

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2) 1350/09-10

Ref : CB2/H/5/09

House Committee of the Legislative Council

**Minutes of the 19th meeting
held in the Legislative Council Chamber
at 2:30 pm on Friday, 16 April 2010**

Members present :

Hon Miriam LAU Kin-ye, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, SBS, S.B.St.J., JP
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan
Dr Hon Margaret NG
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, GBS, JP
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Hon WONG Yung-kan, SBS, JP
Hon LAU Kong-wah, JP
Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Hon LI Fung-ying, BBS, JP
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, SBS, JP
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Dr Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, SBS, JP
Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, SBS, JP
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, GBS, JP
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, BBS, JP
Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC
Hon CHIM Pui-chung
Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP
Hon KAM Nai-wai, MH
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king
Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai, BBS, JP

Hon CHAN Hak-kan
Hon Paul CHAN Mo-po, MH, JP
Hon CHAN Kin-por, JP
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun
Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che
Hon WONG Sing-chi
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, BBS
Hon IP Wai-ming, MH
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP
Dr Hon PAN Pey-chyou
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun
Dr Hon Samson TAM Wai-ho, JP

Members absent :

Hon Fred LI Wah-ming, SBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Dr Hon David LI Kwok-po, GBM, GBS, JP
Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong, GBS
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, SBS, JP
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, SBS, JP

Clerk in attendance :

Mrs Vivian KAM Clerk to the House Committee

Staff in attendance :

Ms Pauline NG	Secretary General
Mr Jimmy MA, JP	Legal Adviser
Mrs Constance LI	Assistant Secretary General 1
Mrs Justina LAM	Assistant Secretary General 3
Ms Connie FUNG	Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 1
Mr Arthur CHEUNG	Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 2
Mrs Sharon TONG	Principal Council Secretary (Complaints)
Ms Emily PANG	Acting Chief Public Information Officer
Miss Odelia LEUNG	Chief Council Secretary (2)6
Mr KAU Kin-wah	Assistant Legal Adviser 6
Ms Clara TAM	Assistant Legal Adviser 9
Ms Amy YU	Senior Council Secretary (2)3
Ms Anna CHEUNG	Senior Legislative Assistant (2)3
Mr Arthur KAN	Legislative Assistant (2)8

I. Confirmation of minutes of meetings

- (a) **Minutes of the special meeting held on 23 March 2010**
(LC Paper No. CB(2) 1286/09-10)
- (b) **Minutes of the 18th meeting held on 9 April 2010**
(LC Paper No. CB(2) 1287/09-10)

The two sets of minutes were confirmed.

II. Matters arising

Report by the Chairman on her meeting with the Chief Secretary for Administration

2. The Chairman said that there was nothing special to report.

III. Business arising from previous Council meetings

Legal Service Division report on subsidiary legislation gazetted on 9 April 2010 and tabled in Council on 14 April 2010
(LC Paper No. LS 55/09-10)

3. The Chairman said that a total of three items of subsidiary legislation, including one Commencement Notice, were gazetted on 9 April 2010 and tabled in the Council on 14 April 2010.
4. Regarding the Dutiable Commodities (Exempted Quantities) (Amendment) Notice 2010, the Chairman said that it sought to implement a proposal in the 2010-2011 Budget to specify the new quantities of duty-free tobacco products allowed to be brought into Hong Kong by incoming passengers for own use. She further said that Mr Vincent FANG, who was not able to attend the meeting, had indicated that he considered it necessary to form a subcommittee to study the Amendment Notice.
5. The Chairman proposed that a subcommittee be formed to study the Amendment Notice in detail. Members agreed. The following Members agreed to join: Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong (as advised by Ms Emily LAU), Mr Vincent FANG (as advised by the Chairman) and Mr CHAN Kin-por.
6. Members did not raise any queries on the other two items of subsidiary legislation.
7. The Chairman reminded Members that the deadline for amending the subsidiary legislation was 12 May 2010.

IV. Further business for the Council meeting on 21 April 2010

Tabling of papers

Report No. 8/09-10 of the House Committee on Consideration of Subsidiary Legislation and Other Instruments

(LC Paper No. CB(2) 1292/09-10 issued vide LC Paper No. CB(3) 587/09-10 dated 15 April 2010)

8. The Chairman said that the report covered only one item of subsidiary legislation, i.e. the Designation of Libraries Order 2010, the period for amendment of which would expire on 21 April 2010. She further said that as a Member had notified his intention to speak on the Order, she, as Chairman of the House Committee, would move a motion to take note of the report in relation to the Order.

Council meeting on 21 April 2010 and the Chief Executive's Question and Answer ("CE's Q&A") Session on 22 April 2010

9. The Chairman said that the Administration would respond to Members' comments on the Appropriation Bill 2010 at the Council meeting of 21 April 2010. As a total of nine proposed amendments to the Bill would be moved, long debates were anticipated and it was difficult to estimate at that stage whether the business on the Agenda could be finished by 3:00 pm on 22 April 2010. The President had therefore determined that the CE's Q&A Session originally scheduled for Thursday, 22 April 2010, from 3:00 pm to 4:30 pm be re-scheduled to the same time on Friday, 23 April 2010. The Finance Committee meeting would be held at 4:45 pm on 23 April 2010.

V. Business for the Council meeting on 28 April 2010

(a) Questions

(LC Paper No. CB(3) 584/09-10)

10. The Chairman said that 20 questions (six oral and 14 written) had been scheduled for the meeting.

(b) Bills - First Reading and moving of Second Reading

Motor Vehicle Idling (Fixed Penalty) Bill

11. The Chairman said that the Administration had given notice to present the above Bill to the Council on 28 April 2010. The House Committee would consider the Bill at its meeting on 30 April 2010.

Action

(c) **Government motion**

12. The Chairman said that no notice had been received yet.

(d) **Members' motions**

(i) **Motion to be moved by Hon James TO Kun-sun**

13. The Chairman said that the subject of the motion to be moved by Mr James TO was "Strengthening the regulation of the sale of residential properties".

(ii) **Motion to be moved by Hon LEE Cheuk-yan**

14. The Chairman said that the subject of the motion to be moved by Mr LEE Cheuk-yan was "Eradicating plutocratic monopoly and promoting social harmony".

15. The Chairman reminded Members that the deadline for giving notice of amendments, if any, to the motions was Wednesday, 21 April 2010.

VI. Advance information on business for the Council meeting on 5 May 2010

Bills - First Reading and moving of Second Reading

Stamp Duty (Amendment) Bill 2010

16. The Chairman said that the Administration had given notice to present the above Bill to the Council on 5 May 2010. The House Committee would consider the Bill at its meeting on 7 May 2010.

VII. Report of Bills Committees and subcommittees

Report of the Bills Committee on Employment (Amendment) Bill 2009

(LC Paper No. CB(2) 1297/09-10)

17. Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Chairman of the Bills Committee, reported that the Bills Committee had held nine meetings and had completed the scrutiny work. He elaborated that the Bill sought to create a new criminal offence against employers who wilfully failed to make payment under an award made by the Labour Tribunal ("LT") or the Minor Employment Claims Adjudication Board ("MECAB"). He referred Members to the Bills Committee's report for details of its deliberations.

Action

18. Mr WONG then highlighted the relevant issues deliberated by the Bills Committee. These included justifications for criminalizing the non-payment of LT and MECAB awards; process of investigation and institution of criminal proceedings against defaulting employers; whether written consent of the Commissioner for Labour should be required for instituting prosecution for the new offence and whether a time limit should be prescribed for the giving of such consent; coverage of specified entitlements under the Bill; liability of and safeguards to directors and partners; adequacy of the manpower in the Labour Department for conducting investigation and prosecution; and publicity work.

19. Mr WONG further reported that the new offence applied to an award which provided for the payment by an employer of any specified entitlement as defined under the Bill. In response to members' views, the Administration would move Committee Stage amendments ("CSAs") to include compensation and terminal payments arising from unreasonable and unlawful dismissal in the definition of specified entitlement. He added that the Bills Committee supported the resumption of the Second Reading debate on the Bill at the Council meeting on 28 April 2010.

20. The Chairman reminded Members that the deadline for giving notice of CSAs, if any, was Monday, 19 April 2010.

VIII. Senior judicial appointments

(Director of Administration's letter dated 8 April 2010 to the Chairman of the House Committee issued to Members on 8 April 2010)

21. The Chairman said that CE had announced on 8 April 2010 his acceptance of the recommendation of the Judicial Officers Recommendation Commission to appoint:

- (a) Mr Justice Geoffrey MA Tao-li as the Chief Justice of the Court of Final Appeal ("CFA"); and
- (b) Mr Justice Robert TANG Ching, Mr Justice Frank Stock and Mr Justice Michael John Hartmann as non-permanent Hong Kong judges to CFA.

22. The Chairman further said that in accordance with the procedure for endorsement of appointment of judges recommended by the Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services ("AJLS Panel") and endorsed by the House Committee, it was for the House Committee to decide whether a subcommittee should be formed to consider the recommended appointments. Should a subcommittee be formed to consider the recommended appointments, the Administration would give notice of the motion to seek the endorsement of the Legislative Council ("LegCo") of the recommended appointments after the subcommittee had reported its deliberation to the House Committee.

Action

23. Ms Emily LAU proposed that a subcommittee be formed to consider the recommended appointments.

24. The Chairman invited Members' view on the proposal.

25. Mr Ronny TONG sought information on the procedure for the endorsement of appointment of judges.

26. The Chairman explained that in accordance with the relevant procedure, it was for the House Committee to decide whether or not to form a subcommittee to consider the recommended appointments. Subcommittees formed in the past for the purpose would discuss the recommended appointments. The subcommittees had never invited the recommended appointees to their meetings, although this would be up to the relevant subcommittees.

27. Dr Priscilla LEUNG said that she would object to the proposal if the subcommittee could consider inviting the recommended judges to its meetings. In her view, it was not appropriate for LegCo to do so.

28. Dr Margaret NG said that the AJLS Panel had discussed in-depth some years ago the procedure to be established for the endorsement of appointment of judges. It had issued a consultation paper in this regard and had conducted extensive consultation including the legal profession. The option of adopting the United States system of holding open hearings to question nominees had been considered but was found not suitable for Hong Kong after consultation. The procedure recommended by the AJLS Panel was for the House Committee to decide whether to refer the recommended appointments to a subcommittee for discussion and for the subcommittee, if formed, to report its deliberations to the House Committee.

29. Dr NG further said that after the endorsement of the procedure, LegCo had on several occasions considered the recommended appointments. Improvement had been made with the purpose of obtaining more comprehensive information on the recommended appointments. Subcommittees formed to discuss the recommended appointments had never invited the recommended judges to their meetings to answer questions. Indeed, the AJLS Panel had recently considered the matter and had sought the views of the two legal professional bodies on the need to revise the procedure. The consensus was that there was no need to revise the procedure which was considered in order.

30. Dr Priscilla LEUNG sought clarification on the nature and scope of work of a subcommittee formed to discuss recommended judicial appointments. She remained concerned about the possibility for the subcommittee to invite the recommended judges to their meetings.

Action

31. The Chairman said that as she understood it, it was for the subcommittee to decide whether or not to invite the recommended judicial appointees to its meetings.

32. Dr Margaret NG said that in deciding on the appointment of a subcommittee to consider judicial appointments, the House Committee would normally not specify the matters that should not be done by a subcommittee. Nevertheless, there had been a consensus that LegCo had the responsibility to uphold the principle of judicial independence and should not politicize judicial appointments. While the House Committee had no authority to restrict certain powers of subcommittees formed to consider judicial appointments, she believed that Members well understood their constitutional responsibilities and would not make attempts to hamper judicial independence. Even if a suggestion was made by individual members to invite the recommended judicial appointees to the subcommittee, the suggestion would be carefully considered by other members of the subcommittee.

33. Mr IP Kwok-him did not consider it necessary to form a subcommittee to consider the recommended appointments. He said that Members belonging to the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong had great reservations about the possible power of the subcommittee to invite the recommended judicial appointees to answer questions. He enquired about the feasibility of agreeing to a mechanism under which the subcommittee had to revert to the House Committee on any proposal to invite the recommended judicial appointees to answer questions. He added that if such a mechanism could be agreed to by Members, his concern could be allayed.

34. At the invitation of the Chairman, Legal Adviser ("LA") explained that the Basic Law ("BL") conferred LegCo with an important power to endorse the appointment and removal of judges of CFA and the Chief Judges of the High Court as recommended by CE. The exercise of such power entailed responsibility. As pointed out by Dr Margaret NG, the principles underlying the procedure recommended by the AJLS Panel for the endorsement of the House Committee were the preservation of judicial independence and the non-politicization of the process of judicial appointments. The United States system of holding open hearings to question nominees was considered not suitable for Hong Kong. In exercising its relevant power under the BL, LegCo had never invited or made any proposal to invite the recommended judicial appointees to the meetings of the subcommittees formed to discuss recommended judicial appointments. Under the Rules of Procedure ("RoP"), the House Committee could set up subcommittees to consider issues of concern. Should the House Committee decide to appoint a subcommittee for the case in question, its terms of reference would clearly be to consider the four recommended judicial appointments made by CE. The discussion by LegCo of recommended judicial appointments prior to the appointment under the agreed procedure was to avoid the politicization of the process. LA added that like other subcommittees formed under the House Committee, it was for the subcommittee formed to study the recommended judicial appointments to decide how it should carry out its task, and seldom would the House

Action

Committee set restrictions on the operation of a subcommittee when making the appointment.

35. Mr IP Kwok-him considered that his concern had not been allayed. He stressed that the fact that the subcommittees formed in the past on recommended judicial appointments had never invited the nominees to their meetings was no guarantee that the proposed subcommittee would not do so.

36. Dr Margaret NG said that the procedure recommended by the AJLS Panel was endorsed by the House Committee. The understanding of the House Committee was that the procedure did not involve the summoning of nominees by a subcommittee formed to discuss recommended judicial appointments. Should the proposed subcommittee consider it necessary to summon the nominees, it had to revert to the House Committee for exercising such a power.

37. At the invitation of the Chairman, LA said that like any other subcommittees formed under the House Committee, the proposed subcommittee did not have the power to summon. He believed that the proposed subcommittee would be prudent in considering the invitation of any judicial nominees to its meetings. He pointed out that the procedure as endorsed by the House Committee had not expressly disallowed such an invitation, and it would be up to Members to decide.

38. The Chairman said that the procedure endorsed by the House Committee did not include the invitation of nominees to answer questions by a subcommittee formed to discuss recommended judicial appointments. Should Members have a consensus on this point, the proposed subcommittee would need to revert to the House Committee for inviting any recommended judicial nominees to answer questions.

39. Mr Ronny TONG said that it was provided clearly under Article 73(7) of the BL ("BL 73(7)") that LegCo had the power to endorse the appointment and removal of judges of CFA and the Chief Judge of the High Court. He stressed that LegCo was not a rubber stamp; it could endorse or not endorse the judicial appointments. How LegCo would exercise its powers conferred under BL 73(7) would depend on the circumstances of individual cases and the candidates recommended for appointments. He noted the practice for subcommittees on recommended judicial appointments not to invite the nominees to answer questions. He agreed that such a practice should be adhered to in respect of the proposed subcommittee. Indeed, he was not aware of any request for LegCo to meet with the nominees concerned. However, he did not agree that Members should have a consensus that LegCo should never invite the nominees concerned to the relevant subcommittee's meetings when considering the recommended judicial appointments. In his view, this was a contravention of the BL. He stressed that the current-term LegCo should not seek to bind LegCo of subsequent terms with such a consensus, as LegCo of each term should have the power to determine its own practice having regard to the cultural changes and developments in society.

Action

He therefore considered it necessary to seek clarification of the consensus referred to by the Chairman.

40. The Chairman clarified that no Member had proposed that LegCo should never invite nominees for judicial appointments to its meetings. What had been proposed was that the proposed subcommittee should revert to the House Committee for deliberation should it consider it necessary to invite the nominees concerned to their meetings.

41. Ms Emily LAU said that the Secretariat should have provided for Members' reference the relevant report of the AJLS Panel to the House Committee on the procedure for endorsement of appointment of judges by LegCo under BL 73(7). Members could then refer to the report for the agreed procedure to avoid any misunderstanding. She pointed out that if the proposed subcommittee was formed under the House Committee, it would have to follow the procedure endorsed by the House Committee and would need to seek the endorsement of the House Committee for making any changes to the procedure. She reiterated her view that it was appropriate for Members to form a subcommittee to consider the recommended appointments to discharge their duties under BL.

42. Dr Priscilla LEUNG said that it was her understanding that any decision made by the House Committee in the current term could be amended by the House Committee in subsequent terms. She reiterated the need for a clear understanding among Members that the proposed subcommittee, if appointed, would not invite the recommended judges to its meetings. She pointed out that in the United States, judges could stand for political elections. She hoped that the existing convention in Hong Kong whereby judges should refrain from participating in political activities should be maintained. She sought clarification on whether LegCo had appointed a subcommittee to consider the appointment of the incumbent Chief Justice.

43. At the invitation of the Chairman, LA said that the appointment of the incumbent Chief Justice, which took effect on 1 July 1997, was approved by the Provisional LegCo through the enactment of the Hong Kong Reunification Bill. Since the handover of the sovereignty on 1 July 1997, it was the first time for LegCo to consider a recommendation for the appointment of the Chief Justice. Nonetheless, LegCo had exercised its power to endorse the appointment of permanent and non-permanent judges to CFA on several occasions, and subcommittees had been formed to consider some of these appointments in accordance with the procedure endorsed by the House Committee in May 2003.

44. Mr IP Kwok-him reiterated his view on the importance for Members to have a clear understanding that for the current term, the relevant subcommittees should seek the endorsement of the House Committee on any proposal to invite the recommended judicial appointees to answer questions.

Action

45. Mr Andrew LEUNG sought clarification on whether subcommittees formed under the House Committee had to seek the endorsement of the House Committee for any proposals to invite individuals/organizations to their meetings or whether they had to seek the support of the House Committee only for exercising powers to summon witnesses. He was concerned that should the former be the case, the function of subcommittees would be diminished greatly.

46. The Chairman clarified that generally speaking, subcommittees formed under the House Committee could invite individuals/organizations to their meetings. However, they could not exercise the powers conferred under section 9(1) of the LegCo (Powers and Privileges) Ordinance to summon any person to testify or give evidence unless they were authorized by resolution of the Council. Pursuant to the procedure for endorsement of senior judicial appointments by LegCo recommended by the AJLS Panel and endorsed by the House Committee, such recommended appointments should be considered by subcommittees appointed under the House Committee if considered necessary. Dr Margaret NG had mentioned earlier at the meeting that when the procedure was formulated, the AJLS Panel was of the view that no arrangement should be made for the judicial nominees to be questioned by Members, although such requirement had not been expressly laid down in the procedure. In view of such, she had sought Members' view on whether they agreed that the proposed subcommittee would need to revert to the House Committee for inviting any recommended judicial nominees to answer questions. She stressed that she was referring to the proposed subcommittee for considering the recommended senior judicial appointments, and not other subcommittees appointed under the House Committee.

47. Mr Andrew LEUNG sought LA's view on whether the Chairman's understanding was correct.

48. At the invitation of the Chairman, LA said that it was for Members to decide whether they had a consensus concerning the proposed subcommittee. He added that under RoP 75(18), the practice and procedure of the House Committee and its subcommittees should be determined by the House Committee.

49. Dr Margaret NG said that since the announcement by the incumbent Chief Justice of his retirement last year, the Secretariat had issued all the relevant information concerning endorsement of judicial appointments including the procedure endorsed by the House Committee to members of the AJLS Panel. Under the procedure, it was for the House Committee to decide whether to form a subcommittee to discuss the recommended judicial appointments. Should a subcommittee be formed, its practice and procedure should follow the procedure which had been endorsed by the House Committee. The procedure did not provide for the invitation of the nominees to answer questions, as in the case of the United States. Unless a proposal was made to revise the procedure, the proposed subcommittee, if appointed, should follow the procedure as endorsed by the House Committee.

Action

50. At the request of Ms Emily LAU, the Chairman explained the procedure as endorsed by the House Committee at its meeting on 16 May 2003 as follows:

- (a) the Administration advised the House Committee of CE's acceptance of the recommendation of the Judicial Officers Recommendation Commission and provided sufficient information on the recommended judicial appointee(s) to LegCo (this should take place before CE made any public announcement of his acceptance of the recommendation);
- (b) the House Committee referred the matter to a subcommittee for discussion;
- (c) the subcommittee discussed the matter as soon as possible;
- (d) the subcommittee reported its deliberation to the House Committee;
- (e) the Administration gave notice of a motion to seek the endorsement of LegCo of the recommended appointment;
- (f) the motion was moved, debated and voted on at a Council meeting; and
- (g) if the motion was passed by LegCo, CE made the appointment.

51. The Chairman added that if the proposed subcommittee was formed, it had to follow the procedure as endorsed. To allay some Members' concern, it should be made clear that the subcommittee had to revert to the House Committee on any proposal to invite the recommended appointees to answer questions.

52. Members agreed to the proposal for setting up a subcommittee to discuss the four recommended judicial appointments as announced by CE on 8 April 2010. The following Members agreed to join: Dr Margaret NG, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Ronny TONG and Dr Priscilla LEUNG.

IX. Position on Bills Committees and subcommittees

(LC Paper No. CB(2) 1288/09-10)

53. The Chairman said that there were five Bills Committees, six subcommittees under the House Committee (i.e. two subcommittees on subsidiary legislation, one subcommittee on proposed senior judicial appointments and three subcommittees on policy issues) and nine subcommittees under Panels in action.

Action

X. Methods for selecting the Chief Executive and forming the Legislative Council in 2012

(Letter dated 13 April 2010 from Hon IP Kwok-him to the Chairman of the House Committee (LC Paper No. CB(2) 1310/09-10(01))

54. Mr IP Kwok-him said that the Administration had published on 14 April 2010 a package of proposals on the methods for selecting CE and for forming LegCo ("the two electoral methods") in 2012. Given the wide public concern, he considered it necessary for LegCo to follow up on the matter. He pointed out that when the Administration put forth in October 2005 proposals for the two electoral methods in 2007/2008, a subcommittee had been formed under the House Committee to study the proposals. He proposed that the same approach be adopted for following up the Administration's proposals for the two electoral methods in 2012. He added that as opposed to the appointment of a subcommittee under the Panel on Constitutional Affairs ("CA Panel") which only members of the CA Panel could join, the appointment of a subcommittee under the House Committee would afford all Members the opportunity to join it.

55. Dr Margaret NG sought clarification on whether the Administration had indicated the specific timing for introducing into LegCo the two motions regarding the amendments to the two electoral methods. The Chairman said that the Administration had only indicated that it would do so before the LegCo recess in mid-July 2010. Dr Margaret NG suggested writing to the Administration to enquire about the specific timing for introducing the two motions. Members agreed.

56. In response to Mr Ronny TONG, the Chairman said that the Subcommittee formed in 2005 was under the House Committee, and not the CA Panel, to enable all interested Members to join. The Subcommittee was formed before the Administration had given formal notice for the relevant motions to allow more time for Members to consider the proposals.

57. Members agreed to Mr IP Kwok-him's proposal that a subcommittee be formed under the House Committee to study the Administration's proposals for the two electoral methods in 2012. The following Members agreed to join: Dr Margaret NG, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Ms Emily LAU, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Mr Ronny TONG, Ms Cyd HO, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mrs Regina IP and Dr PAN Pey-chyau.

XI. Any other business

58. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 3:11 pm.