

**Summary of Written/Oral Representations**

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
<b>Number of Geographical Constituencies (“GCs”)</b>				
1	1	-	Supports the Electoral Affairs Commission’s (“EAC”) provisional recommendations on maintaining the existing boundaries of the 5 GCs.	The supporting view is noted.
2	4	-	<p>(a) Propose to add a GC named “New Territories North” in the New Territories. Reasons provided by each representation are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the seats for New Territories West (“NTW”) GC is perennially insufficient. The percentage deviation of the population from the resulting number for NTW GC has long been high, and it reaches as high as +11.90% under the present delineation. The current mechanism is unfair to the electors concerned;</li> <li>● New Territories East (“NTE”) and NTW GCs are too large in area. The Legislative Council (“LegCo”) candidates or Members of the GCs</li> </ul>	<p><u>Items (a) to (d)</u> These proposals are <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) according to the requirement of the Legislative Council Ordinance (Chapter 542) (“LCO”), there are to be 5 GCs for the purpose of returning Members for the 2020 LegCo General Election. This requirement is a statutory pre-condition for the EAC, as to which the EAC must strictly adhere and has no authority to make any variation. Under the circumstance that there is no increase in the number of GCs under the law, the EAC cannot add 1 GC to the New Territories;</p> <p>(ii) regarding the delineation of GC boundaries for the 2020 LegCo General Election, in accordance with the calculation based</p>

\* W: Number of written representations.

O: Number of oral representations.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<p>concerned need to spend much time on reaching out to different places in the GCs due to their large size. It is also difficult for them to focus on their services, and let electors get to know them;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the northernmost parts of Hong Kong (such as Fanling, Sheung Shui, Lok Ma Chau and San Tin, etc.) are currently delineated into either NTE or NTW GC. The names and coverage of the GCs are inconsistent with the actual geographical situation;</li> <li>it is not reasonable for both the New Territories and Kowloon to have 2 GCs as the former is much larger in area than the latter; and</li> <li>it is considered more appropriate to add a new GC than to transfer administrative districts in existing GCs because the transfer of one of the administrative districts (such as the Kwai Tsing, Tsuen Wan, Islands or Yuen Long Districts) from NTW GC to another GC cannot</li> </ul>	<p>on the latest projected population figures, the percentage deviations of the projected population from the resulting number of the existing 5 GCs are all within the 15% permissible range stipulated under section 20(1)(b) of the Electoral Affairs Commission Ordinance (Chapter 541) (“EACO”). According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not necessary; and</p> <p>(iii) the delineation recommendations must be based on the statutory requirements and objective data of projected population. The daily operation of LegCo Members in the GCs is not a relevant factor of consideration.</p> <p>As the proposals made in the representations involve amendment to the LCO, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC, the EAC has referred the relevant views to the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau (“CMAB”) for consideration.</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<p>reflect the local livelihood and social characteristics of the above administrative districts accurately.</p>	
			<p>(b) One of the representations proposes to transfer the Tuen Mun and Yuen Long Districts of NTW GC and the North and Tai Po Districts of NTE GC to the new GC named “New Territories North” so as to better reflect the local livelihood and social characteristics of the above administrative districts.</p>	
			<p>(c) One of the representations proposes to transfer the Yuen Long District of NTW GC and the North and Tai Po Districts (except the Sai Kung North Constituency) of NTE GC to the new GC named “New Territories North”. Besides, it proposes to transfer District Council Constituency Area (“DCCA”) of the Islands District (the Lamma &amp; Po Toi Constituency) from NTW GC to Hong Kong Island (“HKI”) GC while the Sai Kung North Constituency which currently belongs to the Tai Po District should</p>	

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<p>remain in NTE GC. The above proposal will lead to a more balanced distribution of population and seats among the new GC of "New Territories North" and the other 5 GCs, and a more logical GC delineation.</p> <p>(d) One of the representations proposes to transfer the Yuen Long District of NTW GC and the North District of NTE GC to the new GC named "New Territories North".</p>	
3	1	-	<p>(a) Since the size of HKI is larger than that of Kowloon, proposes to delineate HKI into 3 GCs by the name of, for instance, "Hong Kong Island East", "Hong Kong Island West" and "Hong Kong Island South".</p> <p>(b) Proposes that the Islands District should form an individual GC. Reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the area of NTW GC is too large;</li> <li>● the Islands District is very different from other administrative districts of NTW GC in terms of living environment, facilities,</li> </ul>	<p><u>Items (a) and (b)</u> These proposals are <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) according to the requirement of the LCO, there are to be 5 GCs for the purpose of returning Members for the 2020 LegCo General Election. This requirement is a statutory pre-condition for the EAC, as to which the EAC must strictly adhere and has no authority to make any variation. Under the circumstance that there is no addition to the number of GCs under the law, the EAC cannot add 2 GCs to HKI or 1 GC to the Islands District; and</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<p>transport and background of the population. Besides, some LegCo Members of NTW GC are not living in the Islands District and do not have a good understanding of the needs of the residents in the Islands District. They are therefore not qualified to represent the electors of the Islands District; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Islands District has fewer residents than other places in NTW GC. The LegCo Members concerned will not spend much time in taking care of the needs of the residents in the Islands District.</li> </ul>	<p>(ii) please see views (ii) and (iii) under item 2.</p> <p>As the proposals made in the representation involve amendment to the LCO, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC, the EAC has referred the relevant views to the CMAB for consideration.</p>
4	2	1	<p>Propose that the whole territory of Hong Kong should be designated as one single GC for returning Members for all the 35 GC seats. One of the representations provides the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the area of Hong Kong is not large. Electors should choose all the LegCo Members whom are deemed suitable; and</li> <li>LegCo Members should represent all members of the</li> </ul>	<p>The proposal made in the representations is related to the enactment of the primary legislation, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred the relevant view to the CMAB for consideration.</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			public in Hong Kong, and should not be elected by electors of individual GCs.	
5	-	2	<p>(a) The representations consider that NTW GC covers a large area, and its percentage deviation of the population from the resulting number is high and near +12%. In the anticipation that the population of NTW GC will increase further, they propose that the Government should rectify the problem of insufficient seats for NTW GC as soon as possible. The review should commence upon the conclusion of the 2020 LegCo General Election so that the relevant work can be completed by 2020 or 2021, with a view to facilitating those who have intention to stand at the election to plan in advance the relevant preparatory work.</p> <p>(b) One of the representations proposes an increase in the number of GCs to solve the problem of insufficient seats for NTW GC, and considers that a delay in the review on whether or not to increase the number of GCs until 2022 or 2023 is infeasible.</p>	<p><u>Items (a) and (b)</u> The proposals made in the representations are related to the enactment of the primary legislation, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred the relevant views to the CMAB for consideration.</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
<b>Number of seats</b>				
6	2	-	Support the EAC's provisional recommendations on maintaining the number of seats allocated to each GC unchanged.	The supporting views are noted.
7	1	-	(a) Agrees in principle with the EAC's provisional recommendations as it is understood that the EAC is required to comply with various statutory provisions and criteria in conducting the delineation exercise, and hence, there is very limited room for adjustment. The representation also agrees with the current calculation method for allocating seats to each GC and the rationale behind (i.e. the "principle of equal representation" which enables the number of people represented by each seat of the LegCo GCs be roughly the same on average).	<u>Item (a)</u> The view is noted.
			(b) The EAC can only allocate 9 seats to NTW GC in view of the statutory upper limit of seats even though it should be entitled to 10 seats. This reflects the failure of the existing legislation in keeping up with the actual situation and hence imposed restrictions on the EAC's	<u>Item (b)</u> The proposal made in the representation is related to the enactment of the primary legislation, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred the relevant view to the CMAB for consideration.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			work in delineating GC boundaries. Such situation is considered undesirable. Proposes to revise the LCO to increase the upper limit of seats for each GC to 10 in the next LegCo general election.	
8	-	1	Proposes that the Government should revise the existing requirement of returning no more than 9 Members for each GC, with a view to allowing 10 seats be allocated to NTW GC.	The proposal made in the representation is related to the enactment of the primary legislation, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred the relevant view to the CMAB for consideration.
9	1	-	<p>Proposes to add 10 seats to the LegCo bringing the total number of seats to 80, and to create a new GC named "Islands" and two new functional constituencies ("FCs"), namely Sports FC and Landscape FC. The allocation of the newly-added seats is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● "Islands" GC: 3 seats;</li> <li>● Sports FC: 1 seat;</li> <li>● Landscape FC: 1 seat;</li> <li>● NTW GC: 1 seat;</li> <li>● Kowloon East ("KE") GC: 1 seat;</li> <li>● District Council ("DC") (First) FC: 2 seats; and</li> </ul>	The proposal made in the representation is related to Annex II to the Basic Law and provisions of the primary legislation, which do not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred the relevant view to the CMAB for consideration.



<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DC (Second) FC: 1 seat.</li> </ul>	
<b>Working principles</b>				
10	1	-	<p>Although understands that the EAC has no authority to revise the statutory criteria for delineating GC boundaries, hopes that the EAC or the Government will look into the following issues in details in future for long term planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• although it is understood that one of the EAC's established working principles is to treat HKI, Kowloon and the New Territories separately, given the rapid urban development, the boundaries of many areas have become increasingly unclear, and the delineation in the early years has failed to keep up with the changing need of the community. For instance, Stonecutters Island, once a small island, has been connected to the nearby land after reclamation works in recent years. Due to the constrains of the delineation of administrative districts in the early years, Stonecutters Island currently spans over the Sham Shui Po and Kwai Tsing Districts, but not entirely belongs to the nearest Sham Shui Po District. This greatly increases the cost of district</li> </ul>	<p>(i) While the EAC agrees that on-going development in community infrastructure and transport network may increase connections of HKI, Kowloon and the New Territories, in particular their bordering areas, the EAC also notes that the boundaries and names of the existing GCs were drawn up according to the relevant working principle in the first LegCo general election in 1998 and have been used since then. Members of the public are already used to the conventional division of HKI, Kowloon and the New Territories as three distinct components. In this connection, the EAC considers that HKI, Kowloon and the New Territories should be treated separately as far as possible having regard to the statutory criteria under the EACO (in particular the percentage deviations of the projected population from the resulting number of the GCs are all within the 15% statutory permissible range); and</p> <p>(ii) the proposal made in the representation to put the</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<p>administration in the Kwai Tsing District; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Kwai Tsing District should be transferred to a GC in Kowloon. Many electors of the Kwai Tsing District have regarded Kwai Chung as an extension of Kowloon West (“KW”) GC. Most residents would not consider that there is an obvious difference between the surrounding area of the Kwai Tsing District and Kowloon. Therefore, geographically speaking, there would be no big problem to transfer the Kwai Tsing District to a GC in Kowloon.</li> </ul>	<p>entire Stonecutters Island into the Sham Shui Po District involves changing of boundaries of administrative districts, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred this view to the Government for consideration.</p>
11	-	1	<p>Considers that treating HKI, Kowloon and the New Territories separately is only a working principle of the EAC but not a statutory requirement. In view of the growing population of NTW and KE GCs, proposes to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>transfer part of the Islands District (with the population) to HKI GC; and</li> <li>transfer those parts of KE GC which is geographically close to KW GC (with the population) to KW GC.</li> </ul>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) according to the EACO, the delineation exercise must be conducted on the basis of the projected populations of individual GCs in the year in which the election is to be held. Regarding the delineation of GC boundaries for the 2020 LegCo General Election, in accordance with the calculation based on the latest projected population figures, the percentage deviations of the projected population from the resulting number</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
				<p>of the existing 5 GCs are all within the 15% permissible range stipulated under section 20(1)(b) of the EACO. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not necessary; and</p> <p>(ii) please see view (i) under item 10.</p>
12	-	1	<p>Objects to the working principle of treating HKI, Kowloon and the New Territories separately due to the continuous decrease in HKI's population and the continuous population growth in the New Territories. Under such circumstances, some areas in the New Territories should be transferred to HKI GC, rather than creating the new "New Territories North" GC.</p>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:</p> <p>(i) regarding the delineation of GC boundaries for the 2020 LegCo General Election, in accordance with the calculation based on the latest projected population figures, the percentage deviations of the projected population from the resulting number of the existing 5 GCs are all within the 15% permissible range stipulated under section 20(1)(b) of the EACO. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries is not necessary; and</p> <p>(ii) please see view (i) under item 10.</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
13	-	1	Considers that apart from the projected population, the EAC should also take the community integrity, in particular the transport network into account when conducting the delineation exercise.	The view is noted. The EAC conducts the delineation exercise in accordance with all relevant statutory provisions and criteria as well as established working principles, in which the EACO stipulates that apart from taking into account the projected population, the EAC shall also have regard to other statutory factors, including community identities, preservation of local ties and physical features (such as size, shape, accessibility and development) of the relevant area. Therefore, under the EAC's delineation recommendations, the GCs are all along composed of entire administrative districts and there would be no splitting of DCCAs in an administrative district.
<b>Others</b>				
<b>(I) Legislative amendments</b>				
14	1	2	<p>The representations raise views on the statutory permissible range of deviation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>one of the representations states that the percentage deviation of the population from the resulting number is near +12% for NTW GC and near -6% for NTE GC. The two GCs differ in population by about 350 000 but are both allocated with 9 seats. It is doubtful whether the</li> </ul>	The views made in the representations are related to the enactment of the primary legislation, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred the relevant views to the CMAB for consideration.

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<p>existing 15% permissible range of deviation is still appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• one of the representations considers that the existing 15% permissible range of deviation has provided adequate flexibility for the delineation exercise. The Government should not relax this restriction easily.</li> <li>• one of the representations considers the existing statutory permissible range of the percentage deviation of the population from the resulting number of 15% is appropriate. Nevertheless, as a result of the Government's development, the population in some areas of the New Territories (such as Kwu Tung North and Fanling North, etc.) will increase in the long run. In view of this, the Government should be forward-looking and review the legislation relating to the delineation so as to tie in with the latest demographic situation in individual GCs.</li> </ul>	
15	1	-	<p>Requests the EAC to urge the Government to revise the LCO and repeal the largest remainders formula of "Hare quota" adopted for allocation of the elected GC seats and DC (Second) FC seats. Instead,</p>	<p>The proposal made in the representation is related to the electoral system, involving provisions of the LCO, which does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred the relevant view to the</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			the “d’Hondt method” or the “Droop quota” should be adopted to avoid the significant wastage of votes cast and minimise the fragmentation of the LegCo caused by multiple minority parties.	CMAB for consideration.
16	-	1	(a) Considers that the Lok Ma Chau Loop is part of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. However, the Lok Ma Chau Loop is not included in the area of NTW or NTE GC as shown in the maps of the EAC’s provisional recommendations on GC boundaries.	<p><u>Item (a)</u> Regarding the boundaries and names of GCs for the 2020 LegCo General Election, the EAC must follow sections 18 and 19 of the LCO, and the statutory criteria stipulated under section 20 of the EACO in drawing up the recommendations. Amongst which, section 20 of the EACO stipulates that the EAC shall have regard to the existing boundaries of the administrative districts and existing boundaries of GCs. Since the Lok Ma Chau Loop does not fall within the areas of the existing boundaries of the administrative districts as specified under the District Councils Ordinance (Chapter 547) (“DCO”), the Lok Ma Chau Loop is not included in the provisional recommendations.</p>
			(b) Enquires about the responsible party for delineating the boundaries of administrative districts and whether the EAC will include the Lok Ma Chau	<p><u>Item (b)</u> The statutory functions of the EAC include considering or reviewing the boundaries of LegCo GCs, but not delineating the areas of administrative</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			Loop in any of the GCs if there is a change to the boundaries of the administrative districts in the 2023 DC Ordinary Election.	districts, which is under the purview of the Government.  In drawing up the provisional recommendations, the EAC must, in accordance with the requirements of the EACO, give regard to the existing boundaries of administrative districts. The EAC will continue to adhere to the relevant legislation in future delineation exercises.
17	-	1	Suggests that the Government should revise the electoral systems and fully implement direct GC elections in future LegCo elections.	The suggestion made in the representation is related to Annex II to the Basic Law and provisions of the primary legislation, which do not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred the relevant view to the CMAB for consideration.
18	-	1	Proposes to delineate a new administrative district at the Tseung Kwan O New Town of the Sai Kung District in the delineation exercises for future DC ordinary elections. In addition, proposes to transfer Ma On Shan from the Sha Tin District to the Sai Kung District to reflect the existing community environment and flow of residents.	The proposal made in the representation involves changing of the number and boundaries of administrative districts, which do not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred this view to the Government for consideration.
<b><i>(II) Adjustment of GC boundaries</i></b>				
19	1	-	Proposes to transfer islands, other than Lantau Island or islands to the east of Lantau Island of the Islands District	This proposal is <b>not accepted</b> because:

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<p>from NTW GC to HKI GC, and put the aforementioned islands in the Central &amp; Western DC. Reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the percentage deviations of the population for both NTW and HKI GCs will be smaller under this proposal than that in the provisional recommendations;</li> <li>• the islands proposed to be transferred are isolated from NTW GC geographically and have no actual ties with the GC. In contrast, they are closely connected with HKI, especially in terms of transport;</li> <li>• there are precedents for transferring part of an administrative district to another administrative district. Taking the delineation of constituency boundaries of DC ordinary elections as an example, the EAC would also split or merge DCCAs in accordance with changes in population and transfer DC seat from one administrative district to another one; and</li> <li>• the population structure of those islands is relatively stable. If they are transferred to HKI GC, where the planning is</li> </ul>	<p>(i) regarding the delineation of GC boundaries for the 2020 LegCo General Election, in accordance with the calculation based on the latest projected population figures, the percentage deviations of the projected population from the resulting number of the existing 5 GCs are all within the 15% permissible range stipulated under section 20(1)(b) of the EACO. According to the established working principles, adjustment to their existing boundaries will not be necessary;</p> <p>(ii) the boundaries of the existing 5 GCs have come into existence since the first LegCo general election in 1998. These GCs are all along composed of entire administrative districts. This is also in line with the EAC's established working principles (in particular the percentage deviations of the projected population from the resulting number of the GCs are all within the 15% statutory permissible range);</p> <p>(iii) regarding the constituency boundaries for DC ordinary elections, in</p>



<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<p>mature, further adjustment to GC boundaries due to changes in population distribution in the future can be avoided.</p>	<p>drawing up the provisional recommendations, the EAC must follow the number of elected seats stipulated for each DC under the DCO and delineate the same number of DCCAs within the existing boundaries of the administrative districts. The EAC has no power to increase or reduce the number of DCCAs in any administrative districts. Similarly, the EAC may not transfer the new seats and DCCAs approved for a certain administrative district to another administrative district;</p> <p>(iv) all along, for LegCo general elections, the latest projected population figures as at 30 June of the election year are adopted for the delineation exercise in accordance with the established practice. Developments thereafter will not be taken into consideration; and</p> <p>(v) changing of boundaries of administrative districts does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred this view to the Government for consideration.</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
20	1	-	<p>Proposes to transfer Tseung Kwan O from NTE GC to KE GC. Reasons are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tseung Kwan O is similar to Kowloon in terms of development. In geographical location, it is also closer to Yau Tong and Lam Tin of KE GC; and</li> <li>• Tseung Kwan O is under the Kowloon East Police Region.</li> </ul>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b>. Please see views (i) and (ii) under item 19.</p>
21	-	1	<p>In view of the growing population in NTW GC, proposes to merge KE and KW GCs into 1 GC so as to free up a GC for creation in the New Territories.</p>	<p>This proposal is <b>not accepted</b>. Please see view (i) under item 19.</p>
<b><i>(III) Matters not relating to the present consultation</i></b>				
22	-	1	<p>Raises the following views regarding the GC boundaries for the 2024 LegCo General Election:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• objects to grouping the North, Yuen Long and Tuen Mun Districts to form a new GC named “New Territories North”. This is because the surrounding areas of the Sha Tin District or Kowloon, rather than the Yuen Long or Tuen Mun Districts, are the main areas of activity for residents of the North District;</li> </ul>	<p>(i) In drawing up the provisional recommendations, the EAC must strictly adhere to the statutory provisions under sections 18 and 19 of the LCO, the statutory criteria under section 20 of the EACO and the established working principles. The delineation should be made on the basis of the projected populations. The EAC will continue to adhere to the relevant legislation in future delineation exercises; and</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in view of the growing population in NTW GC, proposes to transfer Tsing Chau Tsai Peninsula and Disneyland or Ma Wan from the Tsuen Wan District to the Islands District in the delineation exercise for the 2023 DC Ordinary Election. Afterwards, to transfer the Islands District from NTW GC to HKI GC in the delineation exercise for the 2024 LegCo General Election; and</li> <li>• proposes to transfer the Sai Kung District from NTE GC to HKI GC if the population continues to drop in HKI GC but grow in Tseung Kwan O New Town of the Sai Kung District.</li> </ul>	(ii) changing of boundaries of administrative districts does not fall under the purview of the EAC. The EAC has referred this view to the Government for consideration.
23	1	1	<p>(a) Proposes to put Tak Bo Garden, Wang Kwong Building, Lee Kee Building and Amoy Gardens of the Kwun Tong District into the same DCCA.</p> <p>(b) Worries that the present public consultation on the delineation of GCs may have an impact on the 2019 DC Ordinary Election, and considers that the EAC has only taken into account population figures but not</p>	<p><u>Items (a) and (b)</u> The present public consultation concerns the provisional recommendations on the boundaries and names of GCs for the 2020 LegCo General Election drawn up by the EAC for submission of the final recommendations to the Chief Executive in accordance with the requirements of the EACO. The delineation of constituency boundaries for DC ordinary elections is outside the scope of the present consultation.</p>

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>No.*</i>		<i>Representations</i>	<i>EAC's Views</i>
	<i>W</i>	<i>O</i>		
			<p>other factors such as geographical and environmental issues when delineating the DCCAs. Taking On Tat Estate in Kwun Tong as an example, two of its 11 blocks (i.e. Oi Tat House and Shing Tat House) are delineated in the Sau Mau Ping Central Constituency, while the remaining nine blocks are delineated in the Po Tat Constituency. This makes it difficult for candidates representing On Tat Estate to be elected in future elections.</p>	