

香港特別行政區
立法會
議事規則委員會

**Committee on Rules of Procedure
of the Legislative Council
of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region**

2004 年 10 月至 2005 年 6 月的工作進度報告

**Progress Report for the period
October 2004 to June 2005**

**2005 年 7 月 6 日
6 July 2005**

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1.	Introduction	1
2.	Review of the procedural arrangements of the Council	2
—	Procedure for debate on the Policy Address	2
—	Members' attire during the Legislative Council meetings	4
—	Withdrawal of bills under the Rules of Procedure and the House Rules	6
3.	Review of the procedures and working mechanism of committees of the Council	8
—	Ringling of bell to notify members that voting will take place at committee meetings	8
—	Handbooks for chairmen of committees	9
—	Extending the duration of committee meetings	10
—	Voting rights of chairman of a committee/subcommittee	12
—	Formation of a subcommittee under two or more Panels	15
4.	Acknowledgement	17

Appendix

I. Membership list

II. List of issues studied by the Committee on Rules of Procedure during the 2004-2005 Legislative Council session (as at 30 June 2005)

1. Introduction

1.1 The Committee on Rules of Procedure (CRoP) is a committee of the Legislative Council (LegCo) established under Rule 74 of the Rules of Procedure of the Council. The functions of CRoP are to review the Rules of Procedure (RoP) of the Council and the committee system, propose to the Council any amendments or changes as are considered necessary, and examine matters of practice and procedure relating to the Council referred by the Council or its committees or the President, or raised by its own members.

1.2 CRoP consists of 12 members, including the Chairman Hon Jasper TSANG Yok-sing, the Deputy Chairman Hon Margaret NG and 10 other members. They were appointed by the President in accordance with the recommendations of the House Committee (HC). The membership list is in **Appendix I**.

1.3 This report covers the period from October 2004 to June 2005, during which a total of five CRoP meetings were held to study a wide range of issues under the following categories:

- (a) review of the procedural arrangements of the Council; and
- (b) review of the procedures and working mechanism of committees of the Council.

A complete list of the issues studied by the Committee in the current session up to 30 June 2005 is in **Appendix II**.

2. Review of the procedural arrangements of the Council

2.1 In the report period, CRoP examined a number of procedural issues, which included:

- (a) procedure for debate on the Policy Address;
- (b) Members' attire during LegCo meetings; and
- (c) withdrawal of bills under RoP and the House Rules (HR).

Procedure for debate on the Policy Address

2.2 Having considered Members' views, CRoP recommended to HC that the arrangements for the debate on the 2004 Policy Address should be adopted for the debate on the 2005 Policy Address (the Debate), subject to adjustments concerning the Council meeting time and the speaking time limit for Members. In this connection, three options on Members' speaking time limit and the ending time of each day of the Debate were proposed by CRoP for consideration by HC. HC endorsed CRoP's recommendations and selected one of the proposed options. The endorsed arrangements for the Debate were as follows:

- (a) the Debate should adopt the "3-day-5-session" format, i.e. a total of five debate sessions should be held on three consecutive days. Each debate session should be devoted to one group of policy areas. The number of debate sessions in each day should depend on the length of the debate on each group of policy areas. The grouping of policy areas should be agreed between the Administration and HC;
- (b) policy briefings for Panels should be held after the delivery of the 2005 Policy Address and before the commencement of the Debate;

- (c) the first day of the Debate should start at 2:30 pm and end at around 10:30 pm. For the other two days, the starting time should be 9:00 am and the ending time should be around 7:30 pm. Subject to the President's discretion, the scheduled ending time for each day might be extended for about 30 minutes where necessary. Meal breaks should not be provided on any of the three days;
- (d) the total speaking time limit for a Member in the five debate sessions should be 25 minutes. Provided that no Member might speak after the designated public officers had spoken, each Member should be allowed to speak once in each session of the Debate;
- (e) the HC Chairman might speak for more than once in the fifth session on the amendment(s), if any, and in reply respectively. The HC Chairman, as mover of the motion for the Debate, should have an additional 15-minute speaking time for moving the motion and in reply. If there was/were amendment(s) to the motion, another five minutes to speak on the amendment(s) should be allowed;
- (f) after Members' speeches in each session, there should be a 10-minute suspension of the Council meeting for the Administration to coordinate its response;
- (g) the total speaking time limit for designated public officers in each debate session should be -
 - (i) for one or two officers, each officer might speak for not less than 15 minutes, subject to the total speaking time limit of 45 minutes. Under this arrangement, where two officers were to speak, the officer speaking first should not speak for more than 30 minutes, leaving at least 15 minutes for the other officer. Subject to such a restriction, it should be up to the officers to determine their order of speaking and their respective actual speaking time; and
 - (ii) for three or more officers, it should be calculated on the basis of 15-minute speaking time limit for each officer; and
- (h) the timing and manner in which the Policy Address-related

publications were released, as decided by the Administration, should not cause inconvenience to Members.

2.3 The above arrangements were adopted for the debate on the 2005 Policy Address which lasted for three days from 26 to 28 January 2005.

Members' attire during LegCo meetings

2.4 At the President's invitation, CRoP studied whether more detailed requirements needed to be provided in Rule 42(a) of RoP, which provided that during a meeting of the Council, all Members should enter or leave the Council properly attired and with decorum, including what constituted proper attire and how failure by Members to observe such requirements should be handled.

Proper attire at Council meetings

2.5 Having considered the practice and convention of LegCo and other legislatures regarding Members' attire, CRoP was of the view that it was impossible to exhaust all possible cases of improper attire. CRoP also considered that:

- (a) there was no need to amend Rule 42(a) of RoP;
- (b) in view of the change of times, T-shirts and sweat shirts, which were the types of clothing regarded as improper attire for Council meetings in the circular issued in October 2003 by the Clerk to LegCo, should no longer be regarded as improper attire;
- (c) there was no need to stipulate penalties or sanctions for non-compliance with the relevant requirement; and
- (d) if the President considered a Member's attire to be extremely improper and the Member ignored the President's advice, the President might regard the Member as behaving in a grossly disorderly manner. The President could deal with the situation in accordance with Rule 45(2) of RoP and order the Member to withdraw immediately from the Council for the remainder of the meeting concerned.

Display of sign or message at Council meetings

2.6 CROp also considered the issue of whether Members should be subject to the same requirement as members of the public and be forbidden from displaying any sign or message, including that on clothing, when attending Council meetings.

2.7 Having considered the practice and convention of LegCo and other legislatures on the matter, CROp was of the view that:

- (a) there was no need to expressly provide that Members were not allowed to display at Council meetings any sign or message, including that on clothing; and
- (b) Rule 42(a) of RoP should be applicable to the handling of display of signs or messages, and there was no need to stipulate penalties or sanctions against Members who displayed improper signs or messages. If a Member displayed a sign or message the content of which was extremely improper, the President could regard him/her as behaving in a grossly disorderly manner and could deal with the situation in accordance with Rule 45(2) of RoP.

The President's response

2.8 CROp's above views were conveyed to the President. In response, the President stated that she fully respected the views expressed by CROp, and would act on the basis of its recommendations. The President also pointed out that as CROp was not able to set clear standards for proper attire, nor define the acceptable and unacceptable signs or messages on Members' clothing when attending meetings, she would deal with such matters only when a Member complained to her during a Council meeting about the improper attire of another Member present. However, if the Member under complaint ignored her advice, she would take no further action.

2.9 The President further stated that if a Member's attire or the sign/message on his/her clothing was alleged to be extremely improper, she would first consult the representatives of various parties and groupings in LegCo. If the consultation showed that the majority of Members agreed that such attire or sign/message should not be allowed, but the Member concerned insisted on ignoring the advice, she would then order the Member concerned to withdraw from the Council on grounds of grossly disorderly conduct under Rule 45(2) of RoP.

2.10 Copies of the correspondence between the CRoP Chairman and the President on the matter were issued to all LegCo Members for information on 14 January 2005.

Withdrawal of bills under RoP and HR

2.11 Part K of RoP prescribes five stages for processing a bill at Council meetings, i.e. (a) First Reading, (b) Second Reading (moving of Second Reading motion and debate adjourned), (c) Second Reading (debate resumed), (d) Committee Stage, and (e) Third Reading. Before Rule 64 of RoP was amended on 4 May 2005, it provided that “The Member or public officer in charge of a bill may, by announcement in Council at the beginning of proceedings for its second or third reading, withdraw or postpone the bill.” Under Rule 64 before its amendment, withdrawal of bills might take place only at the beginning of either stage (b) or (e).

2.12 At HC’s invitation, CRoP studied whether Rule 64 of RoP should be amended to facilitate the withdrawal of bills in other situations, such as that involving the National Security (Legislative Provisions) Bill which had gone through stages (a) and (b) at the time but did not proceed to stage (c) and beyond. After its review, CRoP proposed that Rule 64 and the other relevant provisions of RoP and HR should be revised along the following lines:

- (a) apart from withdrawal at the beginning of stages (b) and (e), bills might also be withdrawn at the beginning of stage (c) (Second Reading (debate resumed)), subject to the following:
 - (i) Rule 76(9) of RoP, which provided that a Bills Committee (BC) should, as soon as it had completed consideration of a bill allocated to it, notify HC and then report further to the Council;
 - (ii) the address by the Member presenting a BC report on the bill concerned should be made at the time when the report was laid on the Table of the Council under “Tabling of Papers” on the Agenda of the relevant Council meeting. The address would be subject to Rule 21(6) of RoP, which did not permit it to provoke a debate;
 - (iii) the announcement to withdraw the bill should be made

at the beginning of the resumption of the Second Reading debate. In making the announcement, the Member or public officer in charge of the bill might speak on matters relevant to the withdrawal, including the BC report; and

- (iv) on the two occasions mentioned in (ii) and (iii) above, other Members were not allowed to speak on the relevant BC report or bill;
- (b) such withdrawal should not be allowed for bills which had not gone through adjournment of debate at the beginning of its Second Reading process; and
- (c) in giving notice of the resumption of the Second Reading debate on a bill for the purpose of withdrawal, the Member or public officer in charge of the bill should state that the purpose of the resumption was for making an announcement for withdrawal of the bill.

2.13 In response to CRoP's invitation for comments on the proposed amendments to RoP and HR regarding withdrawal of bills, the Administration responded that the proposed procedure under the new Rule 64(2) of RoP would enable the Member/public officer to withdraw a bill at the resumption of the Second Reading debate on the bill. With this new procedure, the Administration noted that it would still remain a matter for the Member/public officer to decide whether he/she would resume the Second Reading debate on a bill for the purpose of withdrawing it. The Administration also noted that section 9(4) of the Legislative Council Ordinance, as reflected in Rule 11(4) of RoP, would not be affected by the new procedure, i.e. the consideration of any bill would lapse at the end of a Council term. With the above understanding, the Administration had no comments on the proposed amendments.

2.14 The proposed amendments to RoP and HR were endorsed by HC at its meeting on 15 April 2005. The proposed amendments to RoP as endorsed by HC were then passed by the Council at its meeting on 4 May 2005.

3. Review of the procedures and working mechanism of committees of the Council

3.1 In the report period, CRoP examined a number of issues relating to the procedures and working mechanism of committees of the Council, which included:

- (a) ringing of bell to notify members that voting will take place at committee meetings;
- (b) handbooks for chairmen of committees;
- (c) extending the duration of committee meetings;
- (d) voting rights of chairman of a committee/subcommittee; and
- (e) formation of a subcommittee under two or more Panels.

Ringing of bell to notify members that voting will take place at committee meetings

3.2 At HC's invitation, CRoP studied whether a bell should be rung to notify Members that voting would take place at committee meetings. CRoP considered that it was reasonable to notify all members of a committee who were in the LegCo Building by the ringing of a bell when a matter was to be put to vote at a meeting of the committee, so that those members who were temporarily absent might return to the meeting room in time to participate in the voting. CRoP therefore recommended that HR should be amended to specify such procedure, the details of which are as follows:

- (a) when a matter has to be voted upon during a meeting of a committee, a voting bell will be rung to notify members of the committee of the voting if the chairman so orders, on his own motion or upon request of any member of the committee. The committee will proceed to vote immediately after the bell has been rung for two minutes. This procedure will apply irrespective of whether a meeting is held in public or not;
- (b) if a committee meeting is held simultaneously with a

Council meeting, a voting bell for the committee will not be rung; and

- (c) in circumstances where no voting bell is provided for the venue where a committee meets, or if the bell does not function or may not be rung, the chairman of the committee concerned will order the clerk to arrange for members of the committee within the precincts of the Chamber to be notified of the voting. The voting will be held four minutes after the order has been made.

3.3 CRoP proposed that the above procedure should apply across the board to all committees of the Council, including the Finance Committee (FC), Establishment Subcommittee (ESC) and Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC). Subject to the agreement of FC, ESC and PWSC, their respective procedures would be amended accordingly.

3.4 CRoP also noted that at present, only the Chamber and Conference Room A were each equipped with a bell for summoning members to vote. Subject to HC's agreement to the procedure, the Secretariat would install voting bells in Conference Rooms B and C. The installation was expected to complete before the beginning of the next session. During the interim, committees holding meetings in the Chamber and Conference Room A could use the voting bells therein. To avoid confusion, CRoP recommended that simultaneous ringing of the voting bells in different meeting venues should not be facilitated.

3.5 CRoP's recommendations and the proposed amendments to HR were endorsed by HC at its meeting on 29 April 2005. FC, ESC and PWSC also amended their respective procedures on 27 May 2005 to put in place the procedure regarding the ringing of voting bell.

Handbooks for chairmen of committees

3.6 CRoP studied the suggestion that a handbook providing guidelines for committee chairmen should be prepared by the Secretariat. After deliberation, CRoP supported the suggestion and agreed that:

- (a) separate handbooks should be prepared for the Council's

various types of committees. Priority should be given to preparing the handbooks for chairmen of Panels, BCs and subcommittees on subsidiary legislation, as a greater number of Members were involved in chairing these committees/subcommittees;

- (b) the handbooks should provide quick reference to the relevant rules and practices as well as general guidelines to assist committee chairmen in understanding their responsibilities, powers and authority, and in making preparations for, chairing, and undertaking follow-up work flowing from meetings;
- (c) the handbooks should be written in a simple, easy to read and user-friendly style;
- (d) the handbooks should be updated as and when necessary; and
- (e) the practices set out in the handbooks should be for reference only.

3.7 Pursuant to CRoP's instruction, the Secretariat sought the views of all LegCo Members on a draft Handbook for Chairmen of Panels. At CRoP's recommendation, HC endorsed, at its meeting on 17 June 2005, the revised draft Handbook for Chairmen of Panels which had taken into account Members' views received. The Handbook for Chairmen of Bills Committees and Handbook for Chairmen of Subcommittees on Subsidiary Legislation are being prepared by the Secretariat and will be presented to CRoP for consideration in due course.

Extending the duration of committee meetings

3.8 At HC's invitation, CRoP studied whether some guidelines should be drawn up regarding how long a committee might continue to meet beyond the appointed ending time. Currently, neither RoP nor HR had any provision on extending the duration of committee meetings beyond the appointed ending time.

3.9 CRoP observed that, currently, members of a Panel, BC and

subcommittee were normally consulted on the agenda items for a meeting. In accordance with Rule 24(m) of HR, the chairman of a committee would, as far as practicable, decide beforehand the time allowed for each particular item on the agenda of each meeting. In deciding on the agenda items for a meeting and the duration of each item, the chairman and members of the committee concerned would normally consider whether the duration of the meeting was sufficient for dealing with all items on the agenda. If not, they would allow a longer time for discussing particular items and for the whole meeting. During the meeting, the chairman should have regard to the time allowed for each item, and remind members if necessary to avoid excessive overrun of committee meetings.

3.10 CRoP also observed that, generally speaking, Members did not find excessive overrun of a meeting desirable even if the meeting venue was still available. Some members might not be able to continue to attend a meeting which had overrun significantly due to other prior commitments. There might also be quorum problem for other meetings if some members were not able to participate in these meetings due to the excessive overrun of an earlier meeting. In addition, there might be members who were not able to attend a meeting during the appointed time but might be able to do so and wished to do so in an extended meeting. If the meeting was overrun excessively, these members might have strong feelings about not being alerted to an extension of the meeting and missing the opportunity to join the extended part of the meeting, particularly if a vote was taken on an issue.

3.11 On the other hand, it was appreciated that sometimes a committee might wish to continue the discussion of a matter although the discussion had to take place beyond the appointed ending time of a meeting. It seemed therefore necessary to allow flexibility for extending the duration of a committee meeting beyond the appointed ending time.

3.12 To strike a balance between maintaining discipline and allowing flexibility in the conduct of committee meetings, CRoP proposed to amend HR to provide for the procedure for extending the duration of the meeting of a committee beyond the appointed ending time. Under the new procedure:

- (a) the chairman of a committee may extend the duration of a meeting of the committee for not exceeding 15 minutes

beyond the appointed ending time. The meeting may be extended for a specified period beyond that 15-minute period, and further extended for a further specified period, if no member of the committee present at the meeting raises objection to the proposal (i.e. there is no dissenting voice);

- (b) the extension of a committee meeting for any period is subject to the availability of the meeting venue;
- (c) no new motion may be proposed during the period of the extension agreed to by the committee. However, if a motion has been proposed during the original appointed meeting time or the 15-minute period extended by the chairman but has not been dealt with, that motion may be disposed of during the period of the extension; and
- (d) the procedure for extending the duration of committee meetings will not apply to proceedings of the Council, HC, FC and its two subcommittees, i.e. ESC and PWSC.

3.13 CRoP is preparing the proposed amendments to HR with a view to implementing the procedure as soon as possible.

Voting rights of chairman of a committee/subcommittee

Current position

3.14 CRoP considered the issue of whether the chairman of a subcommittee formed under HC, a BC or a Panel should have both an original vote which is cast at the same time as other Members and a casting vote. Both RoP and HR are silent on the voting rights of the chairman of such a subcommittee.

3.15 In considering the above matter, CRoP observed that, currently, the voting rights of chairmen of the various committees of the Council varied, as set out below:

Provision of RoP	Committee	Original vote	Casting vote

Provision of RoP	Committee	Original vote	Casting vote
71(8)	FC	No	Yes
72(7)	Public Accounts Committee	No	Yes
73(5)	Committee on Members' Interests	Not specified in RoP	Yes
73A(9)	Investigation Committee	No	Yes
74(5)	CRoP	Not specified in RoP	Yes
75(16)	HC	No	Yes
76(8)	BC	Yes	Yes
77(13)	Panel	Yes	Yes
79(6)	Select Committee	No	Yes

3.16 After discussion, CRoP decided to:

- (a) study further whether, and if so how, the current voting rights of committee chairmen should be rationalized; and
- (b) make recommendations on the voting rights of the chairmen of subcommittees in the light of the outcome of the above study.

Convention in the exercise of the casting vote

3.17 CRoP also studied whether the chairmen of the above committees/subcommittees (if CRoP recommended that subcommittee chairmen should have a casting vote) should be required to exercise the casting vote by reference to the convention of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom (UK) Parliament. Under such convention, the exercise of the casting vote by the chairmen of committees/subcommittees is guided by the following three principles:

- (a) to provide an opportunity for further discussion, where this is possible, e.g. on the Question that a bill be read a second time, the chair would vote Aye, to enable the House of Commons to give further consideration to the bill at its later stages;

- (b) when no further discussion is possible, decisions should not be taken except by a majority, e.g. on the Question that a bill be read the third time, the chair would vote No, because there is no further opportunity for consideration by the House of Commons, and a majority has not been obtained; and
- (c) a casting vote on an amendment to a bill/motion should leave the bill/motion in its existing form. The chair would therefore vote against the amendment.

3.18 CRoP noted that in LegCo, the convention was already followed by the chairmen of FC, ESC and PWSC who, under the relevant provisions of the respective procedures of FC, ESC and PWSC, should not exercise the casting vote in such a way as to produce a majority vote in favour of the question put.

3.19 To assist it in making recommendation on the issues mentioned above, CRoP decided to first seek the views of all Members on:

- (a) whether the chairmen of the committees/subcommittees mentioned in paragraphs 3.14 and 3.15 above should have an original vote, a casting vote or both; and
- (b) whether the chairmen of the above committees/subcommittees (if CRoP recommended a casting vote for subcommittee chairmen) should be required to exercise the casting vote by reference to the convention mentioned in paragraph 3.17 above.

3.20 CRoP will consider the views collected at its meeting to be held on 4 July 2005, with a view to presenting its proposed amendments to RoP to HC for endorsement and then to the Council for approval at the beginning of the next LegCo session in October 2005.

Formation of a subcommittee under two or more Panels

3.21 At HC's invitation, CRoP considered whether the existing RoP and HR, which are silent on the formation of a subcommittee under two or more Panels, should be amended to allow the formation of such a subcommittee.

3.22 CRoP noted that under Rule 77(9) of RoP, a Panel might, if it considered appropriate, appoint subcommittees to study specific issues and to report to the Panel. Rule 22(s) of HR provided that members of such subcommittees should consist of members of that Panel.

3.23 CRoP also noted that under Rule 77(10) of RoP, a Panel or its subcommittee might, if it considered appropriate, meet jointly with any other Panel or its subcommittee for the purpose of considering any matter of common interest to the Panels. Rule 22(n) of HR set out the quorum requirement of such a joint meeting. Rule 22(l) of HR provided that, if the chairmen of two Panels could not agree on how an issue straddling the work of two Panels should be handled, the chairman of HC should be consulted on whether one of the Panels should take up the issue, or whether the Panels should hold joint meetings. Under Rule 22(m) of HR, if more than two Panels met jointly on a subject of common interest, and if it was necessary, the chairman of HC might be consulted as to whether the Panel having a prominent interest in the subject matter should convene a meeting with members of other interested Panels invited to attend, or whether informal briefings for all interested Members should be held.

3.24 In considering the matter, CRoP also studied the practice and convention of UK, New Zealand and the Province of Ontario in Canada regarding the setting up of a subcommittee under two or more committees.

3.25 Having considered the existing rules of the Council and the practice and convention of the above overseas legislatures, CRoP recommended that:

- (a) RoP and HR should be amended to expressly provide that two or more Panels may set up a subcommittee to study matters of common interest to the Panels;

- (b) subject to the provisions of RoP and HR, the terms of reference and the practice and procedure of the subcommittee should be approved by all the relevant Panels. Its report should be submitted to all the relevant Panels for endorsement. In the event of controversies among the relevant Panels on matters relating to the subcommittee, the Panels should meet to resolve the differences;
- (c) in line with Rule 22(s) of HR, the membership of the subcommittee should only consist of members of the relevant Panels, not other LegCo Members; and
- (d) the quorum requirement of the subcommittee should follow that of a joint Panel meeting, as set out in Rule 22(n) of HR.

3.26 The proposed amendments to RoP and HR will be considered by CROp at its meeting to be held on 4 July 2005.

4. Acknowledgement

4.1 CROp wishes to record its appreciation of the views of Members of the Council and their support for the work of the Committee.

4.2 CROp also wishes to recognize the effective support provided by the LegCo Secretariat.

Membership list of Committee on Rules of Procedure

Chairman Hon Jasper TSANG Yok-sing, GBS, JP

Deputy Chairman Hon Margaret NG

Members Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP
Hon Martin LEE Chu-ming, SC, JP
Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-ye, GBS, JP
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon LI Fung-ying, BBS, JP
Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, BBS, JP
Hon MA Lik, GBS, JP
Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC
Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP
Hon KWONG Chi-kin

(Total : 12 Members)

Clerk Ms Miranda HON

Legal Adviser Mr Jimmy MA, JP

Committee on Rules of Procedure

**List of issues studied during the
2004-2005 Legislative Council Session**

(as at 30 June 2005)

Item	Issue	Reference	Progress/Remarks
1	Procedure for debate on the Policy Address	Rule 13 of Rules of Procedure (RoP)	Arrangements for the debate, which were proposed by the Committee on Rules of Procedure (CRoP) and endorsed by the House Committee (HC), were adopted for the debate on the 2005 Policy Address held from 26 to 28 January 2005.
2	Members' attire during the Legislative Council (LegCo) meetings	Rules 42(a) and 45 of RoP; section 12 of the Administrative Instructions for Regulating Admittance and Conduct of Persons	The results of CRoP's deliberations were conveyed by the CRoP Chairman to the President, who referred the issue to CRoP, on 11 January 2005. The President made a written response on 13 January 2005. Copies of the correspondence between the CRoP Chairman and the President were issued to all LegCo Members for information on 14 January 2005.
3	Withdrawal of bills under RoP and the House Rules (HR)	Rules 53 to 64 of RoP; Rules 2 and 21 of HR	CRoP's proposed amendments to RoP and HR regarding withdrawal of bills were endorsed by HC on 15 April 2005 and passed in the Council on 4 May 2005.

Item	Issue	Reference	Progress/Remarks
4	<p>Ringling of bell to notify members that voting will take place at committee meetings</p>	<p>Rules 47(1)(c), and 47(2)(c) of RoP; Rule 24(i) of HR; paragraphs 46 and 47 of the Finance Committee (FC) Procedure; paragraph 39 of Establishment Subcommittee (ESC) Procedure; paragraph 40 of Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC) Procedure</p>	<p>CRoP's recommendations and proposed amendments to HR were endorsed by HC on 29 April 2005. FC, ESC and PWSC also amended their respective procedures on 27 May 2005.</p>
5	<p>Handbook for chairmen of committees</p>	<p>—</p>	<p>The Handbook for Chairmen of Panels was endorsed by HC at its meeting on 17 June 2005. The Handbook for Chairmen of Bills Committees, and Handbook for Chairmen of Subcommittees on Subsidiary Legislation are being prepared and will be presented to CRoP for consideration in due course.</p>
6	<p>Extending the duration of committee meetings</p>	<p>Rule 24(c) and (m) of HR</p>	<p>CRoP is preparing the proposed amendments to HR on extending the duration of committee meetings with a view to implementing the procedure as soon as possible.</p>

Item	Issue	Reference	Progress/Remarks
7	Voting rights of chairman of a committee /subcommittee	Rules 71(8), 72(7), 73(5), 73A(9), 74(5), 75(16), 76(8), 77(13) and 79(6) of RoP; paragraph 45 of FC Procedure	CRoP has sought the views of all LegCo Members on the voting rights of the chairman of a committee/subcommittee. CRoP will consider these views at its meeting to be held on 4 July 2005, with a view to presenting its proposed amendments to RoP to HC for endorsement and then to the Council for approval at the beginning of the next Legislative Council session in October 2005.
8	Formation of a subcommittee under two or more Panels	Rule 77(9) and (10) of RoP; Rule 22(l), (m), (n) and (s) of HR	The proposed amendments to RoP and HR on the formation of a subcommittee under two or more Panels will be considered by CRoP at its meeting to be held on 4 July 2005.

Legislative Council Secretariat
30 June 2005