

**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**

**2010 年 11 月至 2011 年 6 月的工作進度報告  
Progress Report for the period  
November 2010 to June 2011**

**2011 年 7 月 13 日  
13 July 2011**

## CONTENTS

<b>Chapter</b>		<b>Page</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Review of the procedural arrangements relating to Council meetings</b>	<b>2</b>
—	Procedure for dealing with interdependent amendments to a bill during the Committee stage	2
—	Display of objects by Members during Council meetings	4
—	Sanctions against Members for repeated or persistent disorderly conduct at Council meetings	7
<b>3.</b>	<b>Review of the procedures of committees of the Council</b>	<b>11</b>
—	Order at committee meetings	11
—	Other procedures for committees	12
<b>4.</b>	<b>Procedure for the election of the President of the Legislative Council</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Procedural arrangements for the implementation of Article 73(9) of the Basic Law on impeachment of the Chief Executive</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Acknowledgement</b>	<b>17</b>

---

## **Appendix**

- I. Membership list**
  
  - II. List of issues studied by the Committee on Rules of Procedure during the period from November 2010 to June 2011**
-

## 1. Introduction

1.1 The Committee on Rules of Procedure (“the Committee”) is a committee of the Legislative Council established under Rule 74 of the Rules of Procedure of the Council. The functions of the Committee are to review the Rules of Procedure 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 The Committee consists of 12 members, including the Chairman Hon TAM Yiu-chung, the Deputy Chairman Dr Hon Margaret NG and 10 other members, appointed by the President in accordance with the recommendations of the House Committee. The membership list is in **Appendix I**.

1.3 This report covers the period from November 2010 to June 2011, during which four meetings were held to study a range of subjects that may be grouped under the following categories:

- (a) review of the procedural arrangements relating to Council meetings;
- (b) review of the procedures of the committees of the Council;
- (c) procedure for the election of the President of the Legislative Council; and
- (d) procedural arrangements for the implementation of Article 73(9) of the Basic Law (“BL”) on impeachment of the Chief Executive (“CE”).

A complete list of the issues studied by the Committee in the current session is in **Appendix II**.

## **2. Review of the procedural arrangements relating to Council meetings**

2.1 In the 2010-2011 session, the Committee examined a number of procedural arrangements relating to meetings of the Council, including:

- (a) procedure for dealing with interdependent amendments to a bill during the Committee stage;
- (b) display of objects by Members during Council meetings; and
- (c) sanctions against Members for repeated or persistent disorderly behaviour at Council meetings.

### **Procedure for dealing with interdependent amendments to a bill during the Committee stage**

2.2 The sequence of dealing with provisions in a bill and amendments to the bill during the Committee stage is provided in Rule 58 of the Rules of Procedure. In particular, subrule (5) provides that any proposed new clause would be considered after the clauses of the bill had been disposed of and before consideration of any schedule of the bill, while subrule (7) provides that any proposed new schedule would be considered after the schedules of the bill had been disposed of. Under subrule (2), the Chairman in a committee of the whole Council may allow a single discussion to cover a series of interdependent amendments to a bill in order to save time and avoid repetition of arguments, but Rule 58 failed to provide that for the purpose of subrule (2), the Chairman might change the sequence of dealing with new clauses, schedules and new schedules as stipulated in subrules (5) and (7).

2.3 As a result, where the Chairman in a committee of the whole Council considered it appropriate to allow a single discussion on a series of interdependent amendments which were related to a clause, a proposed new clause, a schedule and/or a proposed new schedule of a bill, the Member or the public officer who was to move the amendments would need to move a motion to suspend Rule 58(5) and/or (7), in accordance with Rule 91, in order that the Chairman

might order a single discussion on the interdependent amendments to enable Members to consider the new clause, the schedule and/or the new schedule together with any interdependent clause of the bill.

2.4 As Rule 91 of the Rules of Procedure stipulates that only the President may give consent for a motion to be moved to suspend a rule, whenever such a motion is to be moved, the Chairman in a committee of the whole Council will have to order the Council to resume so that the required consent for moving that motion may be given by the President. When such a motion has been voted upon, the Council will again resolve itself into committee for the continuation of the proceedings on the amendments to the bill.

2.5 The above procedure was invoked on many occasions in the past. During the Committee stage of the Minimum Wage Bill at the Council meeting of 14 July 2010, the President, in the capacity of the Chairman of the committee of the whole Council, requested the Committee to examine whether the procedure referred to in paragraph 2.4 above could be dispensed with.

2.6 In the course of its study, the Committee noticed that the problem did not lie with the current mechanism for suspension of rules provided in Rule 91, but with the absence of an express provision in Rule 58 to provide that when there is a series of interdependent amendments to a bill, the Chairman in a committee of the whole Council may allow not only a single discussion on those amendments but also a change to the sequence of dealing with new clauses, schedules and new schedules as currently provided in Rule 58(5) and (7). The Committee recommended that Rule 58(2) be amended to the effect that where there is a series of interdependent amendments to a bill, the Chairman in a committee of the whole Council may allow a single discussion on the interdependent amendments and, if necessary, change the sequence of dealing with new clauses, schedules and new schedules as currently provided in Rule 58(5) and (7).

2.7 The proposed amendment to Rule 58(2) had the support of the House Committee and was approved by the Council on 30 March 2011.

### **Display of objects by Members during Council meetings**

2.8 Rule 45(2) provides that “T[t]he President, the Chairman of a committee of the whole Council or the chairman of any committee shall order a Member whose conduct is grossly disorderly to withdraw immediately from the Council or the committee for the remainder of that meeting; and the Clerk or clerk of any committee shall act on orders received by him from the Chair to ensure compliance with this order”. The current regulatory standards (“the current regulatory standards”) in relation to the display of signs and messages by Members during Council meetings are:

- (a) the President would allow Members to display signs and messages so long as the items do not disturb the proceedings of meetings or obstruct other Members or public officers attending the meetings;
- (b) the President would ask the Members concerned to put away the signs and messages properly if their display causes disturbance or obstruction, either upon the complaints of other Members or of the President’s own accord; and
- (c) should a Member put up a placard or attempt to present the placard to any public officer, thus disturbing order at the meeting and amounting to grossly disorderly conduct, the President could order the Member to withdraw immediately from the Council for the remainder of the meeting in accordance with Rule 45(2) of the Rules of Procedure.

2.9 The Committee conducted a consultation exercise in August 2010 on the issue of display of signs and messages by Members during Council meetings. In the consultation exercise, Members were asked to give their views on whether the current regulatory standards should be changed, and if a change is considered necessary, whether and how the Rules of Procedure should be amended to give effect to the change.

2.10 The need for conducting a study on the display of signs and messages by Members in the Chamber during Council meetings arose from the incident of over 20 Members displaying placards throughout the Council meeting on 14 October 2009 when CE delivered his Policy Address. Thirty-two Members jointly wrote to the President expressing their concern. In his reply, the President stated that the display of placards by Members was an issue that would inevitably give rise to controversy among Members. If any change was to be made to the regulatory standards, it should have the support of the majority of Members in order for corresponding amendments to be made to the Rules of Procedure.

2.11 The outcome of the consultation revealed that the majority of Members did not support changing the current regulatory standards set out in paragraph 2.8 above. According to the findings, 67% of Members did not consider it necessary to change the current regulatory standards, while 30% of Members considered the change necessary. In addition, a significant minority of Members (32%), regardless of whether they considered the change necessary, were of the view that the display of signs and messages by Members should only be allowed when Members were speaking and so long as the items were used to help them illustrate their arguments and did not disturb the proceedings of meetings or obstruct other Members or public officers attending the meetings. As about two-thirds of the Members did not support changing the current regulatory standards, the Committee decided that there was no need for the Committee to further follow up the matter.

2.12 However, following the occurrence of several incidents in January and February 2011 involving some Members throwing objects at public officers during meetings of the Council and committees, the Committee re-visited the issue of display of objects by Members during Council meetings upon the President's request to consider whether appropriate amendments should be made to the Rules of Procedure to more effectively ensure the smooth conduct of meetings.

2.13 In this review, the Committee studied the relevant rules and practices of the Parliaments of the United Kingdom ("UK"), Australia, New Zealand and Canada as well as the Legislative Yuan of Taiwan on display of objects by Members at sittings. The Committee noted that

all these legislatures, except Canada, allow the use of visual aids by Members during debates in the chamber, although in the UK and Australia the use of such aids is tolerated rather than encouraged. The relevant Speakers had ruled that Members should be sufficiently articulate to express what they wished to say without any aid. In all these five legislatures, only the Legislative Yuan of Taiwan expressly bans dangerous objects to be brought into the chamber. In the other four legislatures, objects which may pose danger are not allowed in the chamber as a matter of convention established through rulings made by Speakers over the years. It is also their established practice to disallow the use of visual aids which may cause inconvenience to Members or obstruct the proceedings of the Parliament.

2.14 The Committee noted that under the Rules of Procedure, there is no provision to regulate Members' bringing of objects into the Chamber which are intended to be used or displayed during Council meetings. The practice of the Legislative Council is that the use of any objects brought into the Chamber during Council meetings should not cause obstruction to other Members in their participation of the proceedings of the Council. Where a point of order is taken by a Member that obstruction has been caused and where the President considers it necessary, he will direct the Member causing the obstruction to remove the object(s). If that Member refuses to comply with the President's direction, the President will regard the refusal of that Member to be grossly disorderly conduct under Rule 45(2) and will order that Member to immediately withdraw from the Council for the remainder of that meeting.

2.15 The Committee is generally of the view that it is not necessary to amend the Rules of Procedure to regulate the kinds of objects which should not be allowed to be brought into the Chamber, as the existing provisions in the Rules of Procedure are adequate for the President to deal with disruption at Council meetings caused by display of objects by Members at these meetings. For instance, if a Member's behaviour is determined by the President to be contrary to Rule 42(a) of the Rules of Procedure which provides that "Members shall enter or leave the Council properly attired and with decorum" and the Member continues to behave in such a manner despite the President's order for him to stop such behaviour, the President may exercise his power provided to him under Rule 45(2) of the Rules of Procedure to order

the Member concerned to leave the Council for the remainder of the meeting on grounds of grossly disorderly conduct.

2.16 The Committee generally agrees to the principle adopted by the House of Representatives of the New Zealand Parliament in its Standing Order 108 under which Members are permitted the use of appropriate visual aids to illustrate points made in their speeches, provided that the aids do not cause inconvenience to other Members or obstruct the proceedings of the House, and the aids must be removed at the end of the speech. At the completion of this review, the Chairman of the Committee wrote to the President on 30 May 2011 and suggested to him to draw reference from the principle reflected in the New Zealand standing order in the event that he needs to rule on the use of any object which may cause inconvenience to other Members or obstruct the proceedings of the Council.

### **Sanctions against Members for repeated or persistent disorderly conduct at Council meetings**

2.17 Under the Rules of Procedure, Members:

- (a) should speak on the subject under discussion and should not introduce irrelevant matter (Rule 41(1));
- (b) should not use offensive and insulting language about other Members (Rule 41(4));
- (c) should not impute improper motives to another Member (Rule 41(5));
- (d) should attend a Council meeting in proper attire and with decorum (Rule 42(a));
- (e) should not cross the floor of the Council unnecessarily during a Council meeting (Rule 42(b));

- (f) should not read newspapers and other documents during a Council meeting which are not related to the business of the Council (Rule 42(c));
- (g) should be silent and should not make unseemly interruptions while another Member is speaking (Rule 42(d)); and
- (h) should not persist in irrelevance or tedious repetition of their own or other Members' arguments in a debate (Rule 45(1)).

2.18 The Rules of Procedure do not provide any specific sanctions against Members who have breached the rules cited in paragraph 2.17 above. Suspension, as provided under Rule 85<sup>1</sup>, is a sanction relating to interests, operating expenses or operating funds, and not disorderly conduct. Nevertheless, Rule 45(2) of the Rules of Procedure empowers the President to order a Member whose conduct is grossly disorderly to withdraw immediately from the Council for the remainder of that meeting.

2.19 In past cases, it was the President to determine whether any breach of the above rules (or any other conduct of a Member) constitutes grossly disorderly conduct and, as the President deems fit, to order the Member concerned to withdraw from the Council. Listed below are the types of disorderly conduct in question:

- (a) refusal to stop displaying signs and messages;
- (b) throwing objects at meetings;
- (c) crossing the floor of the Council and attempting to grab the speech of a public officer;

---

<sup>1</sup> Under Rule 85 of RoP, any Member who fails to comply with Rule 83 (Registration of Interests), 83A (Personal Pecuniary Interest to be Disclosed), 83AA (Claims for Reimbursement of Operating Expenses or Applications for Advance of Operating Funds) or 84(1) or (1A) (Voting or Withdrawal in case of Direct Pecuniary Interest) may be admonished, reprimanded or suspended by the Council on a motion to that effect.

- (d) crossing the floor of the Council unnecessarily and refusal to return to seat;
- (e) speaking aloud when it was not the Member's turn to speak and refusal to sit down and stop speaking;
- (f) refusal to withdraw offensive and insulting language;
- (g) refusal to withdraw accusations against the President;
- (h) refusal to stop speaking on irrelevant matter;
- (i) not observing the rules of asking supplementary questions to oral questions; and
- (j) refusal to stop making comments on a ruling made by the Chairman of the Finance Committee.

2.20 In response to the concern that there was a lack of sanction under the Rules of Procedure to deter repeated or persistent disorderly conduct of Members at Council meetings, the Committee conducted a number of studies on issues relating to order in Council in the last two legislative sessions. After deliberations, the Committee noted that there was no consensus view among members on whether there was a need to amend the Rules of Procedure or introduce any new arrangements to deal with Members' repeated disorderly conduct in Council. Generally speaking, members considered that the power given to the President under Rule 45(2) of the Rules of Procedure to order a Member whose conduct is grossly disorderly to withdraw immediately from the Council was adequate to deal with the situation. Any further sanctions against Members would have to be considered carefully to ensure no contravention with the Basic Law.

2.21 In response to the request of some members, the Committee requested the Secretariat to conduct a further study on the rules and practices of overseas legislatures which give their President/Speaker the authority to suspend the service of a Member for repeated or persistent grossly disorderly conduct at sittings, without the need of moving a motion to that effect, as practised in a number of Parliaments.

2.22 This further study covered the Parliaments of Germany, India and South Africa, where the President/Speaker has the authority to order a Member to leave the chamber for serious breach of order(s) for the remainder of the sitting and to suspend the service of a Member for repeated breaches of order(s) at sittings up to a certain period, without the need for a motion to be passed before the suspension can take effect. It was noted that although the President/Speaker may order suspension of service for a certain period, such suspension is subject to some form of an appeal mechanism, such as an objection lodged by the Member concerned to be placed on the agenda of the next sitting for a decision by the House without debate, or a motion to be moved at any time that the suspension of a Member be terminated. In the case of South Africa, the Member who has been suspended may submit a written expression of regret to the Speaker. If the Speaker approves such an expression of regret, he may discharge the suspension and inform the National Assembly accordingly. An expression of regret approved by the Speaker is recorded in the minutes of proceedings.

2.23 After further deliberations, members remained generally of the view that it would not be necessary to amend the Rules of Procedure to impose sanctions to deal with Members' disorderly conduct in Council.

2.24 Nevertheless, following a number of incidents occurring in May and June 2011 which involved some Members behaving in a disorderly manner at Council and committee meetings, the President requested the Committee to further consider the subject. The Committee will study the relevant rules and practices of selected overseas legislatures dealing with violent acts, in particular the throwing of objects, committed by Members during sittings of the Parliament or committee meetings, at its meeting in July 2011.

### **3. Review of the procedures of committees of the Council**

3.1 The Committee also studied the following issues relating to the procedures of committees of the Council in the 2010-2011 session:

- (a) order at committee meetings; and
- (b) other procedures for committees.

#### **Order at committee meetings**

3.2 The issue of whether Rules 44 and 45 of the Rules of Procedure should be extended to cover other committees of the Council was last studied by the Committee in 2004. Rule 44 referred to the finality of decisions made by the President or the chairman of any standing committee or select committee on a point of order, while Rule 45(1) empowered the President or such chairman to order Members who persist in irrelevance or tedious repetition to stop speaking. Rule 45(2) empowered the President or the chairman of any standing committee or select committee to order immediate withdrawal of Members whose conduct is grossly disorderly. The review concluded that it was not necessary to extend the rules to other committees, as the power given to the chairmen of these committees was adequate for them to deal with disputes at meetings. Subsequently in 2009, in response to a suggestion to extend these rules to other committees, consultation with Members was conducted by the Committee. The outcome of the consultation indicated that Members had divergent views on the proposed extension of rules. The Committee agreed that the matter should not be dealt with for the time being.

3.3 Following recent incidents involving some Members behaving in a disorderly manner at committee meetings and upon the President's request referred to in paragraph 2.12 above, the Committee discussed ways of ensuring the smooth operation of committees. The majority of the members considered that the present approach of handling disorderly conduct of Members at committee meetings could no longer ensure the smooth operation of the committees, due to increasing frequency of disorderly conduct of Members at committee meetings. Some members pointed out that although the chairman concerned

might suspend a meeting if a Member continued to act in a disorderly manner despite the chairman's warnings, such suspension was highly disruptive to the work of the committee. If, upon resumption of the meeting, the Member continued to act in a disorderly manner, the chairman might have no alternative but to suspend the meeting again to let the Member calm down. Most members of the Committee supported that Rules 44 and 45 of the Rules of Procedure should be extended to cover all committees of the Council.

3.4 Dr Hon Margaret NG, Deputy Chairman of the Committee, was however of the view that to empower the chairmen of other committees to order withdrawal of a Member from a meeting on the ground of disorderly conduct might lead to more conflicts and confrontations, which would not be conducive to the smooth operation of these committees. Dr NG's view was noted.

3.5 The Committee's recommendation to extend Rules 44 and 45 was discussed at the House Committee meeting on 15 April 2011. In response to objection expressed by some Members about extending Rules 45(1) to the chairmen of all committees, two separate motions, the first to amend Rules 44 and 45(2), and the second one to amend Rule 45(1), were moved at the Council meeting of 11 May 2011. The first motion was approved by the Council, while the second motion was negated by the Council.

### **Other procedures for committees**

3.6 The Committee has also requested the Secretariat to undertake research on the practice and procedures in overseas legislatures in respect of the following:

- (a) procedure for making amendments to the report of a committee, such as a select committee, after it has been dissolved; and

- (b) procedure for handling minutes of closed meetings of committees, such as select committees, which had been dissolved and members of the relevant committee are no longer Members of the Legislative Council.

3.7 The Committee will discuss these issues at its meeting in July 2011.

#### **4. Procedure for the election of the President of the Legislative Council**

4.1 The Committee conducted a review of the procedure for the election of the President of the Legislative Council, as set out in the Schedule to the Rules of Procedure, in response to the comments raised by a member of the public concerning the election method.

4.2 The member of the public points out that under the current procedure for the election of the President of the Legislative Council, where there are more than two candidates, a candidate who receives the highest number of votes among all candidates will be elected, regardless of whether he or she receives less than or more than half of the votes cast. Given that the President of the Legislative Council is an important office, the member of the public suggests that the Legislative Council should consider adopting an absolute majority system for the election of this office, i.e. for a candidate to be elected, he or she must receive more than half of the votes cast. The member of the public also points out that an absolute majority system is adopted for the election of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of a District Council. The member of the public also suggests revisions to the wording of the election procedure.

4.3 In view of the different views expressed in the course of the Committee's deliberations, members consulted their respective political parties and groupings on whether the current procedure for the election of the President should be amended to the effect that only a candidate who received more than 50% of the votes cast would be elected. As the views obtained during consultation on the matter were also diverse, the Committee considers that the current procedure for the election of the President of the Legislative Council should not be revised. The Committee will re-visit the issue in the future if and when necessary. The Committee also agrees not to revise the wording of the current election procedure for the President raised by the same member of the public, which are technical in nature, as the existing wording is sufficiently clear.

## **5. Procedural arrangements for the implementation of Article 73(9) of the Basic Law on impeachment of the Chief Executive**

### 5.1 Article 73(9) of BL provides:

“如立法會全體議員的四分之一聯合動議，指控行政長官有嚴重違法或瀆職行為而不辭職，經立法會通過進行調查，立法會可委托終審法院首席法官負責組成獨立的調查委員會，並擔任主席。調查委員會負責進行調查，並向立法會提出報告。如該調查委員會認為有足夠證據構成上述指控，立法會以全體議員三分之二多數通過，可提出彈劾案，報請中央人民政府決定”。

(English translation)

“If a motion initiated jointly by one-fourth of all the members of the Legislative Council charges the Chief Executive with serious breach of law or dereliction of duty and if he or she refuses to resign, the Council may, after passing a motion for investigation, give a mandate to the Chief Justice of the Court of Final Appeal to form and chair an independent investigation committee. The committee shall be responsible for carrying out the investigation and reporting its findings to the Council. If the committee considers the evidence sufficient to substantiate such charges, the Council may pass a motion of impeachment by a two-thirds majority of all its members and report it to the Central People’s Government for decision”.

5.2 After reviewing the initial proposal of the Committee of the Third Legislative Council, the Committee of the Fourth Legislative Council agreed on a revised proposal using a streamlined, five-step approach comprises three stages. Under the proposed mechanism, a motion for investigation would be moved and debated in Council if not less than one-fourth of all Legislative Council Members jointly sign and give notice of such a motion. If the motion is passed, the Legislative Council may give a mandate to the Chief Justice who will

form and chair an independent investigation committee. Upon the completion of the investigation and its submission of a report to the Legislative Council, a motion of impeachment may be moved if the investigation committee considers that the evidence was sufficient to substantiate the charges. If the motion of impeachment is passed with a two-third majority of all Legislative Council Members, it should be reported to the Central People's Government for decision. The proposed mechanism was described in detail in the Committee's progress report in the 2009-2010 session.

5.3 The Administration was concerned about the procedure for notifying CE upon the triggering off of the impeachment procedure and whether the normal requisite notice period for motions would apply to the motion for investigation. The Administration has replied to the Secretariat in writing on 30 June 2011 that it is still in the process of consolidating its views and would revert to the Committee as soon as it is in a position to do so.

5.4 The Committee also requested the Secretariat to study and collate relevant information on the procedure for the impeachment of the head of state in other jurisdictions to facilitate its consideration of the matter. The Committee will continue its deliberations when the Administration's reply is received.

## **6. Acknowledgement**

6.1 Members of the Committee wish to record their appreciation of the views of Members of the Council and their support for the work of the Committee.

---

## Appendix I

### Membership list

#### Committee on Rules of Procedure

**Chairman** Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP

**Deputy Chairman** Dr Hon Margaret NG

**Members** Hon Albert HO Chun-yan  
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan  
Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, GBS, JP  
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP  
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, SBS, JP  
Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC  
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, JP  
Hon IP Wai-ming, MH  
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yea, GBS, JP

(Total : 12 Members)

**Clerk** Miss Mary SO

**Legal Adviser** Mr Jimmy MA, JP

**Appendix II****Committee on Rules of Procedure****List of issues studied during the period from November 2010 to June 2011**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Relevant rule(s)</b>	<b>Progress/remarks</b>
1	<b>Display of objects by Members during Council meetings</b>	Rule 45 of the Rules of Procedure	The Committee is generally of the view that it is not necessary to amend the Rules of Procedure to regulate the kinds of objects which should not be allowed to be brought into the Chamber. The Committee generally agrees to the principle that Members are permitted to use visual aids to illustrate points made in their speeches, provided that the aids do not cause inconvenience to other Members or obstruct the proceedings of the Council. In addition, the aids must be removed at the end of the speech. A letter was sent by the Chairman of the Committee to the President on 30 May 2011 and suggested to him to draw reference from the aforesaid principle in the event that he needs to rule on the use of any object which may cause inconvenience to other Members or obstruct the proceedings of the Council.
2	<b>Sanctions against Members for repeated or persistent disorderly conduct at Council meetings</b>	Rules 44 and 45 of the Rules of Procedure	The Committee is of the view that it is not necessary to amend the Rules of Procedure to impose sanctions to deal with Members' disorderly conduct at Council meetings. The Committee will further study at its meeting in July 2011 the relevant rules and practices of selected overseas legislatures dealing with violent acts, in particular the throwing of objects, committed by Members during sittings of the Parliament or committee meetings.

Item	Issue	Relevant rule(s)	Progress/remarks
3	<b>Procedure for dealing with interdependent amendments to a bill during the Committee stage</b>	Rule 58(2) of the Rules of Procedure	The amendment to Rule 58(2) received the support of the House Committee and was approved by the Council on 30 March 2011. The provision was amended accordingly.
4	<b>Procedure for the election of the President of the Legislative Council</b>	Schedule of the Rules of Procedure	The Committee concludes that since the majority of views expressed by members indicated a wish to maintain the current system, there was no need to make any change to the Rules of Procedure. The Committee agrees that the issue could be re-visited in the future if and when necessary.
5	<b>Order at committee meetings</b>	Rules 44 and 45 of the Rules of Procedure	The recommendations by the Committee on the amendments to Rules 44 and 45 of the Rules of Procedure were considered by the House Committee on 15 April 2011. The Council approved the amendments to Rules 44 and 45(2) at the meeting of 11 May 2011 and the relevant provisions were amended accordingly.
6	<b>Procedure for amending published reports of committees of the Legislative Council</b>	--	The Committee has requested the Secretariat to conduct a study of the relevant rules and practices of other legislatures. The Committee will discuss the issue at its meeting in July 2011.
7	<b>Procedure for handling minutes of closed meetings of committees which had been dissolved</b>	--	The Committee has requested the Secretariat to conduct a study of the relevant rules and practices of other legislatures. The Committee will discuss the issue at its meeting in July 2011.
8	<b>Procedural arrangements for the implementation of Article 73(9) of the</b>	Article 73(9) of Basic Law	The Committee notes that the Administration is still in the process of consolidating its views and would revert to the Committee as soon as it is in a

<b>Item</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Relevant rule(s)</b>	<b>Progress/remarks</b>
	<b>Basic Law on impeachment of the Chief Executive</b>		position to do so. The Committee will continue its deliberations when the Administration's reply is received