

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**

2005 至 06 年度會期工作進度報告
(2005 年 7 月 1 日至 2006 年 7 月 12 日)

Progress Report for the 2005-06 session
(1 July 2005 to 12 July 2006)

2006 年 7 月 12 日
12 July 2006

CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. Introduction	1
2. Review of the procedural arrangements of the Council	2
— Procedure for debate on the Policy Address	2
— Procedure for dealing with motions concerning the amendments to the methods for the selection of the Chief Executive and for the formation of the Legislative Council	2
— Asking oral questions at Council meetings	4
— Review of Rule 2 of the House Rule and procedure to facilitate debates on subsidiary legislation subject to negative vetting but to which no amendment has been proposed	6
3. Review of the procedures and working mechanism of committees of the Council	7
— Formation of joint subcommittees by two or more Panels of the Council	7
— Voting rights of chairmen of committees/subcommittees	7
— Handbook for chairmen of committees	11
— Determination of the time and place of a committee meeting	12
4. Acknowledgement	15

Appendix

- I. Membership list**

- II. List of issues studied by the Committee on Rules of Procedure during the 2005-2006 Legislative Council session (as at 12 July 2006)**

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 1 July 2005 to 12 July 2006, during which a total of eight 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 CRoP in the current session up to 12 July 2006 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) procedure for dealing with motions concerning the amendments to the methods for the selection of the Chief Executive (CE) and for the formation of LegCo;
- (c) asking oral questions at Council meetings; and
- (d) review of Rule 2 of the House Rules (HR) and procedure to facilitate debates on subsidiary legislation subject to negative vetting but to which no amendment has been proposed.

Procedure for debate on the Policy Address

2.2 CRoP reviewed the arrangements for the debate on the 2005 Policy Address held from 26 to 28 January 2005. Having considered the views of Members and of the Administration, CRoP recommended to HC that those arrangements should be adopted for the debate on the Policy Addresses delivered on 12 October 2005 and in the remainder of the current term, subject to adjustment of the total speaking time for each Member in the debate to 30 minutes. HC endorsed CRoP's recommendation at its meeting on 7 October 2005. The arrangements were adopted for the debate on the Policy Address delivered on 12 October 2005. The debate lasted for three days from 26 to 28 October 2005.

Procedure for dealing with motions concerning the amendments to the methods for the selection of CE and for the formation of LegCo

2.3 On 19 October 2005, the Administration's Constitutional Development Task Force published its Fifth Report (the Fifth Report) containing a package of proposals for the methods for selecting CE in 2007 and for forming LegCo in 2008. The Fifth Report also set out the two draft motions to be presented by the Government to the Council concerning the

amendments to the methods. On 21 October 2005, HC decided to set up a Subcommittee to Study the Administration's Proposals for the Methods for Selecting CE in 2007 and for Forming LegCo in 2008 (the Subcommittee).

2.4 Against the above background, CRoP studied the procedure for dealing with the motions concerning the amendments to the methods for the selection of CE and for the formation of LegCo. Before studying the procedural matters, CRoP referred the legal issues concerning the motions to the Subcommittee for clarification by the Administration. Having sought the Administration's clarification, the Subcommittee discussed the issues at its meeting.

CRoP's views

2.5 CRoP considered the Administration's clarification and the relevant deliberations of the Subcommittee. CRoP noted that RoP already contained provisions for dealing with motions generally. There were no specific provisions stipulating the Interpretation by the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress (NPCSC) that amendments to the methods should be introduced by the Government only; neither were there specific provisions to give effect to the requirement in Annexes I and II to the Basic Law (BL) that the endorsement of a two-thirds majority of all Council Members was required for the passage of the proposed amendments to the methods. However, CRoP was of the view that the motions proposed by the Administration could be processed in the Council even in the absence of such provisions in RoP, provided that the procedure did not contravene BL and its Annexes, and the NPCSC's Interpretation.

Proposed amendment to Rule 46(1) of RoP

2.6 CRoP noted that Rule 46(1) of RoP provided for exceptions to the general rule of requiring a majority vote for the passage of motions. The exceptions included Rules 49B (Disqualification of Member from Office) and 66 (Bills Returned for Reconsideration) of RoP and Articles 52(2), 73(9) (in respect of a motion of impeachment) and 159 of BL which imposed different voting requirements, i.e. two-thirds majority of the Members present or of all Members. CRoP proposed to amend Rule 46(1) of RoP to include Annexes I and II to BL in the excepted provisions.

2.7 CRoP's views and the proposed amendment to Rule 46(1) of RoP were endorsed by HC on 9 December 2005. The amendment to RoP was approved by the Council on 14 December 2005.

Asking oral questions at Council meetings

2.8 At HC's invitation, CRoP reviewed the arrangements for raising oral questions at Council meetings.

Proposal to disallow changing oral questions to written ones

2.9 CRoP studied whether Members should be allowed to change questions from oral to written ones after notices of the questions had been given. CRoP noted that changing an oral question to a written one would deprive interested Members of the opportunity to ask supplementaries on the question. Furthermore, under Rule 25(1)(l) of RoP, a question asked and answered in the Council could not be raised again in the same LegCo session. To avoid such situation, CRoP proposed that Members should not be allowed to change oral questions to written ones after notices of the questions had been given.

Proposal to ask oral questions on behalf of other Members

2.10 Under Rule 26(6) of RoP, if a Member was not present to ask his/her oral question, the question might with his/her consent be asked by another Member, but otherwise should be treated as a written question. In view of its proposal to disallow changing oral questions to written ones, CRoP studied whether the oral question of an absent Member, who had not invited or given consent to another Member to ask it, should be treated as having been withdrawn. CRoP noted that such treatment would have the effect of prohibiting the question to be asked at the Council meeting at which it was originally scheduled. This might delay the answering of oral questions of topical interest in a timely manner.

2.11 CRoP therefore proposed that when a Member was not present to ask his/her oral question and had not invited or given consent to another Member to ask it on his/her behalf, the question should be asked by the chairman or, in her absence, the deputy chairman of HC. The chairman of HC might decide whether or not to follow the usual practice and ask the first supplementary question after the public officer had answered the question. In the unlikely event that both of them were absent or otherwise unable to ask the question, the President should call upon the Member present who had the highest precedence in the order of precedence of Members as determined in accordance with Rule 1A (Precedence of Members) to ask the question. The President would then ask the responsible public officer to answer the question; thereafter, Members of the Council might ask supplementary questions to the original question.

Proposal to allow withdrawing an oral question if there is no dissenting voice

2.12 CROp also studied whether or not Members might be allowed to withdraw oral questions scheduled to be asked at Council meetings under Rule 26(8) of RoP in view of its proposals in paragraph 2.9 above. CROp considered that, while disallowing the withdrawal of an oral question might achieve its aim to ensure that a scheduled oral question and supplementary questions could be asked and answered, a total ban against withdrawal even where there were valid reasons for withdrawing a question might not be in the Council's interest. For example, there had been cases in which the matters asked in questions or part(s) of them were overtaken by the announcements made by the Administration prior to the Council meeting, and the Members decided that no useful purpose would be served by continuing to ask the questions or part(s) of them.

2.13 To strike a fair balance, CROp proposed that the Member who had given notice to ask an oral question at a Council meeting might, with leave of the Council, withdraw the question at the relevant meeting before it was asked, provided that there was no dissenting voice and that no debate on the withdrawal was allowed. This arrangement was similar to that under Rule 35(2) of RoP in relation to withdrawing a motion or an amendment before the relevant question was put at a Council meeting.

Restrictions on number of questions asked not applicable to asking oral questions on behalf of other Members

2.14 Under Rule 24(3) of RoP and Rule 7(b) of HR, each Member was normally limited to asking only one oral and one written or alternatively two written questions at any one meeting. However, if 20 or more Members wished to raise questions at a meeting, each Member was allowed to raise only one question. Currently, these restrictions on the number of questions did not apply to the asking of an oral question by a Member on behalf of another Member. CROp proposed that such restrictions should also not apply to the asking of oral questions by the chairman or deputy chairman of HC or a Member under the arrangement mentioned in paragraph 2.11.

Proposed amendments to RoP and HR

2.15 The proposed amendments to RoP and HR to give effect to the above proposals were endorsed by HC on 16 December 2005. The amendments to RoP were approved by the Council on 11 January 2006.

Review of Rule 2 of HR and procedure to facilitate debates on subsidiary legislation subject to negative vetting but to which no amendment has been proposed

2.16 At HC's invitation, CRoP reviewed Rule 2 of HR concerning the provision to the President of an advance copy of an intended address on subsidiary legislation and a paper tabled in the Council, as well as a Bill Committee (BC) report on a bill which was to be withdrawn.

2.17 CRoP studied the practice of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom (UK) Parliament regarding an address on a paper, subsidiary legislation or BC report tabled in the Parliament. In the House of Commons, all speaking opportunities for Members of Parliament (MPs) on subsidiary legislation were in the form of debate. The House normally did not have reports from committees on bills because such committees were standing committees which held their own debates. MPs were allowed to address the House when making personal statements, which were rare and usually related to reports on conduct by the Committee of Standards and Privileges, ministerial resignations, or other matters such as giving thanks for support from colleagues and staff. Debate must not arise upon personal statements.

2.18 By convention, MPs had to submit in advance to the Speaker "the precise contents" of the proposed personal statements when seeking leave given by the Speaker for making the statements. The rationale was that "the practice of the House is not to permit such statements to be subject to intervention or debate", and thus the Speaker must ensure their contents to be "appropriate". The MP permitted to make such a statement was not allowed to depart from the agreed text.

2.19 Having considered the UK practice, CRoP agreed that there was no need to change the requirements of providing an advance copy of an intended address on a paper or a BC report on a bill which was to be withdrawn.

2.20 CRoP also considered whether a procedure should be provided in RoP to facilitate debates on subsidiary legislation subject to negative vetting by the Council but to which no amendment has been proposed. Having studied the practice and procedure of legislatures of the UK, Canada, New Zealand and Australia in this regard, and a suggestion to provide a special procedure for such debates, CRoP decided that the subject should be shelved until members could come up with a better option that would be acceptable to members. The existing procedure for Members to debate or speak on such subsidiary legislation, as well as the requirement to provide to the President under Rule 2 of HR an advance copy of an intended address on subsidiary legislation to be made under Rule 21(5) of RoP will remain unchanged.

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) formation of joint subcommittees by two or more Panels of the Council;
- (b) voting rights of chairmen of committees/subcommittees;
- (c) handbook for chairmen of committees; and
- (d) determination of the time and place of a committee meeting.

Formation of joint subcommittees by two or more Panels of the Council

3.2 As stated in its previous progress report for October 2004 to June 2005, CRoP proposed that two or more Panels of the Council might form joint subcommittees, and the relevant proposed amendments to RoP and HR would be considered at its meeting on 4 July 2005. CRoP supported the amendments at the meeting. They were endorsed by HC on 8 July 2005. The amendments to RoP were then approved by the Council on 19 October 2005.

Voting rights of chairmen of committees/subcommittees

Consultation with Members on voting rights of chairmen of committees/subcommittees

3.3 As stated in its previous progress report for October 2004 to June 2005, CRoP decided to consult Members on whether the chairmen of committees/subcommittees should only have an original vote, or only a casting vote, or both; and whether the chairmen of committees/subcommittees (if CRoP recommended a casting vote for the chairmen) should be required to exercise the casting vote according to the convention followed by the Speaker of the House of Commons of the

United Kingdom Parliament (the UK Parliamentary convention), which consisted of three principles:

- (a) to provide an opportunity for further discussion, where this was 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 was 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 was no further opportunity for consideration by the House of Commons, and a majority had not been obtained; and
- (c) a casting vote on an amendment to a bill should leave the bill in its existing form. The Chair would therefore vote against the amendment.

3.4 56 Members responded to the questionnaires issued by the Secretariat in this regard. Their views were summarized as follows:

- (a) the majority, i.e. over 50%, of the Members who responded considered that the chairmen of Finance Committee (FC), Public Accounts Committee (PAC), HC, Investigation Committee (IC), Select Committee (SC), Committee on Members’ Interests (CMI), and CRoP, and of HC’s subcommittees other than those on subsidiary legislation should have a casting vote but not an original vote;
- (b) an absolute majority of Members considered that the chairmen of these committees/subcommittees should exercise the casting vote according to the UK parliamentary convention;
- (c) the majority of Members considered that the chairmen of BCs, Panels, and their subcommittees, and of HC’s subcommittees on subsidiary legislation should have only one vote, irrespective of whether it was an original vote or a casting vote; and
- (d) regarding whether the chairmen’s only one vote should be

an original vote which was to be exercised according to their own will, or a casting vote which was to be exercised according to the UK parliamentary convention, Members' views were equally divided. 28 Members supported giving an original vote to the chairmen and the other 28 supported giving them a casting vote.

CRoP's recommendations regarding the consultation results

3.5 In the light of the above results, CRoP recommended that:

- (a) the chairmen of FC, PAC, HC, IC, SC, CMI, and CRoP and of HC's subcommittees other than those on subsidiary legislation should have a casting vote but not an original vote. The casting vote should be exercised according to the UK parliamentary convention; and
- (b) the chairmen of BCs, Panels, and their subcommittees, and of HC's subcommittees on subsidiary legislation should have only one vote. Although Members of the Council had not reached a majority view on whether the one vote of the chairmen of these committees/subcommittees should be an original vote or a casting vote, CRoP recommended that, given the principle that the chairman of a committee had the same voting rights as other committee members unless RoP expressly provided to the contrary, these chairmen should have an original vote. In addition, RoP should specifically provide that the chairmen's original votes should be cast at the same time as other committee members and, if a chairman did not cast his/her vote at the same time as other members, he/she would be regarded as having given up his/her right to vote on that occasion.

Applicability of the UK parliamentary convention to chairmen of committees of this Council

3.6 CRoP also studied how the three principles of the convention, which applied to the handling of bills by the UK House of Commons, might be reflected in RoP regarding committees of the Council.

3.7 CRoP noted that in this Council, the formal proceedings on bills took place at meetings of the Council. CRoP considered that, for FC, PAC,

HC, IC, SC, CMI, and CRoP and of HC's subcommittees other than those on subsidiary legislation, the first and third principles of the convention should not apply to the chairmen of these committees/subcommittees when exercising the casting vote.

3.8 CRoP noted that the second principle of the convention, i.e. when no further discussion was possible, decision should not be taken except by a majority, was already reflected in the current provisions in the relevant procedures of FC, the Establishment Subcommittee and the Public Works Subcommittee. According to these provisions, the respective chairmen should not exercise the casting vote in such a way as to produce a majority vote in favour of the question before the committee/subcommittee. CRoP recommended that provisions of the same effect should be provided in the relevant RoP regarding the exercise of the casting vote by the chairmen of the other committees/subcommittees.

Voting rights of chairmen of HC's subcommittees on subsidiary legislation not subject to sections 34 and 35 of the Interpretation and General Clauses Ordinance (Cap. 1)

3.9 Rule 75(10) and (11) of RoP provided respectively that HC should decide the manner of consideration of any subsidiary legislation which was subject to the provisions of sections 34 and 35 of the Interpretation and General Clauses Ordinance (Cap. 1) (the Cap. 1 provisions) and that HC might consider, in such manner as it thought fit, any other item relating to the business of the Council. Rule 75(12) provided that HC might appoint subcommittees to assist it in performing its functions under Rule 75(10) and (11). Under Rule 75(12B) and (12C) of RoP, the chairmen of HC's subcommittees on subsidiary legislation which was subject to the Cap. 1 provisions should have an original vote but not a casting vote, while the chairmen of HC's other subcommittees should only have a casting vote in a tied vote situation.

3.10 CRoP also noted that other than subsidiary legislation, there were also instruments made under legislation and subject to scrutiny by the Council similar to that applicable to subsidiary legislation. Examples of these instruments were codes of practice and technical memoranda. Furthermore, there was also subsidiary legislation which was not subject to a legislative scrutiny mechanism.

3.11 CRoP noted that HC might appoint subcommittees to study the instruments and subsidiary legislation mentioned in paragraph 3.10 above. HC might also appoint a subcommittee to study an item of subsidiary

legislation which was subject to the Cap. 1 provisions, together with items that were not so subject.

3.12 As the instruments referred to in paragraph 3.10 above and subsidiary legislation not subject to the Cap. 1 provisions were made under legislation, CRoP recommended that the chairmen of the subcommittees dealing with them should have the same voting rights as the chairmen of subcommittees which dealt with subsidiary legislation which was subject to the Cap. 1 provisions. In other words, the chairmen should likewise have an original vote but not a casting vote.

3.13 Furthermore, HC had previously appointed subcommittees to study drafts of subsidiary legislation subject to section 34 of Cap. 1 and instruments made under an Ordinance. Some items of subsidiary legislation had also been studied by subcommittees even though the notices of the motions to approve them had been withdrawn at the request of HC. These were not the subsidiary legislation referred to in the Cap. 1 provisions. However, since the subcommittees so appointed dealt with subsidiary legislation or instruments to be made or intended to be made under an Ordinance, CRoP recommended that the chairmen of these subcommittees should have the same voting rights as the chairmen of subcommittees dealing with subsidiary legislation subject to the Cap. 1 provisions.

3.14 The two sets of proposed amendments to RoP, which sought to give effect to the above recommendations, were endorsed by HC on 7 October and 11 November 2005 and approved by the Council on 19 October and 23 November 2005 respectively.

Handbook for chairmen of committees

3.15 CRoP's previous Progress Report for October 2004 to June 2005 stated that the Handbook for Chairmen of BCs and Handbook for Chairmen of Subcommittees on Subsidiary Legislation were being prepared by the Secretariat, and would be presented to CRoP for consideration in due course.

3.16 The Secretariat had completed preparing the Handbook for Chairmen of BCs. After consideration by CRoP and consultation with all Members, the Handbook was presented to and endorsed by HC on 25 November 2005.

3.17 The Secretariat had also completed preparing the Handbook for Chairmen of Subcommittees on Subsidiary Legislation/Other Instruments.

The draft Handbook will be circulated to all Members for comments. Members' comments will be considered by CRoP in the next session.

Determination of the time and place of a committee meeting

3.18 According to RoP, the time and place of meetings of FC, PAC, CMI, CRoP, HC, BC, a Panel and SC were determined by the chairmen of the committees. RoP had no such provisions for IC (Rule 73A).

3.19 In response to the concern that a committee would not be able to function if the chairman, for whatever reason (e.g. not in Hong Kong), could not be contacted by the Secretariat to give approval to convene an urgent meeting to discuss an important issue, CRoP studied whether a procedure should be put in place to enable an urgent meeting to be held in such circumstances.

Practice and procedure in overseas legislatures

3.20 CRoP studied the procedures in the legislatures of UK, Canada, New Zealand, Australia and the United States (US).

3.21 In general, the five legislatures adopted two different approaches for handling the situation. In the House of Commons of the UK Parliament and the House of Commons of the Parliament of Canada, in the absence of the chairman of a committee, no member of the committee was allowed to determine the time and place of a meeting of the committee.

3.22 The Houses of Representatives of the New Zealand Parliament, the Parliament of Australia and the US Congress each had a procedure for determining the time and place of a meeting of a committee in the absence of the chairman of the committee:

- (a) in New Zealand, the deputy chairman of a committee might determine the time and place of a meeting of the committee if the chairman of the committee was absent from New

Zealand. The Speaker might determine when the committee should meet if they were both absent from New Zealand;

- (b) in Australia, in the absence of the chairman of a committee, the deputy chairman might determine the time and place of a meeting of the committee. Where both the chairman and deputy chairman were absent, the committee might elect a new temporary chair who would have the power to convene a meeting of the committee and determine the time and place of it; and
- (c) in US, three or more members of a committee might make a written request to the chairman of the committee for calling a special meeting. If the chairman refused or failed to call the meeting, a majority of the members of the committee were allowed to call such a meeting and determine the time and place of it.

Proposed arrangements for dealing with a request for holding a meeting of a committee if the chairman of the committee cannot be contacted

3.23 Having regard to the procedure in the New Zealand Parliament and the Parliament of Australia, CRoP proposed that if the chairman of a committee could not be contacted for considering a request made by a member of the committee for holding a meeting of the committee to discuss a specific issue of urgent importance, the deputy chairman of the committee should be given the authority to consider the request and determine the time and place of the meeting in such circumstances. The clerk to the committee should be given 48 hours to contact the chairman before approaching the deputy chairman who would then decide whether to convene the meeting and, if convened, the time and place of it. The arrangement should also be applicable to subcommittees of committees of the Council.

3.24 As the arrangement had impact on the power of the chairman and deputy chairman of a committee in determining the time and place of a meeting of the committee, CRoP proposed that the arrangement should be implemented from the next session.

3.25 To enable the clerk to a committee to convey a request for a meeting of the committee to discuss a specific issue of urgent importance, CRoP proposed that the chairman and deputy chairman of the committee

should be required to provide the clerk with adequate information on how they could be contacted.

3.26 The proposed amendments to RoP for giving effect to the above arrangements were endorsed by HC on 7 July 2006. They will be presented to the Council for passage at the first regular Council meeting in the next session on 18 October 2006.

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, SBS, 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
2005-2006 Legislative Council Session

(as at 12 July 2006)

Item	Issue	Reference	Progress/Remarks
1	Procedure for debate on the next and future Policy Addresses	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 Policy Address held from 26 to 28 October 2005. They will also be adopted for the debate on future Policy Addresses delivered in the remainder of the current term.
2	Procedure for dealing with motions concerning the amendments for the selection of the Chief Executive and for the formation of the Legislative Council	Annexes I and II to Basic Law; Rule 46(1) of RoP	CRoP's views on the issue and its proposed amendments to Rule 46(1) of RoP were endorsed by HC on 9 December 2005. The amendment to RoP was approved by the Council on 14 December 2005.
3	Asking oral questions at Council meetings	Rules 24(3) and 26(6) of RoP; Rules 7(b) and 11 of House Rules (HR)	At its meeting on 16 December 2005, HC agreed to revise CRoP's proposed amendments to RoP and HR. The revised amendments were approved by the Council on 11 January 2006.

Item	Issue	Reference	Progress/Remarks
4	Review of Rule 2 of HR and procedure to facilitate debates on subsidiary legislation subject to negative vetting but to which no amendment has been proposed	Rule 2 of HR	CRoP decided that the subject should be shelved until members could come up with a better option that would be acceptable to members. The existing procedure for Members to debate or speak on such subsidiary legislation, as well as the requirement to provide to the President under Rule 2 of HR an advance copy of an intended address on subsidiary legislation to be made under Rule 21(5) of RoP will remain unchanged.
5	Formation of joint subcommittees by two or more Panels of the Council	Rule 77 of RoP; Rules 22, 23 and 26 of HR	The proposed amendments to RoP and HR were endorsed by HC on 8 July 2005. The amendments to RoP were approved by the Council on 19 October 2005.
6	Voting rights of chairmen of committees/ subcommittees	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 Finance Committee Procedure	The two sets of proposed amendments to RoP were endorsed by HC on 7 October and 11 November 2005 and approved by the Council on 19 October and 23 November 2005 respectively.
7	Handbook for chairmen of committees	—	The Handbook for Chairmen of Bills Committees was endorsed by HC on 25 November 2005. The Handbook for Chairmen of Subcommittees on subsidiary legislation/other Instruments will be circulated to all Members for comments. Members' comments will be considered by CRoP in the next session.

Item	Issue	Reference	Progress/Remarks
8	Determination of the time and place of a committee meeting	Rules 71(6), 72(6), 73(3), 74(3), 75(14), 76(5), 77(11) and 79(2) of RoP	The proposed amendments to RoP were endorsed by HC on 7 July 2006. They will be presented to the Council for passage at the first regular Council meeting in the next session on 18 October 2006.

Legislative Council Secretariat

12 July 2006