposes that the EAC should take into account factors relating to candidates and residents in the delineation exercise so as to facilitate the LegCo Members in providing better services to residents in the districts.	The delineation proposals must be drawn up on the basis of the statutory requirements and objective data of the population distribution. The provision of services by the LegCo Members is not a relevant factor of consideration.