

ABSTRACT

The legislation to implement Article 23 of the Basic Law, which concerns the prohibition of crimes against national security, was among the most controversial issues since the reunification of HKSAR and MSAR with the PRC. Reporting styles varied and media coverage was detected with great differences. This study analyzed journalistic narratives of four newspapers – *Wen Wei Po* and *Apple Daily* from Hong Kong, *Macao Daily News* from Macao, and *People's Daily* from China and examined how these newspapers had framed Article 23 differently. A total of 231 news articles from 2000 to 2009 were content analyzed.

Results showed that *Wen Wei Po*, *Macao Daily News* and *People's Daily* reported Article 23 by the SARs' Duty Frame, Nationalism Frame and Procedural Frame while *Apple Daily* by Suppression of Freedom of Speech Frame, Individualism Frame and Debates Frame most common. Meanwhile, *Macao Daily News* was shown to be a more pro-China newspaper than the *Wen Wei Po* on the issue over Article 23; *People's Daily*, the mouthpiece of the PRC, did not totally framed Article 23 the most obvious among the three pro-China newspapers as hypothesized. Furthermore, these four newspapers framed Article 23 relatively constant within these nine years; and the four newspapers simultaneously framed Article 23 most obvious when Macao's legislation took turns.