

OFFICIAL RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Friday, 1 June 2012

The Council continued to meet at Nine o'clock

MEMBERS PRESENT:

THE PRESIDENT

THE HONOURABLE JASPER TSANG YOK-SING, G.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE ALBERT HO CHUN-YAN

IR DR THE HONOURABLE RAYMOND HO CHUNG-TAI, S.B.S., S.B.ST.J., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE LEE CHEUK-YAN

DR THE HONOURABLE DAVID LI KWOK-PO, G.B.M., G.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE FRED LI WAH-MING, S.B.S., J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE MARGARET NG

THE HONOURABLE JAMES TO KUN-SUN

THE HONOURABLE CHEUNG MAN-KWONG

THE HONOURABLE CHAN KAM-LAM, S.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE MRS SOPHIE LEUNG LAU YAU-FUN, G.B.S., J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE PHILIP WONG YU-HONG, G.B.S.

THE HONOURABLE WONG YUNG-KAN, S.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE LAU KONG-WAH, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE LAU WONG-FAT, G.B.M., G.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE MIRIAM LAU KIN-YEE, G.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE EMILY LAU WAI-HING, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE TAM YIU-CHUNG, G.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE ABRAHAM SHEK LAI-HIM, S.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE LI FUNG-YING, S.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE TOMMY CHEUNG YU-YAN, S.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE FREDERICK FUNG KIN-KEE, S.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE AUDREY EU YUET-MEE, S.C., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE VINCENT FANG KANG, S.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE WONG KWOK-HING, M.H.

THE HONOURABLE LEE WING-TAT

THE HONOURABLE JEFFREY LAM KIN-FUNG, G.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE ANDREW LEUNG KWAN-YUEN, G.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE CHEUNG HOK-MING, G.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE WONG TING-KWONG, B.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE RONNY TONG KA-WAH, S.C.

THE HONOURABLE CHIM PUI-CHUNG

PROF THE HONOURABLE PATRICK LAU SAU-SHING, S.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE KAM NAI-WAI, M.H.

THE HONOURABLE CYD HO SAU-LAN

THE HONOURABLE STARRY LEE WAI-KING, J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE LAM TAI-FAI, B.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE CHAN HAK-KAN

THE HONOURABLE PAUL CHAN MO-PO, M.H., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE CHAN KIN-POR, J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE PRISCILLA LEUNG MEI-FUN, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE CHEUNG KWOK-CHE

THE HONOURABLE WONG SING-CHI

THE HONOURABLE WONG KWOK-KIN, B.B.S.

THE HONOURABLE IP WAI-MING, M.H.

THE HONOURABLE IP KWOK-HIM, G.B.S., J.P.

THE HONOURABLE MRS REGINA IP LAU SUK-YEE, G.B.S., J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE PAN PEY-CHYOU

THE HONOURABLE PAUL TSE WAI-CHUN, J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE SAMSON TAM WAI-HO, J.P.

THE HONOURABLE ALAN LEONG KAH-KIT, S.C.

THE HONOURABLE LEUNG KWOK-HUNG

THE HONOURABLE TANYA CHAN

THE HONOURABLE WONG YUK-MAN

MEMBERS ABSENT:

THE HONOURABLE LEUNG YIU-CHUNG

THE HONOURABLE ANDREW CHENG KAR-FOO

THE HONOURABLE TIMOTHY FOK TSUN-TING, G.B.S., J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE JOSEPH LEE KOK-LONG, S.B.S., J.P.

DR THE HONOURABLE LEUNG KA-LAU

THE HONOURABLE ALBERT CHAN WAI-YIP

PUBLIC OFFICERS ATTENDING:

THE HONOURABLE GREGORY SO KAM-LEUNG, J.P.
SECRETARY FOR COMMERCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

THE HONOURABLE RAYMOND TAM CHI-YUEN, J.P.
SECRETARY FOR CONSTITUTIONAL AND MAINLAND AFFAIRS

MISS ADELINE WONG CHING-MAN, J.P.
UNDER SECRETARY FOR CONSTITUTIONAL AND MAINLAND
AFFAIRS

CLERKS IN ATTENDANCE:

MR ANDY LAU KWOK-CHEONG, ASSISTANT SECRETARY GENERAL

MRS JUSTINA LAM CHENG BO-LING, ASSISTANT SECRETARY
GENERAL

MRS PERCY MA, ASSISTANT SECRETARY GENERAL

BILLS**Committee Stage**

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Clerk, please ring the bell to summon Members to the Chamber.

(After the summoning bell had been rung, a number of Members entered the Chamber)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The meeting now starts.

Before we proceed to put the remaining amendments to vote, let me first explain to Members the meeting arrangements for today's meeting. The suspension of meeting to provide meal breaks and short breaks for Members is only applicable during the Committee stage of the Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012, which is likely to conclude this morning. Nonetheless, as meetings of the House Committee and the Finance Committee have been scheduled in the afternoon, I will still suspend the meeting at about 1 pm to allow Members take meals and attend the meetings. The Council meeting will resume after the Finance Committee meeting has ended. We now proceed to put the remaining amendments to vote.

Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1141.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL (AMENDMENT) BILL 2012

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Good morning, Chairman.

Chairman, I move amendment No. 1141 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1141 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Kwok-kin has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Prof Patrick LAU, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1142.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1142 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1142 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Kwok-kin has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Prof Patrick LAU, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1143.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1143 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1143 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Kwok-kin has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Dr David LI, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Prof Patrick LAU, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1144.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1144 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1144 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Kwok-kin has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Dr David LI, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Prof Patrick LAU, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1145.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1145 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1145 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Kwok-kin has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Dr David LI, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1146.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1146 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1146 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Kwok-kin has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Dr David LI, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1147.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1147 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1147 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Kwok-kin has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Dr David LI, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1148.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1148 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1148 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Kwok-kin has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1149.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1149 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1149 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Kwok-kin has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1150.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1150 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1150 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Kwok-kin has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1151.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1151 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1151 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Kwok-kin has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1152.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1152 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1152 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Kwok-kin has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1153.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1153 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1153 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Kwok-kin has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1154.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1154 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1154 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Kwok-kin has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1155.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1155 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1155 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Kwok-kin has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1156.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1156 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1156 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Kwok-kin has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1157.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1157 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1157 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Kwok-kin has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1158.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1158 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1158 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Kwok-kin has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyau, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1159.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1159 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1159 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr WONG Yuk-man rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1160.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1160 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1160 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Kwok-kin has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1161.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1161 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1161 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr WONG Kwok-kin rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Kwok-kin has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1162.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1162 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1162 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Dr PAN Pey-chyou rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr PAN Pey-chyou has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present and 20 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1163.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1163 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1163 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Dr PAN Pey-chyou rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr PAN Pey-chyou has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 18 were present and 18 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1164.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1164 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1164 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Dr PAN Pey-chyou rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr PAN Pey-chyou has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1165.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1165 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1165 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Dr PAN Pey-chyou rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr PAN Pey-chyou has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Committee now proceeds to put Mr WONG Yuk-man's amendment Nos. 1183 to 1232 to vote, that is, the last 50 amendments.

Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1183.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1180 under my name.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): It should be amendment No. 1183.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Amendment No. 1183.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1183 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Dr PAN Pey-chyou rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr PAN Pey-chyou has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present and 20 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1184.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1184 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1184 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Dr PAN Pey-chyou rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr PAN Pey-chyou has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1185.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1185 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1185 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Dr PAN Pey-chyou rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr PAN Pey-chyou has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present and 20 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1186.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1186 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1186 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Dr PAN Pey-chyou rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr PAN Pey-chyou has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1187.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1187 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1187 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Dr PAN Pey-chyou rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr PAN Pey-chyou has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung and Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present and 20 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 13 were present, two were in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1188.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1188 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1188 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Dr PAN Pey-chyou rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr PAN Pey-chyou has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung and Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 13 were present, two were in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1189.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1189 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1189 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Dr PAN Pey-chyou rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr PAN Pey-chyou has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung and Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, two were in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1190.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1190 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1190 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Dr PAN Pey-chyou rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr PAN Pey-chyou has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): A quorum is lacking. Clerk, please ring the bell to summon Members to the Chamber.

(After the summoning bell had been rung, a number of Members returned to the Chamber)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1191.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1191 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1191 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Dr PAN Pey-chyou rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Dr PAN Pey-chyou has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr IP

Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present and 20 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1192.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1192 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1192 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr IP Wai-ming rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr IP Wai-ming has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1193.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1193 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1193 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr IP Wai-ming rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr IP Wai-ming has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan and Dr Priscilla LEUNG voted against the amendment.

Mrs Regina IP abstained.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment, eight against it and one

abstained. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1194.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1194 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1194 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr IP Wai-ming rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr IP Wai-ming has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1195.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1195 under my name.

*Proposed amendment***Amendment No. 1195 (See Annex I)**

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr IP Wai-ming rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr IP Wai-ming has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1196.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1196 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1196 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr IP Wai-ming rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr IP Wai-ming has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the

question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1197.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1197 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1197 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr IP Wai-ming rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr IP Wai-ming has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1198.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1198 under my name.

*Proposed amendment***Amendment No. 1198 (See Annex I)**

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr IP Wai-ming rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr IP Wai-ming has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1199.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1199 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1199 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr IP Wai-ming rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr IP Wai-ming has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present and 22 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11

were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1200.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1200 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1200 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr IP Wai-ming rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr IP Wai-ming has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1201.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1201 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1201 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr IP Wai-ming rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr IP Wai-ming has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1202.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1202 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1202 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG and Mr WONG Kwok-kin voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 10 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and eight against it. Since

the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1203.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1203 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1203 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG and Mr WONG Kwok-kin voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 10 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and eight against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1204.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1204 under my name.

*Proposed amendment***Amendment No. 1204 (See Annex I)**

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(Members raised their hands)

Mr WONG Yuk-man rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN

Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1205.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1205 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1205 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present and 20 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1206.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1206 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1206 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present and 20 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1207.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1208 under my name.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): It should be amendment No. 1207.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Amendment No. 1207.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1207 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr

Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1208.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1208 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1208 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr

Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1209.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1209 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1209 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present and 20 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the

question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1210.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1210 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1210 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 19 were present and 19 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1211.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1211 under my name.

*Proposed amendment***Amendment No. 1211 (See Annex I)**

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present and 20 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1212.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1212 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1212 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present and 20 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the

question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1213.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1210 under my name.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): It should be amendment No. 1213.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1213 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 20 were present and 20 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1214.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1214 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1214 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1215.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1215 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1215 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the

question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1216.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1216 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1216 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1217.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1217 under my name.

*Proposed amendment***Amendment No. 1217 (See Annex I)**

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1218.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1218 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1218 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the

question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1219.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1219 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1219 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1220.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1220 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1220 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Prof Patrick LAU, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan and Mr WONG Kwok-kin voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present and 22 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 10 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and eight against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1221.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1221 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1221 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Prof Patrick LAU, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present and 22 were against the amendment; while among

the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1222.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1222 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1222 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Prof Patrick LAU, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present and 22 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1223.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1223 under my name.

*Proposed amendment***Amendment No. 1223 (See Annex I)**

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr WONG Kwok-hing rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Kwok-hing has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Prof Patrick LAU, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan and Mr WONG Kwok-kin voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present and 22 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 10 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and eight against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1224.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1223 under my name.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): It should be amendment No. 1224.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1224 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Mr CHIM Pui-chung voted for the amendment.

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Prof Patrick LAU, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan and Mr WONG Kwok-kin voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 21

against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 10 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and eight against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1225.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1225 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1225 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Prof Patrick LAU, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan and Mr WONG Kwok-kin voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present and 22 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 10 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and eight against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1226.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1226 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1226 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Prof Patrick LAU, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan and Mr WONG Kwok-kin voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 10 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and eight against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1227.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1227 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1227 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Prof Patrick LAU, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the

question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1228.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1228 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1228 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Prof Patrick LAU voted for the amendment.

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 21 against it; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1229.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1229 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1229 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr CHAN Hak-kan rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Hak-kan has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Prof Patrick LAU, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present and 22 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1230.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Mr LAU Kong-wah reminds me that I still have three amendments.

Chairman, I move amendment No. 1230 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1230 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr LAU Kong-wah rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr LAU Kong-wah has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Prof Patrick LAU, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou and Mr Paul TSE voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG and Mr WONG Kwok-kin voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 21 were present and 21 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 11 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and nine against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, you may now move your amendment No. 1231.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1231 under my name. It is going to be the Deputy Secretary of Department's turn next.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1231 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

Mr Paul CHAN rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr Paul CHAN has claimed a division. The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Prof Patrick LAU, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present and 22 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negated.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr WONG Yuk-man, please move your final amendment to the Bill, that is, amendment No. 1232.

MR WONG YUK-MAN (in Cantonese): Chairman, I move amendment No. 1232 under my name.

Proposed amendment

Amendment No. 1232 (See Annex I)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the amendment moved by Mr WONG Yuk-man be passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The question is now put to vote.

A number of Members rose to claim a division.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): A number of Members have claimed a division.*(Laughter)* The division bell will ring for one minute.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please proceed to vote.

(Some Members tapped the bench)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will Members please check their votes. If there are no queries, voting shall now stop and the result will be displayed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): The voting result is as follows: Among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present, one was in favour of the amendment *(Laughter)* and 22 against it

(Mr CHAN Kin-por raised his hand in indication)

MR CHAN KIN-POR (in Cantonese): Chairman, sorry, I request to amend the voting result because I have pushed the wrong button.*(Laughter)*

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Mr CHAN Kin-por voted against the amendment.

Functional Constituencies:

Dr Raymond HO, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Dr Philip WONG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Wong-fat, Ms Miriam LAU, Mr Abraham SHEK, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Mr CHIM Pui-chung, Prof Patrick LAU, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr Paul CHAN, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him, Dr PAN Pey-chyou, Mr Paul TSE and Dr Samson TAM voted against the amendment.

Geographical Constituencies:

Mr WONG Yuk-man voted for the amendment.

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin and Mrs Regina IP voted against the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN, Mr Jasper TSANG, did not cast any vote.

THE CHAIRMAN announced that among the Members returned by functional constituencies, 22 were present and 22 were against the amendment; while among the Members returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections, 12 were present, one was in favour of the amendment and 10 against it. Since the question was not agreed by a majority of each of the two groups of Members present, he therefore declared that the amendment was negatived.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): We have finished voting on all the amendments, and most of the Members are still in a sound mind. *(Laughter)* We will continue with the meeting.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That clauses 1 and 2 stand part of the Bill.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(No hands raised)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I think the question is agreed by a majority of the Members present. I declare the motion passed.

CLERK (in Cantonese): Clause 3 as amended.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That clause 3 as amended stand part of the Bill.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(No hands raised)

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): I think the question is agreed by a majority of the Members present. I declare the motion passed.

CHAIRMAN (in Cantonese): Council now resumes.

Council then resumed.

Third Reading of Bills

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Bill: Third Reading.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL (AMENDMENT) BILL 2012

SECRETARY FOR CONSTITUTIONAL AND MAINLAND AFFAIRS (in Cantonese): President, the

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

has passed through the Committee stage with amendment. I move that this Bill be read the Third time and do pass.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now propose the question to you and that is: That the Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012 be read the Third time and do pass.

Does any Member wish to speak?

MR LAU KONG-WAH (in Cantonese): President, can we break for 10 minutes first? As 20-odd Members have not attended the meetings for 12 days in a row, I hope the meeting can resume when they come back 10 minutes later.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now suspend the meeting for 10 minutes until 11.30 am.

11.20 am

Meeting suspended.

11.30 am

Council then resumed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Council now resumes. Does any Member wish to speak?

MR WONG KWOK-HING (in Cantonese): President, the Government has proposed the Bill in order to prevent Members from resigning and then standing in the by-election for the purpose of instigating a *de facto* referendum. This proposal accords with mainstream public opinion, and is justifiable and reasonable as the Bill serves to plug the loopholes and avoid wasting public money. Besides, the scope of measures provided under the present Bill has already been narrowed down when compared with last year's proposal. Nonetheless, this Bill which aims at plugging the loopholes has been delayed time and again, resulting in today's disarray. Moreover, the Bill has been hijacked by Members in opposition, such that meetings of the Legislative Council in the entire month of May were totally wasted, not to mention that these meetings were supposedly the most valuable and important Council meetings before the current-term Government expires by the end of June. I think the Government should assume responsibility for its miscalculation, dereliction of duty and ineffective administration.

President, these 1 300-odd "five noughts" amendments are "meaningless and frivolous", "unnecessary and unwarranted", "non-conducive to improvement", "unconstructive" and "non-conducive to progression". These crap amendments have hijacked five Council meetings throughout the month of May, incurring a waste of 12 meeting days so far. If the processing of the Bill should span across another day until tomorrow, as previously notified by the Secretariat, it would be 13 days in total.

President, in order to deal with these crap amendments, more than \$12 million hard-earned money of our taxpayers have been wasted for nothing. Concept-wise, how much is \$12-odd million? The annual resource allocation required to provide free tram rides for the elderly and persons with disabilities is exactly \$12 million. This amount of money is now wasted completely!

Besides, these amendments have caused a massive congestion in the Legislative Council, with delay caused to the handling of a considerable number of government bills and 10 Members' motions. Each year, there are 36 meeting dates of the Legislative Council, but one seventh of them are now wasted on

handling these crap amendments alone, resulting in an unprecedented waste in the history of the Legislative Council. Not only is money wasted, but also the precious meeting time of the Council. Is it reasonable? Is it necessary? This is a question Hong Kong people should ponder on seriously.

President, from these protracted meetings and the contents of these crap amendments, it is clear that the People Power has absolutely no regard for public interest, it has no regard for wasting public money, as well as no regard for the need of this Council to resolve urgent livelihood issues. Their action has caused a tremendous waste of social costs, and society is made to pay a heavy price.

In the course of dealing with these amendments, I wrote a doggerel about the People Power "fooling the people". Why is it possible for the People Power to "fool the people"? That is because the pan-democrats have aided and abetted the evil-doer. I am most angry with Mr Albert CHAN of the People Power who has moved more than 1 000 amendments to the Bill. While he explicitly vowed in this Chamber that he would fight until the very last minute

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr WONG, please hold on. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, what is your point?

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): Point of order, please do a headcount.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): A quorum is not present in the Chamber. Clerk, please ring the bell to summon Members to the Chamber.

(After the summoning bell had been rung, a number of Members returned to the Chamber)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Council now resumes. Mr WONG Kwok-hing, please continue.

MR WONG KWOK-HING (in Cantonese): President, I am most angry with Mr Albert CHAN of the People Power who has moved more than 1 000 amendments to the Bill. While he explicitly vowed in this Chamber that he would fight until the very last minute, their ulterior motive was to abort the meeting. One incident impressed me most deeply. At one time, when the number of Members in the Chamber was barely enough to form a quorum, he and Mr WONG Yuk-man stood at the entrance to the Chamber, hurling their hands up with the sign of victory, while "Long Hair" hid behind the other entrance and refused to enter the Chamber. Seemingly, they prided themselves in aborting the meeting for the lack of quorum, and considered it a victory to screw the Legislative Council up. I think they have really crossed the line.

Hence, on that day, I drew a picture of "Three Crabs" with the inscription "let us see how long you can run amok". Given that these three Members have moved amendments to the Bill, they should stay in the Chamber, rather than trifling with the Legislative Council. As the saying goes, "As distance tests a horse's strength, so time reveals a person's heart." Mr Albert CHAN who vowed explicitly to preserve and fight until the very last minute is the first one to jump overboard on the pretext of going to Canada to visit family members, while we guard our position here steadfastly day and night, night and day. Once the first evil-doer accomplished his so-called "heroic deeds", he just took French leave abruptly and disgracefully. I think Mr Albert CHAN of the People Power is a man with no honour and no integrity; he has neither shoulder nor backbone, and he is shameful in lying to the people!

President, since the Council began to put these 1 000-odd amendments to vote, members of the public can always watch the same scene on the screen, that is, one Member, two Members or three Members can hijack 30-odd Members of the pro-establishment camp to vote on these amendments day and night, night and day. Why do we have such a strange scene? Where are the other Members? Aborting the meeting for lack of quorum is in fact another filibuster tactic, or perhaps an even more despicable tactic because once the meeting is adjourned, the agenda items will hold over to the next meeting in the following week. Even if they failed to catch us out this Wednesday, they would try again next Wednesday. This is another form of filibustering. Why is it possible for three Members to hijack the whole Council? I must tell the public, thanks to the 20 Members belonging to the pan-democratic camp, including the Democratic Party, Civic Party, Labour Party, and so on. Without their abetment, those "three

crabs" can do no evil. It is exactly because of their abetment that the meetings of the Legislative Council have been protracted time and again due to the lack of quorum, resulting in continuous waste of time and taxpayers' money. They even said shamefacedly that, "As we oppose this Bill, we will not attend the meeting to show our objection." While they may think they can get away with such nonsense, I think members of the public will not be fooled. Members of the public have criticized them, "As you are remunerated, you should attend the meetings, and should not stay out of the meetings. If you oppose the Bill, you can vote against it." What they are doing now is aiding and abetting the evil-doers, that is, those "three crabs" who keep wasting the normal meeting time of the Legislative Council

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I want to remind Members that according to Rule 63(1) of the Rules of Procedure, debate on the motion on Third Reading shall be confined to the contents of the Bill. Members should be as concise as possible when speaking on matters not directly related to the contents of the Bill.

MR WONG KWOK-HING (in Cantonese): President, my speech is exactly on the reasons why the Third Reading of the Bill has been delayed.

President, the Democratic Party, Civic Party and Labour Party of the pan-democratic camp must bear unequivocal responsibility for allowing these crap amendments to cause wastage, congestion, hijacking and detriments to public interest. This debt will be recorded in our history and members of the public will not forget about it.

President, nobody wins in this filibuster and anti-filibuster warfare; we are all losers. I think members of the public suffer the most because their interests have been seriously undermined. Many members of the public who have been following the Council proceedings on television or radio are greatly dissatisfied, infuriated and frustrated. They witness how their money has been wasted, and how the Legislative Council Members have not performed their proper duties, but behaved in an abnormal and lunatic manner. Hence, I hope all Members of the Legislative Council as well as the current-term Government should reflect deeply on this matter and apologize to the public. I think we should learn a lesson so as to avoid any recurrence in future. We should faithfully perform our duties as

Members of the Legislative Council so that we can live up to the expectations of the public.

President, so far, 12 days have been spent on this Bill! To conclude my speech, I have rewritten the words of a Chinese poem "The Beautiful Lady YU" (《虞美人》) and have drawn a caricature. The poem reads as follows:

"Meaningless and frivolous amendments, when will the filibuster come to an end?

Council meetings stalled and ambushed, public money wasted we can no longer stand.

People's suffering and hardship must still be there

Blind eyes are turned without showing any care

How much sorrow can a person carry?

Like a spring river flowing eastward, without tarry."

This is a poem I wrote on the day the sixth \$1 million was wasted (that is, 18 May). This poem reflects the dissatisfaction felt by the general public on the current situation of the Legislative Council: public money wasted, normal Council proceedings stalled and public interests undermined. Hence, I honestly think that nobody is the winner in this filibuster and anti-filibuster warfare; we are all losers, the people of Hong Kong are losers. May I take this opportunity to urge this Council to apologize to all the people of Hong Kong. We should seriously reflect on this unreasonable and abnormal situation and draw on the lessons learnt, so as to prevent any recurrences in this Council, and that we will safeguard the interest of the people wholeheartedly.

Thank you, President.

MR LAU KONG-WAH (in Cantonese): President, the most meaningless era in history is just over. Colleagues from the pro-establishment camp had joined hands and made concerted efforts in the 12 meeting days spanning over two months, holding fast to their posts at the expense of sleeps and rest. It is a miracle. To the public, we are a group of Members being faithful to our duties. When we returned to the districts, many people cheered us up and said to us, "Thanks for the hard work!"

When it comes to hardship, your Honourable President, you have been working like a "human recorder", yet you have not missed a word. I have nothing but admiration. Above all, your decisive action of ceasing the filibuster has won the applause of the public. Otherwise, the scrutiny would not have finished today. I would also like to thank Mr IP Kwok-him for compiling the roster timetable for us. We only have one minute to go to the washroom and we must be strictly on time. What an exciting experience! Certainly, the tenseness, hardship and tiredness are in stark contrast with the coziness enjoyed by the 20 Members from the pan-democratic camp outside the Chamber, who have continuously been absent from the meeting!

You started a filibuster, I end it; you were absent from the meeting, I attended the meeting; you tried to abort the meeting, I guard against it. These episodes in the past month reveal the different aspects of Members, which will leave a lasting impression on the public. It seems calm on the surface, yet the public know it at heart.

President, though Members of the pro-establishment camp have tried to be patient to stay at the meeting, a fire is burning inside. For we all know that this kind of lunatic filibuster and attempts to abort the meeting are in actuality political blackmail. If they have their way, this will bring endless troubles and Hong Kong will no longer have peace.

As a matter of fact, there is no "bad" law but only "bad" guys. In the past couple of years, it was exactly because of these bad guys that an undesirable culture had emerged in the political landscape in Hong Kong. The series of actions ranging from throwing bananas, sweeping things off the table, speaking foul language, resigning to trigger a by-election to waste public money, filibustering and aborting the meeting to waste time. These Members may take pleasure in doing so and may even consider it heroic. For the purpose of mustering the support from certain supporters, they ignore the overall situation in Hong Kong. They put the interest of their party before the overall interest of Hong Kong. The way they play the game and the way they play on the public will only wreck Hong Kong.

Here, I would like to send two excerpts to Members involving in this lunatic filibuster. I hope they will reflect on these deeply, in particular Mr WONG Yuk-man who is a Christian. During the Renaissance of the 14th

century, an Italian friar well-known as the Father of Humanism, Francis PETRARCH, had in his work *The Secret*, described the situation of certain people: In the face of the hollow glory brought by overwhelming eloquence, you are extremely disconsolate. Tell me, what can be more naïve and insane than wasting time in the learning of discourse and the pleasure of speech but being slack and indifferent to all other things.

In the next paragraph, he said: Why wasting your time and efforts on such silly and trivial matters; why you would have failed to learn the truth and dissipate your life in the world of words. Despite your silver hair and wrinkles, you dwell on childish balderdash. I hope your insanity will only wreck yourself. Now, stop your persistent impairment on the wisdom of young people.

The remark made 700 years ago seems to be the advice to our ears today. Honestly, every Member in this Chamber is but dust in this world for a while. If anyone thinks that he can plan everything down to the last detail and have the entire world in his hands, is he not being inordinately proud and haughty?

Certainly, I have to admit that Members initiating the filibuster have contributed their time and efforts. Members from the Civic Party and the Democratic Party, who have been absent from the meeting for 12 consecutive days, are so displeasing. Why would you become deserters? You have neither taken part in the filibuster nor cease it. You only look forward to aborting the meeting. This mischief of your tilting to one side or the other and your sneaky and ludicrous manner have stirred up anger among the public.

When we joined the legislature, we had all taken the oath to be "conscientious and dutiful", had we not? On what grounds can you just get the pay without going to work? The public cannot but ask: Should the future of Hong Kong be put in your hands?

If you defend yourself by saying that your absence is to reflect your dissatisfaction with the legislation, please state so in your election manifesto in September. Be honest in your promise to your electors, and see how they will judge you. If you are not going to do so, please humbly apologize to the public for wasting public money and time.

The so-called motion of adjournment proposed by Ms Audrey EU and Mr Alan LEONG is actually filibuster in disguise. They had been absent from the meeting deliberately to cause the meeting to abort, but then, they shifted the blame onto Members who had attended the meeting. How can they act this way, their behaviour is unrighteous. No wonder a member of public had come to the Chamber to throw down a book titled "正義" (Righteousness). Did he mean to urge us to right their unrighteousness?

May I ask Members from the Civic Party and the Democratic Party, since when have you become the political parties of unrighteousness? Since when have you failed to keep pace with public pulse? Since when have you chosen to follow the tails of others? Since when have you committed to foolish actions harming others and not benefiting yourselves? Since when have you become such a despicable political party?

Ludicrously, you want to propose a vote of no confidence in the President for his ruling on ceasing the filibuster. In what way you have no confidence in him? Before the President gave his ruling, he had asked if any other Member wanted to speak, had he not? Yet, you were absent deliberately. The President had also allowed the debate to be carried on for another three hours, which was an arrangement agreed upon by various political parties and groupings at the internal meeting. Outside the camera, you remained calm and patient and were open to discussion. Once in front of the camera, you went back on your words and created a stir. Is this the nature of the Civic Party and the Democratic Party?

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung attempted to challenge the ruling of the President by abusing the judicial procedure again. However, the appeal has established the authority of the ruling of the President, which will be particularly helpful to the future amendment of the Rules of Procedure to prevent senseless filibuster.

According to Justice Johnson LAM, the President of the Legislative Council had the power to ensure the effective conduct of business of the Council, which is in other words saying that the ceasing of the filibuster is justified. The Basic Law has protected the freedom of speech of Members but not their right to filibuster. He pointed out directly that such behaviour was absurd. What a great pleasure to hear this. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, what is the point of making a gesture to lodge an appeal?

A member of the public fax a handwritten letter to me, perhaps all Members has received the same letter. The letter is addressed to Members of the Legislative Council, and I think it represents the views of many people:

"The people of Hong Kong are terribly angry. We do not want to see you Members playing the clown's play in the news every day. You are wasting the money of Hong Kong taxpayers every day.

"We do not understand why Members not intending to attend the meeting would have asked the public to vote for you at the beginning if you would only resort to meaningless behaviour like filibusters or walkouts?

"You have not only failed to fulfil your duties but have also taken these contemptible actions. Such behaviour has a bearing on the correct thinking we parents try to instill in the next generation. You Members get paid, yet you only engage in frivolous actions without making any achievement. Shame on you."

He signed the letter under the name of Hong Kong parents' voice. I have to thank this citizen for reflecting the views of many people.

President, when the world is anxious about the European debt crisis and even the second financial crisis, the public hope that we will spend more time on promoting the economy and improving people's livelihood, yet this Council has been entangled in these meaningless amendments for more than a month. Is that not a stark contrast? Have we fallen short of the expectation of the public?

The progress of democracy in Hong Kong should have been consolidated and approaching maturity gradually, why will it become superficial and childish now? Hong Kong needs to have more serious persons working seriously, otherwise, Hong Kong will lose.

Wise men in ancient China warned people engaging in politics that "Addicting to pleasure will sap one's will, addicting to mischief will undermine one's virtue". As legislators, we have set up a lot of rules for others, when will we set up rules for ourselves? Will friends in the pan-democratic camp please reflect on this deeply. There should be no more behaviour irritating colleagues and upsetting the public.

With these remarks, I put my views on record and give words of encouragement to all colleagues and Hong Kong people. Thank you, President.

MRS REGINA IP (in Cantonese): President, I speak in support of the passage of the Third Reading of the Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012 (the Bill). As we are aware, the Government introduced this Bill because several Members returned from the five geographical constituencies resigned *en masse* in May 2010, hoping to trigger a *de facto* referendum. Thus, the Government considered it necessary to amend the relevant law to plug the loophole. I wish to briefly explain why I oppose the *de facto* referendum.

First of all, I wish to talk about "公投", which means "referendum" or "全民公決", meaning "plebiscite". Referendum originated from the political system of the Roman Empire and has a long history. In modern society, referendum is used in many democratic countries. For example, of the 50 states in the United States, 24 have provision on referendum. In the constitutions of countries using referendum, very concrete, detailed and sophisticated provisions for referendum have been laid down. It nonetheless does not mean that referendum can be arbitrarily held if it is not provided for in the constitution. In the case of Hong Kong, neither the Constitution nor the Basic Law has provided for the use of referendum. Therefore, strictly speaking, triggering a *de facto* referendum is unconstitutional. This is why I cannot support it and agree that the Government should plug the relevant loophole. While many colleagues criticized that this *de facto* referendum has wasted some \$100 million public money, I find it more important to oppose it in principle.

On the other hand, in the light of Hong Kong's constitutional setting, we have a democratic parliamentary system, which is a system of representative government. The system of representative government is a kind of indirect democracy, whereas referendum is direct democracy. Since we have indirect democracy, people's views are represented by Members under the parliamentary system. There is downright no need to launch any *de facto* referendum and express views by way of direct democracy in the absence of the relevant constitutional setting. This would forestall political development.

Next, I wish to talk about the Government's proposal to plug the relevant loophole. When the Government first introduced the Bill in around May 2011,

many people considered that the time for consultation was inadequate and the Government had to withdraw the Bill in the end. I am so glad to see that the Government had readily accepted good advice and conducted formal consultations to receive views from various fronts after the withdrawal of the Bill. The New People's Party has also conducted internal consultations and exchanged views with many organizations, and we consider that the best option is the candidate list replacement mechanism. Initially, the Government also proposed the candidate list replacement mechanism as it helps nurture new bloods. For instance, the list proportional representation system is currently used in geographical constituencies direct election. And yet, very few people would notice the second or third candidate on the list for it is extremely difficult for the second candidate on the same list to secure a seat in the Legislative Council. However, if the replacement mechanism is put in place, I believe electors will pay more attention to the second and third candidates on the list. In view of the ageing Council, I think that the candidate list representation system can help nurture new bloods.

I have also examined other countries and the Consulate-General of Japan told me in person that Japan adopts the "one person, two votes" and list proportional representation systems. Regarding the list proportional representation system adopted in Japan's direct election in the district, if a Member resigns, the next candidates on the same list will fill the vacancy and there is no need to hold any by-election. Therefore, we fail to see how the candidate list replacement mechanism will deprive people of their right to vote or to be elected. We think the system is perfectly fine and we thus support it.

Unfortunately, the Government must solicit extensive support — I understand that the Government has been very accommodating — after receiving views from various political parties and affiliations in this Council and professional organizations in the second consultation exercise, the Government had actually taken a few steps back. The final proposal is that Members are prohibited from standing for a by-election within six months of his resignation. Although the New People's Party does not consider this an ideal option, we will support it, given the hardships of the Government.

I will now talk about the numerous votes we had cast and the numerous amendments that we had considered in the past few days. Some amendments are pretty ludicrous, for instance, under what circumstances a Member will be

exempted from the restriction which prohibits him from standing for the by-election within six months of his resignation. They are, *inter alia*, when a Member being diagnosed of liver or lung cancer, or being detained in the Republic of Congo or Iraq. The exemptions are pretty repetitious. President, I know that legal advice had been sought, but I hope that when you come across similar amendments next time, you will classify the amendments into different groups or request the Member concerned to use other expressions. Our suggestion is Members shall be exempted if they are diagnosed of "serious diseases" or being detained by "certain countries" without being tried. This is clear enough and can save us from raising our hands so many times.

The last few days are really the most painful days of my three or four years' experience in this Council. We have been turned into a machine for pressing buttons and many people have been caught. I therefore hope that when colleagues propose amendments or the President approve amendments in the future, they will consider these principles and deal with Members' views in a more efficient manner.

With these remarks, President, I support the Third Reading of the Bill.

MR ALBERT HO (in Cantonese): President, concerning the Bill on the replacement arrangement for filling a vacancy arising from resignation of Legislative Council Members, the Democratic Party has very clearly stated our position at the Second Reading debate. Let me briefly state again our stance, we opine that this Bill is unfair and unreasonable, and it has deprived electors of their political rights, especially their rights to stand for election. Even though the Bill has been amended and the restrictions on our rights have been reduced to a lesser extent, we all know that people had expressed in principle their strong dissatisfaction with this unjust legislative proposal during the July 1 march last year. It would be rational for the Government to withdraw this Bill.

If we evaluate this Bill from the perspective of stopping a referendum, we can make analyses from two angles. First, from the legal point of view, if a Member resigns to trigger a by-election, even if he holds high the banner of a referendum, a by-election is a by-election in the legal sense, and it is not a referendum. How then can the Member violate the constitution? Mrs Regina IP does not have such a legal concept. Second, from the political point of view,

even if a Member or a politician who triggers a referendum by resigning cannot stand for a by-election within six months, another person holding high the banner can still achieve the effect of a *de facto* referendum. How can it be stopped? The same person does not necessarily have to stand for election; therefore, this Bill has failed to achieve the goal of stopping a *de facto* referendum.

This Bill is frivolous, as described by Mr LAU Kong-wah; and it is also unjust, according to the words used by Mr WONG Kwok-hing. In response to Mr WONG Kwok-hing's remarks, I would like to say that a Member supporting an unjust legislative proposal is an unjust person. Moreover, Members in support of a frivolous Bill have acted in a frivolous way. That is my response to Mr LAU Kong-wah's remarks. They have wasted so much time, frivolously supporting an unjust legislative proposal.

President, the Democratic Party has stated very clearly that we oppose the enactment of this Bill and we know that it is useless to reason things out. Given the existing composition of this Council, the majority of Members belong to the pro-establishment camp and they want this Bill passed so as to complete their political task and meet the requirements of the leaders in Beijing. Since they have to complete their political task and they will not reason things out, will it be meaningful for us to sit here and vote? This is a kind of suppression. Thus, we have expressed our anger through protests and boycotts.

Some people have blamed us for aborting the Council meeting; I think they have overestimated our power. How could 23 Members manage to do so? While we were not present in this Chamber in the past few days, other Members were sitting here obediently; how could the Council meeting be aborted? On the contrary, I clearly remember how Members had successfully aborted the Council meeting. Mr WONG Kwok-hing and Mr LAU Kong-wah should clearly remember. We once asked this Council to observe one minute of silence for ZHAO Ziyang a few years ago, but you Members walked out; hence the meeting had to be aborted. These Members can easily abort the Council meeting because they have more than 30 votes.

When Members resigned to trigger the "five geographical constituencies referendum", they could speak for 15 minutes in the Chamber. For those Members who did not like to listen, they could just walk out; that was acceptable. Why then did another Member request a headcount after these Members had left,

causing the cancellation of the Council meeting because a quorum was not present? Even if they did not like to listen to the resigning Members, they should allow other Members to listen, but they aborted the Council meeting instead. Today, they turn and say that this is an extremely unjust and despicable act. I hope these Members would reflect on themselves. The above description should most suitably apply to them. I am sorry, we do not have the power, they have overestimated us.

Even though the Democratic Party boycotts this legislative proposal, it has not taken part in the filibuster. We do not support that approach and we do not consider that filibuster is the most suitable or appropriate measure. Nevertheless, I must emphasize that, if there is a very serious situation in the future; if the community is infuriated as a law or government measure is considered intolerable by Hong Kong people; for instance, the legislation to implement Article 23 of the Basic Law with the intention to deprive Hong Kong people of their basic rights, I believe the Democratic Party and those from the pan-democratic camp will resist by all peaceful means, and take co-ordinated actions within and outside this Council. Within this Council, we will try to stop and counteract any unjust laws and measures through various procedures, including various peaceful actions and the Legislative Council procedures that have been used. Hence, do not force us to take these actions.

President, I would like to make a brief declaration. I know that according to our usual practice, we should not debate on your ruling in this Chamber. However, some views must be put on record and I believe you will be more tolerant as some Members have also discussed this point earlier in their speech.

As you have approved the proposal of over 1 000 amendments and allowed Members to debate on these amendments, we should understand very well that we will have a lengthy debate on these amendments, and this is a price that a democratic legislature should pay. As regards whether the Rules of Procedure (RoP) can provide for such delicate situation, we may need to consider again in the future. On this occasion, on the ground of maintaining the effective operation of this Council, you have, on the basis of your understanding of Rule 92 of the RoP, suddenly complied with Dr Philip WONG's request for "action upon returning", and made a ruling at 4 am. The ruling was made within a very short time without advance consultation, discussion or sufficient notice, and it is really difficult for us to accept that.

We have publicly expressed our opposition to this action, and we have expressed great reservations and divergent views at the office of the President. This incident set a dangerous precedent which made us extremely worried. Now that you have given the ruling, the meeting can only continue in accordance with this ruling. After all, this incident needs to be resolved and the democrats will seriously follow up this matter at the meetings of the Committee on Rules of Procedure. We hope that in future, you would first allow discussion before making a major ruling on any issue, in particular, on issues that are highly controversial with no precedents, or when you will draw reference from practices in foreign countries that have never been heard before. Our basic trust in you can then be established or maintained, and the effective operation of this Council will truly be maintained.

President, we have spent much time on the lengthy examination of this Bill. Although many Members are not present in the Chamber, I can tell Honourable colleagues that we have been constantly monitoring the situation to learn about the progress of the meeting. Should anything happen, we will immediately intervene and participate. I just wish to point out, we are not sure if similar incident will recur in the future but I can tell Honourable colleagues, even though the Democratic Party has very strong views on certain legislative proposals and finds them extremely unacceptable, we will try our best to raise serious, substantial and specific questions. For instance, there are problems with a number of bills that are going to be discussed; we have the ability and we will definitely raise many questions on the complex nature of these problems. I hope Honourable colleagues would not regard that as filibustering, and criticize Members for raising questions, queries and oppositions in relation to many controversial and highly complicated legal issues.

President, the Bill will be put to the vote, and I believe that it will be forcibly passed as the pro-establishment camp is in the majority under this structure. Nonetheless, I emphasize again that this Bill cannot solve the problems and it will conversely lead to more problems. The public may think that the Government ignores public opinion for the sake of achieving certain political purposes. It has forcibly passed certain bills that deprive people of their rights, stirring up their strong opposition and resistance. Let me quote the words said by Mr LAU Kong-wah, I hope that Members would "learn a lesson", and ponder seriously over the matter.

In the course of our examination of this Bill, a number of Members including Ms Audrey EU and Mr Alan LEONG have moved adjournment motions to enable some more important matters to be handled first, in the hope that the Government would engage in self-reflection and withdraw the Bill for the moment. Unfortunately, the Government remains stubborn and the pro-establishment Members continue to support the Government. Thus, time is even more pressing and we still need to handle many important bills within the remaining time of the current-term Legislative Council. I feel very sorry that Members have to face so much pressure.

Lastly, Mr WONG Kwok-hing has commented that no one is the winner and all are losers. My response is that the public are obviously the losers. Originally, they should enjoy equal rights to stand for election under the law, including the Bill of Rights, but their rights have been unreasonably taken away. So, every person is a loser, and the pro-establishment Members who support the passage of the Bill have made the public losers. Are there any winners? There are winners and they are the pro-establishment Members who follow the lead of Beijing through blind allegiance, and give unprincipled support to the passage of this unjust Bill. They are all winners and they have won the political capital that they wish to obtain. I feel really sorry about that. I so submit.

MR LEE CHEUK-YAN (in Cantonese): President, just now Mr LAU Kong-wah said that the most meaningless moment in history is going to end. That is true, because this is the most meaningless and senseless Bill in history. Not only is this Bill meaningless and senseless, it also undermines the people's right to vote and right to be elected. Yes, this moment is going to end. Yet we feel very sorry because under the protection of the royalist camp, this Bill will eventually be passed. That is always the case. With a greater number of votes, they think they have sufficient votes to protect the Government, so there is no need to listen to public views.

If we look back at this Bill, actually it originates from the "five geographical constituencies referendum" incident. The purpose of the "five geographical constituencies referendum" was to enable members of the public to express their stance on the implementation of dual universal suffrage in 2012, which had been vetoed by the Central Authorities through the interpretation of the Basic Law by the National People's Congress. We need to look back in history.

It was because the Central Authorities had vetoed dual universal suffrage twice that led to the "five geographical constituencies referendum". After the "five geographical constituencies referendum", the Government raised the need to plug the so-called loophole to prevent Members from standing for by-election after resignation and triggering people to vote. Then the Government proposed that the next candidate on the same list with the highest number of votes should fill the vacancy. The public responded in an uproar because they had lost their right to choose. Consequently, 200 000 people went to the streets. Later, the Government backed down and came up with this measure. Wishing to avoid such trouble after all, it proposed that Members should be prohibited from standing for by-election within six months upon resignation. However, the requirement which prohibits Members from standing for by-election within six months upon resignation has actually also deprived people of their right to vote and their right to be elected. Moreover, it cannot plug the so-called loophole of the "five geographical constituencies referendum" because after Members have resigned, other members of the political party to which they belong can take their place to stand for the by-election, thereby achieving the purpose of having a referendum in a similar way.

Hence, in the end, the Government will be unable to genuinely plug the so-called loophole in its view — though from my perspective, there is no loophole at all because we should respect people's right to vote. However, from the Government's perspective, this is considered a loophole. Nevertheless, even though the Government has proposed this Bill to plug this loophole, it is unable to achieve such a purpose. As a matter of fact, everything is done just to save the face of Donald TSANG and Stephen LAM. Since they had once said they would get this job done, it must be carried out. Thus, even though it is useless and meaningless, it has to be carried out. Yet, after doing this meaningless job, what they have done in the end is depriving members of the public of their right to vote and their right to be elected. That is the whole story. I hope members of the public will understand its background. Actually this is only a meaningless Bill.

Mr WONG Kwok-hing has said earlier that Members of the pan-democratic camp are helping a tyrant to do evil. May I ask Mr WONG Kwok-hing, who is the tyrant? Who is ruthless like a tyrant? The Central Authorities relentlessly vetoed the implementation of dual universal suffrage in 2012. Stephen LAM and Donald TSANG pushed ahead the replacement

proposal. They are the tyrants and initiators. Let him who tied the bell on the tiger take it off. If they want to settle the matter, all they have to do is to withdraw the Bill. Or Members could support the motion to adjourn, which Mr Alan LEONG, Ms Audrey EU and I had proposed to defer the discussion on this Bill, and the matter would be settled. However, they want to defend and protect the Government. What is more, they want to keep this meaningless Bill. So let them carry on with this meaningless process. If they had supported the motion to adjourn, they would not have ended up in the present situation, but they have stubbornly insisted on their stance. So let them hang on.

Yet most importantly, I think when members of the public look at this issue, they must distinguish what is right from wrong and consider on which side they should stand. I would like to cite from a famous speech made by the Japanese writer Haruki MURAKAMI, which perfectly matches my feelings and thoughts right now: "Between a high, solid wall and an egg that breaks against it, I will always stand on the side of the egg." They are the high wall. The Government is the high wall. When the Government wants to do something against morals and justice, since they enjoy protection from the royalist camp, they are able to do so. That is the high wall. We are indeed acting like an egg that breaks against the wall. Now they angrily reproach other people for filibustering, yet I remember Mr LAU Kong-wah had said before that filibuster was a kind of strategy. When they filibuster, they call it a strategy, but when other people filibuster, they call it a trick.

As a matter of fact, filibuster is a strategy of resistance. When we are faced with a high wall, we have to see if there is any way to loosen and tear down this wall so as to block the passage of a draconian law. That is the nature of filibuster. When members of the public watch the present filibuster, they may have the feeling that it seems meaningless, but we should think deeper. After all, what is it for? It is to block the passage of this draconian law, to tear down this high and solid wall. That is the purpose.

Someone has pointed out earlier that there are rules in the Council. If we wish to oppose something, we may vote against it. Why support filibuster which will cause the Legislative Council to waste public money? Yet we need to think back on one point, which is the deformed nature of this Council. If members of the public understand the deformed nature of this Council, they will agree all the more that we should make use of every method to tear down the high

wall. This high wall represents not only this Bill but also the deformed nature of the Council, that is, we still have half of our Members returned by functional constituencies. Just think about it. Half of the seats are returned by functional constituencies. Some 200 000 people vote for 30 seats while 3 million members of the public vote for only 30 seats. This Council is basically unfair. In fact, people's voices cannot be conveyed.

Members of the public should think whether this is fair. How does your vote compare with that of a banker? One hundred bankers elect one Member, but one to two million people in a geographical constituency can elect only a few Members. What is the difference in proportion? If you find this deformed system unfair, please do not forget there is another unfair system, that is, any amendment has to be decided by separate voting. If you agree that these two unfair systems have led to the basic deformation of the whole Council, turning it into a high wall which is incapable of relaying public opinions, then you should think about how to make use of every possible method to block the passage of the draconian law. It is as simple as that, and among all the available methods, filibuster is one of the strategies.

Today I do not want to comment too much on the President's excessively "brilliant" act in cutting the filibuster, but such an act was indeed a great injustice. Unexpectedly, Rule 92 of the Rules of Procedure was invoked, and then it was said that reference had been drawn from the practice of other legislatures. This is exactly where the biggest problem lies. Although it was said that reference had been drawn from the practice of other legislatures, I believe the President will also agree and admit that no legislature in the world is as deformed as the one in Hong Kong, where half of the seats are returned by functional constituencies. In view of such a deformed nature, should we not make use of every method to fight against any draconian law? Hence, since the very beginning, the Labour Party's stance has been against this draconian law. When there was the need to hold the meeting overnight, we felt obligated to join in and speak on the amendments, since we consider it a gross injustice. They have chosen to stand on the side of the high wall, while we always choose to stand with the egg.

Speaking on wastage of public money, Mr WONG Kwok-hing has been calculating how much money has been wasted every day. Since he regards the matter as meaningless, he said this is a waste of public money. However, if I regard the speech of any one of them as meaningless, should I also start to do the

calculation and accuse them of wasting public money? If that is the case, we had better dissolve the whole Legislative Council. After the whole Council is dissolved, money will be saved. If anyone thinks that the Legislative Council wastes public money, they should not stand for any election to get into the Council. The function of the Legislative Council is to monitor the Government, which includes passing bills or otherwise, and it also includes proposing amendments. LEUNG Chun-ying may say that the Legislative Council has wasted public money by convening so many meetings for his proposal on five Secretaries of Departments and 14 Directors of Bureaux, while Fanny LAW has explicitly stated that members of the public regard Members as playing tricks. Following such a logic, Fanny LAW can say how much public money has been wasted by the various Panels in holding such and such number of meetings to discuss the proposal on five Secretaries of Departments and 14 Directors of Bureaux. If that is the case, an authoritarian regime will waste the least amount of public money. Authoritarianism can attain the highest efficiency. It will not waste any public money because there is no need to use public money, not even a cent. However, should we really work this way? Is that what we want?

Actually, separation of the executive, legislative and judicial powers is a precious system in Hong Kong, under which the executive authorities will at least be monitored by the Legislative Council. Despite its preciousness, this system is at the same time deformed because only half of the Members are returned by direct elections. Yet even what is done by these directly elected Members, constituting just half of the Council, is almost negated, because no matter what the directly elected Members do, they can just say that it is meaningless, because it has hindered the Government from getting endorsement for the legislation. Nevertheless, we have got to remember one point. The Government is as ruthless as a tyrant. Thus we have reasons to fight against it. We fight in the hope of tearing down the high wall.

Hence, I hope members of the public will understand. If you ask who are the losers, of course members of the public are the losers, since a Bill like that can nonetheless be passed. Who enables this piece of legislation to be passed? The royalist camp. So it is the royalist camp which turns all members of the public into losers — since this piece of legislation can be passed.

Thank you, President.

MR FREDERICK FUNG (in Cantonese): President, I do not support this Bill. After all, I consider that all Hong Kong citizens and registered voters should fully have the right to take part in any formal election in Hong Kong, including the right to vote, make nomination, stand for election and be elected. Hence, I cannot support this Bill.

Of course, I also see that in the course of processing this Bill, the Government has been making concessions and retracting continuously. From the initial stance that a resigning Member should not be allowed to stand for election, the Government later conceded that a resigning Member could stand for election, and then it finally proposed that a resigning Member is prohibited from standing in a by-election within six months of his resignation. It is clear that the Government has been making concessions in this matter. Nonetheless, on account of the above-mentioned principles, I still consider that even though the final provisions are the outcome of concession, I cannot accept and agree with the same. That is the first point I want to say.

The second point I would like to say is that, regarding the filibustering mentioned by many Honourable colleagues today, is it something positive or negative? After all, what is it about? Why does it attract so much negative criticisms? Those criticisms mainly come from Members of the pro-establishment camp, while the pan-democrats, including myself, consider that there is no big deal about filibustering. In fact, the actions of filibustering and walking out of meetings in protest are perfectly in line with the rules and regulations of the Council. Furthermore, these means are frequently deployed in the parliaments of civic societies. These means can be strategies, as well as objectives.

President, perhaps let me illustrate my point with a few examples from overseas parliaments. The latest example took place in June 2011 when the House of Commons of Canada discussed a back-to-work bill proposed by the Government to require employees of Canada Post to end their strike and return to work. But on that occasion, Members of the Parliament (MPs) in support of the labour union engaged in filibustering to stall and block the government bill. Of course, the bill was passed eventually, but the filibustering MPs spent 58 hours to discuss the issue with the Government. So, what is the big deal about filibustering, and why is it wrong? Can Members of the pro-establishment camp accept modern politics? Or do they still consider that we were in the feudal age,

and we must support every order given by "Grandpa", the emperor, the Chief Executive and the Directors of Bureaux such that we should pass the Bill expeditiously upon their request?

Another example took place in the United States, where the tactic of filibustering was adopted as early as the 1930s. Louisiana Senator Huey LONG prevented the passage of a bill that he considered unfair to the poor by reading Shakespeare in the Senate. President, I believe that Shakespeare's works may not necessarily be directly related to the bill, yet it was allowed in the United States. He even recited shrimp, crab and oyster recipes, and so on. Senator LONG spoke for 15 hours and 30 minutes. President, that case happened in the 1930s. Have we progressed or regressed in this matter?

Finally, had Members of the pro-establishment camp not engaged in filibuster before? Had they not withdrawn deliberately from a meeting such that the meeting was aborted? Tactically, what is the difference between what they did previously and what we do today? The answer is that there is no difference at all. Then why do they consider it necessary to criticize this tactic so severely? Why does a Member insist on writing Chinese calligraphy in the Chamber? Even though his Chinese calligraphy is beautifully written, it is not necessary for him to demonstrate his Chinese calligraphy skills in such a way or with such a method. Isn't writing Chinese calligraphy also another form of filibuster?

Nevertheless, President, I have not taken part in this filibuster. In this connection, I need to make an explanation. As I see it, filibuster is a "sledgehammer" which should be reserved for the important issues. I have used this tool in the Express Rail Link incident previously by asking more than 20 questions. I did not use it this time for two reasons. Firstly, the Government has been making concessions continuously in this matter. Secondly, as I understand, the society has yet to reach a consensus in this matter even to this date. Most of the people still resist the revised Bill finally proposed by the Government. Although I also oppose the Bill — I must state clearly that I oppose the Bill — I have doubts as to whether this is the right strategy to use the "sledgehammer" at this time. I opt to withdraw from the meeting in protest. I think withdrawing from the meeting can perfectly express the attitude and feeling of disagreement and objection I have for this Bill.

President, I think filibuster can be an objective, as well as a strategy. By "objective", I mean the purpose of filibuster is to prolong the meeting. Of course, no matter how protracted the meeting was, it would finally come to an end, just like in the present case, it is now time to end. However, this is only a process. Regarding the sense of a strategy, filibuster is usually deployed by minority political parties to upset the ruling party and the pro-establishment camp for the purpose of making themselves more vocal and heard by the pro-establishment camp, the ruling party and even general members of the public, even though they would invariably be out-voted in the parliament. That is the purpose.

There is no way they can win eventually. They would invariably be out-voted in the vote which took place after the filibuster. If the purpose of filibuster is to win In the examples I just quoted, the persons engaging in filibuster were eventually out-voted. Hence, it is only a strategy. I think the present filibuster is a strategy more than an objective. I did not use this tactic exactly because in the present case, it is a strategy more than an objective. If filibuster becomes a strategy, that strategy is meant to express and strengthen our voice. I did not use it because I consider that there is another strategy, or as I just said, unless the question is so important that this strategy must be used to achieve another objective.

Filibuster is not a purpose in itself, but a process. What do I mean by that? What I mean is that during the filibuster process, it can serve to educate the public through Members' debate on the contents of each amendment. However, today's filibuster is made up of petty textual amendments to the Chinese text of the Bill, which serves no purpose with regard to public education. Secondly, filibuster can allow the minority parties to buy time to mobilize the mass, public opinion and the majority of the people to indicate clearly to the Government and the ruling party that, "Sorry, the bill you proposed is wrong. This is something we will not accept; this is something the entire society will not accept." Filibuster is a process for the purpose of buying time to solicit public support. But we do not think that it is the case for the present Bill. Hence, I do not think filibuster is the right tactic to use for handling this Bill.

Some people would ask whether there are cases which I consider merit the use of filibuster. Yes, if in future — but my guess is that the scenario is unlikely because our future Chief Executives must also prepare to stand for direct

elections — if a Chief Executive not returned by universal suffrage proposes to enact legislation to implement Article 23 of the Basic Law, and the contents of which are similar to those in the previous legislative exercise, that is the time I think the filibuster tactic should be used. Mr Frederick FUNG will definitely use the filibuster tactic to fight against the enactment, to the extent that filibuster be used to educate the public, mobilize the people and engage the mass against the legislation of Article 23.

President, the third point I would like to mention is that whether the pro-establishment camp has properly performed its role as the pro-establishment camp? The pro-establishment camp is always asking: what do the pan-democrats want? I would also ask: what does the pro-establishment camp want? Surely, the pro-establishment camp would support the Government, right? But is your support genuine or fake? Is your support given under pressure or without any commitment? Is your support given willingly? If you do not support the Government genuinely, then you should not be a member of the pro-establishment camp. If the pro-establishment camp is against this filibuster, they should roll with the punches and launch their own counter-attack. That is the role the pro-establishment camp should assume in debates of the Council. President, I think the performance of the pro-establishment camp is Originally, I intend to use the word "sympathetic", but I think they really miss the point for they only handle the situation by pleading and lamenting. For instance, they cried for help, saying that they could not even use one minute to go to the toilet, or they could not have a proper meal, or they felt tired and must go out for a walk, and so on. As members of the pro-establishment camp and supporters of the Government, is that how they should behave? They are merely acting, or putting on a show for the people. Are they the righteous protagonists of this show, or the evil clowns? The decision should be left to the audience, rather than they themselves. However, I can say that their current performance is highly "un-pro-establishment".

Of course, President, that is the difference between the pro-establishment camp and the ruling party. If their capacity was the ruling party, they were actually bound by their duty. As Members of the ruling party, they were duty-bound to support the administration and the Government, and it was their duty to debate staunchly and righteously with the opposition parties or minority parties. There is no need to complain about filibustering because that is legal,

proper and practiced in each country. That is a common venue of contest for different parties, and that is how the ruling party should behave.

President, so far, none of the political parties in Hong Kong has a ruling party mentality. While we are saying that the Chief Executive of Hong Kong will be returned by universal suffrage in 2017 — I hope this is achievable — and all Members of the Legislative Council will be returned by universal suffrage in 2020, we do not have a single political party which adopts the ruling party mentality. When we were given the opportunity to implement universal suffrage, our political parties said that no political parties in Hong Kong were ready to rule, and their performance also bore witness to the same. This situation is more than aptly demonstrated by the present incident. I hope to implore all political parties present, regardless of whether they belong to the pro-establishment camp, the pan-democratic camp or the so-called opposition, that now is the time for us to change. From now on, we must strive to be our own masters and prepare ourselves to rule Hong Kong. That is how we can change our mentality, behaviour and attitude as demonstrated in the past few days.

Last but not least, President, I must make the following remarks, albeit most unwillingly. I must criticize the President for wrongly ending the filibuster. As I just said, filibuster is a normal and neutral practice or tactic commonly used in all democratic countries. Why can it not be allowed? Why should action be taken by the President to end the filibuster? In other parliaments, such as the United Kingdom and the United States, there are also ways to end a filibuster, though not by the Speaker, but by the Members themselves or the ruling party. That is the difference. President, as far as I am concerned, the Speaker should chair the meeting in a neutral, impartial and non-aligned manner, without caring whether the meeting has been protracted or curtailed. If you consider that these amendments are fragmented and should not be proposed, you should basically disallow these 1 300 amendments involving petty textual changes at the onset. I have not taken part in the filibuster right from the beginning because I cannot see any reason for discussing these petty textual amendments to the Chinese text of the Bill or *The Four Books and The Five Classics* (四書五經) with Members on this occasion. As in the case I just cited about the United States Senator reciting recipes or Shakespeare, I do not want to do such things and hence, I do not take part in the filibuster. Given that the President has allowed the Members to propose their 1 300 amendments in the

first place, I do not think the President should end the filibuster in his capacity as the President. If the filibuster was to be ended, it should be done by the pro-establishment camp. If Members of the pro-establishment camp genuinely support the Government, they should find a way to end the filibuster.

President, I think it is wrong to make this judgment and decision. President, I speak against this Bill, and I will withdraw from this meeting to show my opposition.

Thank you, President.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now suspend the meeting. When the meeting resumes after the Finance Committee meeting to be held in the afternoon, I will call upon other Members to speak.

12.49 pm

Meeting suspended.

8.05 pm

Council then resumed.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Council now continues with the Third Reading debate of the Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012.

MS MIRIAM LAU (in Cantonese): President, we are now reading the Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012 (the Bill) for the Third time. Bearing in mind the President's earlier advice, we should speak on the Bill under discussion.

In fact, President, what you said earlier was right. According to your observation, most Members are still awake. In fact, we have spoken on this

motion for 109 hours since the resumption of the Second Reading debate, excluding the time spent on the Third Reading. During this period of time, we spent 44 hours sitting here, listening to issues which probably only the few Members speaking were interested to speak or hear, including the miracles, the various types of cancers and the political environment of different countries, and so on. Another 55 hours were spent on the ringing of the division bell. Our ears were filled with the buzzing of Members' speeches and the ringing of the division bell. Therefore, President, after asking us, you are very true in saying that you felt so pleased to see some Members still stay awake. I am also very surprised to see that many Members can be so persistent to remain in their seats though we have spent 14 clear days to debate on the Bill.

We must remind ourselves that, as I have said during the Second Reading debate of the Bill, this is a bill introduced by the Government to respond to public views, and it has gone through the established procedures before being tabled at this Council for scrutiny. Whether Members like it or not, support it or not, we must take part in the debate and make our ultimate decision.

I wish to remind Members that this Bill is about a replacement mechanism. If a Member arbitrarily resigns such that a vacancy arises, he is not allowed to stand for the by-election within six months of his resignation. The Bill is as simple as this. The point is, President, in this Third Reading stage, I have nothing more to say about this Bill because it is too simple. I have to take this opportunity to say something about the debate process and my feelings for it.

The tactics which our colleagues used during the Second Reading debate is called filibuster. Like many other colleagues, in the past few weeks, I returned home very late at night, at around 10 pm or 11 pm, feeling exhausted. On my way home, I met some kaifongs and they said, "Thanks for your hard work." Members of the public actually know what is going on in this Council. When I did exercise in the park in the morning, some kaifongs came to me and said, "What actually does the Legislative Council do? What is going on? How come it is so messy? We have no idea of what you are doing."

One day, a kaifong approached me, pointed his finger at me and said, "The Legislative Council is nothing but rubbish." After giving me an earful, he jogged for a lap and then chided me again. On the third time he returned to me, he said, "I do not mean to chide you. I just want to chide those Members who

started the filibuster." We can tell from these examples how members of the public feel. They do not support the filibuster, and even find it annoying and intolerable.

What is filibuster? President, while the division bell was ringing, I have made use of the time to surf the Internet. "Filibuster" is actually a Dutch word, which refers to the British or French pirates who were very active in the Caribbean in the 16th century. They hijacked ships for ransom, and in order to get ransom, they also kidnapped hostages. Today, the same tactic is used in this Council, but it is the procedure and requirement of a motion that has been kidnapped. Considering the origin of the word, there is no doubt that violence is involved and this can be described as violence in the Council.

Why is this called violence in the Council? In fact, this is an abuse of the Rules of Procedure (RoP). Rule 38 of the RoP stipulates that a Member may not speak more than once on a question with the exception of a series of circumstances, like in committee of the whole Council. However, this has been interpreted as speaking indefinitely.

President, I think you also understand, if Members are allowed to speak only once and can speak more than once only on one exception, it does not mean that you can speak indefinitely and endlessly. I think this is worth reviewing by the Council to see if this is the most accurate interpretation, with a view to prohibiting colleagues from abusing the RoP again in the future.

Similarly, President, you have invoked Rule 92 of the RoP, which provides that in any matter not provided for in the RoP, the President may decide on the practice and procedure to be followed in this Council. You have likewise created your own interpretation. In my opinion, both Rules 38 and 92 have room for review in order to ensure the smooth operation of the legislature, such that the right conferred by the RoP on either the President or Member will not be abused.

Of course, the filibustering tactic has given colleagues the right to speak. Being a Member, we certainly have the right to speak. This is our privilege and we are here to speak. However, it is neither the privilege nor the right of Members to abuse the RoP and waste the time of the legislature. Filibuster has been used several times in this Council and is getting worse and more serious,

just like taking drugs. It seems that filibustering has become the drug of this Council. Are Members addicted to it? Do Members really think that this is fun and feel "high"? The drug which this Council takes is no different from ordinary drugs. We have heard and watched the Government's anti-drug advertisement "Not Now Not Ever", which educate the public the harm of drug abuse. Members of the public are tired of the filibuster tactic used in this Council, so I hope that colleagues can hear, see and understand this.

While some people still back up Members taking the filibuster action, the majority of them do not accept filibuster which is regarded as a waste of the Council's time. Some have even described such action as loathsome, which has wasted the legislature's time and the taxpayers' money. People expect Members to express views in this Council for the sake of their interests, but not to stir up troubles.

President, filibustering is not a unique to Hong Kong — Mr WONG Yuk-man should know this very well. It is also used in Taiwan some time ago — I wonder if it is still being used — and the word is transliterated in Mandarin as "Fei li ba shi tou", (費力把事拖), meaning exhausting one's effort to bog down a process. I find it pretty interesting. Members adopting the filibuster tactic originally intended to bog down the process of the Bill, but to their disappointment, some 30 colleagues have played our roles faithfully to prevent this from happening despite the cancellation of meetings one after another. When the Government consulted people on the replacement proposal back then, more than 60% of the respondents support this path and do not want to see the legislative process of the Bill being bogged down by this filibuster action.

Filibustering has also been used in other legislatures — I have just mentioned Taiwan — Canada, the United Kingdom or other European countries have also adopted filibuster. However, so far, it has not aroused serious concern. The most classical example was found in 1957, but then no more classical example of filibustering could be found. While Members continue to have the right to speak, certain provisions on filibuster have been laid down by different legislatures. Members may use filibuster to express their dissatisfaction with certain bills and they are given the opportunity to express their views, but subject to certain restrictions. For instance, the 1 000-odd amendments moved by Members this time could be divided into six groups. Presidents of other legislatures are empowered to allow only one amendment to

be proposed in respect of each of the six groups of amendments. In so doing, the 55-hour division bell time for those 1 300-odd amendments could at least be saved. This is not intended to stop Members from debating, but in a more regulated manner to prevent a waste of time. However, our legislature currently does not have such restrictions or provisions, which has therefore rendered us very passive.

Therefore, President, I strongly propose that the Committee on Rules of Procedure (CRoP) should continue to explore ways to introduce regulations to guard against Members' filibustering. I am certainly aware that a meeting of the CRoP was held in May, but colleagues of the pan-democratic camp had been very unco-operative. I hope that they can change their stance and with a calmness of mind

(Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung rose to his feet)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, what is your point?

(Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung requested a headcount)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Clerk, please ring the bell to summon Members to the Chamber.

(After the summoning bell had been rung, a number of Members returned to the Chamber)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Council now resumes. Ms Miriam LAU, please continue with your speech.

MS MIRIAM LAU (in Cantonese): President, before the meeting is suspended, I was talking about filibustering. The CRoP has conducted a meeting to explore what can be done to guard against filibustering, and the Secretariat has also been very helpful by providing a lot of information. I nonetheless learnt that Members of the pan-democratic camp had been unco-operative and the discussion

had not achieved much progress so far. Here, I call on Members of the pan-democratic camp to change their stance. Perhaps what I am saying are mere empty talks, but I hope that they can be co-operative and rationally explore what rules can be included into our RoP to guard against such act, so that the legislature can resume order and efficiency.

President, I have attached as much importance to the legislature's RoP as to its efficiency and order. I also appreciate that colleagues may have divergent views on certain bills or government policies, and wish to express their views in different ways through various channels. I do respect this. And yet, I also hope that Members will, on the basis of the RoP, strike a balance between the order and efficiency of the legislature and the freedom of expression through rational

(Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung stood up again)

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): President.

MS MIRIAM LAU (in Cantonese): discussions. Thank you.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, what is your point?

MR LEUNG KWOK-HUNG (in Cantonese): A headcount.

MS MIRIAM LAU (in Cantonese): Again.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Clerk, please ring the bell to summon Members to the Chamber.

(After the summoning bell had been rung, a number of Members returned to the Chamber)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Council now resumes. Ms Miriam LAU, please continue with your speech.

MS MIRIAM LAU (in Cantonese): I have finished speaking.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr PAN Pey-chyou, do you wish to speak?

DR PAN PEY-CHYOU (in Cantonese): President, I choose not to speak.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Does any other Member wish to speak?

(No Member indicated a wish to speak)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs, do you want to speak?

(Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs shook his head to indicate that he did not wish to speak)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I now put the question to you and that is: That the Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012 be read the Third time and do pass. Will those in favour please raise their hands?

(Members raised their hands)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Those against please raise their hands.

(No hands raised)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): I think the question is agreed by a majority of the Members present. I declare the motion passed.

(Some Members tapped on the bench and clapped their hands)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Members should remain silent as the meeting is still going on.

CLERK (in Cantonese): Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): We now resume the Second Reading debate on the Competition Bill. As the responsible public officer has yet to attend this meeting, I now suspend the meeting.

(Some Members clapped their hands)

8.41 pm

Meeting suspended.

8.47 pm

Council then resumed.

(Bill scheduled to be dealt with at this Council meeting)

Resumption of Second Reading Debate on Bills

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): We now resume the Second Reading debate on the Competition Bill. Does any Member wish to speak?

COMPETITION BILL**Resumption of debate on Second Reading which was moved on 14 July 2010**

(Ms Audrey EU requested a headcount)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Clerk, please ring the bell to summon Members to the Chamber.

(After the summoning bell had been rung, a number of Members returned to the Chamber)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Does any Member wish to speak?

MR ALBERT HO (in Cantonese): President, should the Chairman of the Bills Committee speak first?

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): As the Chairman of the Bills Committee is not present; other Members can speak first according to the Rules of Procedure.

MR ALBERT HO (in Cantonese): Okay, thank you, President.

President, the Democratic Party has been striving for a competition law for years and before the reunification, it had all along opposed to the monopolization of the market. Since 1992, the Democratic Party has been asking the Government to formulate a fair competition law and establish a competition commission with powers of investigation. After a lapse of more than 20 years, this Council has nearly completed four terms and we finally see the light for the implementation of a competition law. It is not easy for us to count how many benevolent policies the current-term Government under Donald TSANG have accomplished, but the competition law should at least have won him some credits.

In 2005, Donald TSANG discussed, in his policy address, the need to introduce a comprehensive and cross-sectoral law on fair competition. In 2006, the Government collected public opinion on the need for a competition law in Hong Kong. And in 2008, the Government conducted a public consultation on the major contents of the competition law. After much waiting, the Government finally introduced the Competition Bill (the Bill) into the Legislative Council in 2010. Since the Bill is highly controversial and complicated, the Legislative Council has spent a considerable amount of efforts, time and energy in its scrutiny; and it is finally submitted to this Council for debate and passage.

President, after the Bills Committee had conducted more than 40 meetings, and at this stage of resumption of debate on the Second Reading, we still hear the business sector, especially small and medium enterprises (SMEs) express their worries, even though the community as a whole, particularly organizations representing the interests of consumers including the Consumer Council (CC) and democratic political parties have expressed support for the passage of the competition law.

The Democratic Party is of the view that the major objectives and merits of the competition law are to enhance competition in various sectors in Hong Kong, so as to reduce prices and improve the quality of commodities and services; and the biggest beneficiaries are certainly Hong Kong people. Safeguarding the interests of consumers is the goal that we have always strived for, and the competition law stops the hegemony from using its own market power to flagrantly manipulate the market. We should diminish the market influence of the hegemony as this is definitely favourable to SMEs. As we have noticed, unfair anti-competitive conducts have existed in Hong Kong for many years; thus there should not be any more delay in the passage of the competition law.

Competition laws have actually been implemented in many advanced countries. The United States passed and implemented an anti-competition act in 1890s; China implemented an anti-monopoly law in 2008; and the European Union, Canada, Australia, Taiwan and Singapore have formulated competition laws or fair trade laws. There are many successful cases against monopoly and hegemony, including the world's leading companies such as Microsoft, Intel, Apple and Heineken, which have been investigated and penalized by anti-monopoly committees. Consumers at large have been safeguarded and their interests protected.

The current competition law is mainly against a number of market activities involving unfair competition, especially four agreements involving serious anti-competitive conduct, which include price-fixing, market allocation, interference with and control of the supply of goods and bid-rigging. These four kinds of conduct seriously harm the fairness of the business environment, which should be uniformly prohibited regardless of the scale of enterprises. Apart from the abovementioned first conduct rule, the second conduct rule specified in the Bill prohibits undertakings that have a substantial degree of market power in a market from engaging in anti-competitive conduct.

President, some anti-competitive business practices in the past were disappointing. For example, some supermarkets forced suppliers not to supply goods to other retailers, and we suspected that oil companies and supermarkets have engaged in such activities as price-fixing. The Democratic Party had publicly expressed our views and criticized such acts. However, as there were no laws for regulation, such adverse anti-competitive practices have been on the increase. After the passage and implementation of the competition law, we hope that the future Competition Commission (the Commission) would carry out investigations on these anti-competitive activities and take legal actions to penalize the parties concerned.

Under the existing laws, it is very difficult to initiate proceedings against bid-rigging. Two years ago, 17 stall owners in the Tai Po Hui Market were alleged for bid-rigging when they were bidding for stalls, and these owners were involved in fraudulent acts against the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department. Five judges of the Court of Final Appeal unanimously ruled that the bid-rigging agreements had not violated the laws, simply because an effective competition law had not been enacted at that time.

There are concerns in the community that the passage and implementation of the competition law will increase business costs and affect the operation of enterprise; in particular, the profits of SMEs will be considerably reduced because the compliance costs are high. We all know that the passage of laws, including laws prohibiting discrimination, will affect the operation of the business environment. There are many such basic requirements in a civilized community, and business operators must take these compliance costs into consideration. Even if they have to meet these costs, we believe it is worthy as a higher goal of promoting competition and adhering to social justice will be

achieved. Some laws relating to social justice, such as the competition law, must not be avoided.

Some are of the view that competition in Hong Kong is already very tense and they do not see the need of enacting the competition law. However, we understand that businessmen attach great importance to profits. If we require enterprises to engage in fair competition in a self-disciplined manner, and not to adopt unscrupulous and unfair competitive practices, only businessmen who have a strong sense of integrity and social conscience will comply, while unscrupulous businessmen who have no conscience will not. Hence, honest business will be unfairly treated. Moreover, unscrupulous and unfair competitive practices will deprive consumers of their right and freedom to choose. Hence, the enactment of this law is essential.

SMEs are the economic lifeline of Hong Kong and the Democratic Party strongly approves of and advocates giving SMEs policy support. We are also thankful to SMEs for their significant contributions to our economic development throughout the years. The competition law is a new law in Hong Kong and we certainly understand that many SMEs worry about inadvertently falling into a legal trap. Nevertheless, after learning the nature of this law, we would know that it is favourable to SMEs. Moreover, after months of examination of the Bill, the Government and many stakeholders have finally agreed on making some mutually accepted amendments. Although we are aware that these amendments will weaken the power of the Commission to really implement the law in the future, and this tiger is not toothless though it has lost some teeth, this is after all a beginning, and this tiger with missing teeth can still have certain deterrent effects. With the implementation of the law and the accumulation of experience, we hope that we would slowly review and constantly improve the law so as to meet the common expectation of all people.

The newly added *de minimis* arrangements will exclude most SMEs from the application of some provisions of the competition law. Under the first conduct rule, even if the turnover of SMEs exceeds HK\$200 million, so long as they do not have serious anti-competitive conducts, that is, the so-called hardcore violations, a warning notice would be issued in most cases. Enforcement actions would only be initiated by the Commission in the event of non-compliance with a warning notice. This warning notice mechanism can significantly reduce the worries of SMEs about inadvertently falling into a legal trap because of the lack

of knowledge. Certainly, if enterprises have violated the so-called hardcore anti-competitive activities, strict sanctions will be imposed on all enterprises regardless of their size.

The second conduct rule applies to enterprises with substantial degree of market power. An undertaking the turnover of which does not exceed HK\$40 million will be excluded from the application of the second conduct rule. The Government will later propose a market share percentage threshold of 20%. Therefore, I believe SMEs need not worry too much after they have understood these figures.

The Democratic Party supports the revised *de minimis* arrangements. Apart from the *de minimis* arrangements and the warning notice, we understand that the Commission issues an infringement notice in cases of minor violations, asking the person concerned to take effective measures to immediately stop anti-competitive conducts. In the blue Bill, an infringement notice originally bore a sum of payment of up to \$10 million. The Government has already removed the penal arrangement under an infringement notice, so that SMEs would be relieved.

President, SMEs once worried that large enterprises with considerable financial strength might take private actions against SMEs under the competition law. As SMEs lack the financial strength to contend with large consortia, the competition law may eventually become a weapon used by large consortia to monopolize the market. Here, I wish to say that the spirit of the competition law opposes anti-competitive conducts. Unless any enterprise intentionally engages in anti-competitive conducts, I do not see any reason why we should worry too much.

Nonetheless, we are pleased to see that the Government is ready to amend the Bill, and to remove the stand-alone right of private action in Part 7, Division 3, to eliminate unnecessary worries. The Democratic Party thinks that the stand-alone right of private action is needed but we think that a review can be postponed to a later date in light of these worries.

After these amendments, the merger control under the merger rule is confined to the telecommunications sector. We think a review is necessary some time after the Commission has been established and the law has been

passed and implemented. Furthermore, upon implementation of the competition law, we hope the Commission would make publicity and education efforts, and we suggest that the business associations of different sectors would assist SMEs, allowing them to understand how to observe and comply with the requirements of competition law. This point is very important.

I know that we will debate some amendments later. We have views on the exemption for statutory bodies but I understand that the Government is ready to conduct a review in around three years' time. Given this understanding and having listened to the views of the CC, we are now ready to support the exemption but we hope that the review would be fair and impartial.

I so submit.

(Mrs Regina IP raised her hand in indication)

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mrs Regina IP, do you have any questions?

MRS REGINA IP (in Cantonese): I would like to raise a point of order.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Please raise your point of order.

MRS REGINA IP (in Cantonese): As all statutory bodies are exempted from the application of the Competition Bill, and many Members of this Council are directors of various statutory bodies, or are closely related to these bodies. Is it necessary to require these Members to declare interests first?

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Members concerned have to decide for themselves. If Members have any interests relating to a matter under debate, they will have to declare such interests before speaking.

MRS REGINA IP (in Cantonese): President, I hope you would allow me to ask another question.

According to the information I have in hand, litigation involving competition law is a "lucrative" business in the United Kingdom, and senior lawyers make the highest profits. Information shows that a Queen's Counsel can earn as high as £1 million from competition law litigation in the United Kingdom. In other words, all lawyers, especially senior litigation lawyers, can obtain substantial potential benefits through the Competition Law. Do they need to declare interests, President?

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Members concerned also have to decide for themselves on this.

MR ALBERT HO (in Cantonese): President, I only want to declare that I am a member of the Board of the Airport Authority which is a statutory body. But, I want to state very clearly that I have very strong views as lawyers are involved. While litigation may be instigated under all laws, should interests be declared in connection with all laws?

DR MARGARET NG (in Cantonese): President, I would like to ask you to make a ruling on the point of order raised by Mrs Regina IP. According to I do not know why my copy of the Rules of Procedure (RoP) is missing. President, as far as I remember, according to Rule 83A on Personal Pecuniary Interest to be Disclosed, the interest is not related to policies. If we are debating a policy relating to the community as a whole, there is not any interest to be declared by anyone. As I may not remember very clearly, I would like to ask President to make a ruling for the avoidance of doubt.

President, Ms Audrey EU has just lent me her copy of the RoP. President, it is specified in Rule 30AA that Sorry, I should refer to Rule 84 which specifies that a Member shall not vote upon any question in which he has a direct pecuniary interest. This issue should not be involved when we discuss a policy. President, this point is particularly annoying when we discuss this Bill.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Dr Margaret NG has referred to Rules 83(A) and 84(1). Concerning the former rule about the subject of a debate, specifying that "in the Council or in any committee or subcommittee, a Member shall not move any motion or amendment relating to a matter in which he has a pecuniary interest, whether direct or indirect, or speak on any such matter, except where he discloses the nature of that interest", if a Member knows that he has a direct or indirect pecuniary interest in the subject of a debate, he should disclose the nature of that interest.

Rule 84(1) is about voting upon a question, specifying that "a Member shall not vote upon any question in which he has a direct pecuniary interest except where his interest is in common with the rest of the population of Hong Kong or a sector thereof or his vote is given on a matter of Government policy".

As Dr Margaret NG has just said, the enactment of the Competition Bill involves government policies, the voting on the Bill is thus subject to Rule 84(1).

MRS REGINA IP (in Cantonese): The Competition Bill being discussed today is certainly related to policies. Following the passage of the Bill, the Competition Commission will be established and new litigation will be instigated; hence there will be pecuniary interests. Statutory bodies may or may not be exempted, and there will be pecuniary effects if they are involved in any litigation.

As a matter of fact, I think many Members will be affected. When I hosted the programme yesterday, I asked Mr Ronny TONG whether he would apply for appointment as the Chairperson of the Competition Commission in the future; he said that he would not. If any Member may apply for the appointment, he should consider if he needs to declare interest. If any Member is interested in instigating such litigation in the future, he should also consider if he has to declare interest. It will be put on record if he does not make the declaration.

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mrs Regina IP, Rule 83(A) specifies that a Member shall disclose the nature of that interest if he has a direct or indirect pecuniary interest in a matter, and the purpose is to let the public know that, they can make judgment if a Member speaks unfairly on a matter in which he has an

interest. As public information includes Members' occupations, the public knows if Members' sectors will be benefitted or affected by the passage of this Bill.

In line with our consistent practice, a Member who speaks should judge before speaking if he needs to declare interests and he should do so if necessary. If he has not declared interests before speaking, and when other Members subsequently consider that he has violated Rule 83(A), there are rules in the RoP governing how such matters should be handled.

I now call upon Mr Ronny TONG to speak.

MR RONNY TONG (in Cantonese): President, as the Second Reading on the Competition Bill begins today, my heart is filled with all kinds of emotions. At the end of the last term of the Legislative Council, we were deliberating the Minimum Wage Bill. As I recall, we had to debate overnight at the old Legislative Council Building. The Ante-Chamber was like a morgue, with colleagues sleeping all over the place. The debate went on until 6 am. After the Bill was passed in the Third Reading, I left the building immediately.

It took a long time and considerable hard work for the Minimum Wage Bill to be passed. Even in the Civic Party of which I was a founding member, many members were initially against the Minimum Wage Bill. However, the difficulties and unimaginable opposition faced during the legislative process of the Competition Bill are nothing compared with those encountered in the legislative process of the Minimum Wage Bill.

President, from my first day as a Legislative Council Member, I have taken part in the drafting of this Bill. I have spent four years visiting almost all the chambers of commerce in Hong Kong to explain the importance of enacting this legislation, as well as some areas that may be easily misunderstood by many people. However, I never dreamt that when this Bill was finally tabled to Legislative Council, the greatest opposition would come from one group overlooked by me, that is, the small and medium enterprises (SMEs). Nor did I expect so much insult hurled at me and doubts cast on my personal integrity during the process of scrutiny. Should a barrister not take part in the deliberation of bills?

I started my barrister career in company lawsuits. We are deliberating the Companies Bill. After this Bill is passed, and if I am no longer a Legislative Council Member, I will get many cases because of the Companies Ordinance. Does it mean that I should not take part in the scrutiny of that bill? When colleagues become so irrational, I sometimes feel it is a waste of time to stay in Legislative Council. Why would I overlook the opposition of SMEs to this Bill? Because in the hundred-odd countries or places in the world that have enacted competition laws, it is almost a universally acknowledged fact that such legislation is meant to help SMEs.

Over the past eight years, I have invited many top international experts to Hong Kong to help promote this legislation, holding seminars to answer questions from all sides. When those experts learnt that the greatest resistance came from SMEs, they were all astonished and speechless. They questioned why this was the case in the Hong Kong community. I am totally at a loss myself. Maybe those declaring loudly that SMEs are against the competition law do not represent SMEs. I have talked to many SMEs and they all support the enactment of this legislation. However, in this Council, many Members oppose the enactment on behalf of SMEs. But when you ask them why they oppose it, they cannot state the reason.

President, the most fundamental issue is that it is clearly stated at the outset of the Competition Bill that its aim is to prohibit conduct that prevents competition. It also clearly defines in the relevant definition that such conduct must be able to influence the market or the competitive environment. SMEs are defined as small undertakings. According to the above definitions, they cannot possibly influence the market to which they belong or the overall competitive environment. Of course, if all SMEs join together and engage in conduct such as fixing prices, sharing markets, rigging bids and limiting production through an association or other means, they are no longer SMEs, but undertakings that contravene the competition rules. In that case, why should they be given special treatment and not be bound by the rules?

Hong Kong people are very strange, or maybe I should say the businessmen in Hong Kong society are very strange. They always think that they are the only persons who stay sober, while the whole world is wrong and only they are right. How come there is such a mentality in Hong Kong society? Why can't they be humble and learn the secrets of success from other societies?

The secrets of their success are fair play, talking reason and not slandering other people or behaving dishonestly. If I were such kind of people, I would have felt ashamed.

President, I really do not understand what is so fearful about this legislation. Sometimes I feel that it depends on the timing and the position you are in. For instance, those pointing at Donald TSANG and calling him shameless and unpardonable, as well as suggesting that he should be removed from office today are the same people who were opposed to amending section 3 of the Prevention of Bribery Ordinance before. Today, many colleagues may point their fingers at my nose and say that the Competition Bill must not be passed. But one day, they might change their tune. In any case, I still believe that people talk reason in this Council. That is why I will try to talk reason over the next few days.

This Bill is not so hard to understand. Actually all laws should not be hard to understand. The most basic requirement of a law is that it should not be comprehensible to lawyers only. If only lawyers can understand it, there is a great problem with the law. Hence, laws should be written in such a way as to be comprehensible to all. However, if someone says he does not trust the judges or a neutral organization, there is nothing you can say. Many colleagues opposed to this Bill have this attitude. Even though the Bill has clear provisions, they still doubt how they will be applied in future.

President, I take pride in the fact that we have the Independent Commission Against Corruption, the Consumer Council, the Equal Opportunities Commission, the Office of the Ombudsman, and even the Audit Commission. Many such organizations enforce the law in a just and professional manner. After the Competition Bill is passed, why would we not have an equally fair and impartial organization to enforce the law? In particular, the final decision under the law will be made by a judge. Does it mean not even a judge is to be trusted? Thus, I hope very much to lay out the arguments over the next days. Whether the Bill will be passed or not, I hope colleagues will not make any more specious and distorting remarks outside this Council to mislead the general public.

Ever since the Consumer Council started pushing for the enactment of this legislation in 1997, opinion polls conducted every year over the past decade or so indicated that 80% of Hong Kong people support such legislation. The main

objective of enacting this legislation is to protect consumers and SMEs. If a small number of businessmen with great political power are against the legislation, they should come out and voice their opposition and not hide behind SMEs. Why can't you express your opposition openly and directly?

President, there are many provisions in this Bill that are unacceptable. The exemption of statutory bodies is one of the most unacceptable provisions. But which law being considered by this Council is perfect, at least in the past eight years during which I had taken part in the legislative work? None of them. They all make you clench your teeth. They are not palatable enough, but it would be a pity to throw them away. The Domestic Violence Ordinance, the Race Discrimination Ordinance and the Minimum Wage Ordinance are all like that. So is the Competition Bill now. However, we still hope to achieve a little breakthrough from a certain angle and to a certain degree and push open the door a bit, and let the Government or the Legislative Council in the next term or the next term after next decide whether to keep opening up this door. However, if you shut this door at this moment, disregarding the overall competitiveness of Hong Kong's economy and the interest of consumers and SMEs, it would be a great pity.

As I said just now, this Bill is not perfect. If I had the chance, I would redraft it. But at this moment, if we do not pass this Bill, we will not only let Hong Kong people down, we will also let ourselves down. That is why I hope that colleagues can concentrate on the arguments on this issue over the next few days.*(A phone rang)*

President, I may have spoken too long. However, I just wish to point out that it is unacceptable to make some unfounded accusations in this Council. I can understand the political motives behind them. But no matter how the President makes his ruling, as a Member, I still think that I have to defend my honour in my speech.

Thank you, President.

MR WONG TING-KWONG (in Cantonese): President, as the saying goes, "it rains when Heaven deems fit, mother remarries when she wants to". If something is bound to happen, you cannot stop it even if you resort to filibuster.

President, Mr Ronny TONG said just now that some colleagues try to deceive the public. I think he should look at himself. He was actually talking about himself. President, the Competition Bill (the Bill) has a significant impact on Hong Kong's business environment and economic development. If the Bill passes successfully, it is certainly an important first step towards protecting consumers' rights. To ensure the effective enforcement of the law, protect people's rights and for the sake of the business environment, I and the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong (DAB) support the passage of the Bill and the Administration's amendments.

In October the year before last, the Legislative Council set up a Bills Committee to study the Bill. In light of the solemnity of the matter, the DAB also set up a committee on Competition Bill to study the relevant Bill. A subcommittee was set up under that committee to study the provisions of the Bill and make suggestions to the committee. We invited various chambers of commerce — several dozen organizations and bodies — to seminars and listen to their views. In particular, we invited academics for and against the Bill to hold discussions. After compiling reports based on the views collected, we submitted our views to the Administration.

As a representative of the business sector, I am particularly concerned about the impact of the Bill on the small and medium enterprises (SMEs). In the past, SMEs had always demanded an anti-monopoly law, rather than a competition law. To use an analogy, it is as if the SAR Government gave us a rotten orange in response to our demand for an apple. This is very disappointing. However, we still have to face reality and urge the Government to amend the areas targeted by the Bill and enhance its transparency. While maintaining a stable and predictable regulated environment, it should focus on combating anti-competitive conduct that has a substantial impact on the market, rather than deviations that have no effect on the market at all.

SMEs told me that in order to successfully combat monopoly, we should target the big corporations and protect small enterprises. Over the years, different markets in Hong Kong have been monopolized by big businesses. As a result, petrol prices are raised quickly and lowered slowly, supermarkets put pressure on suppliers, big developers have hegemony and the power companies hold a monopoly. In view of this, SMEs want the Government to crack down on

monopolizing practices and question whether the Bill can regulate the big conglomerates.

Singapore's experience also places the industry in a great dilemma. After the implementation of the competition law in Singapore, the relevant regulations are mostly targeted at SMEs. According to data provided by the industry, out of nine cases of violation of the competition law tried at Singapore courts, there were seven cases in which SMEs were convicted, while the defendants in the other two cases were acquitted. The dismissed cases involved a big airline group. In one of the cases related to the contravention of the competition law, the local medical association was convicted of breaking the relevant law for issuing guidelines on health service charges to its doctor members. The SAR Government intends to adopt a "*de minimis* approach" to protect SMEs. But under the same arrangement in Singapore, those convicted of contravening the competition law are still mostly SMEs.

The Bill allows private litigation. Even though this provides an additional channel to seek justice, SMEs have great reservations about this. They are especially worried that the arrangement of stand-alone action may be abused and become the weapon of big businesses to attack SMEs that are their competitors. Lacking the financial and legal resources to counter the big businesses, SMEs will be in a disadvantageous position in litigations. Even if the proceedings are eventually dismissed, the process of instituting the proceedings and the circulation and reporting of the relevant stories will get the accused enterprises into great trouble and harm their reputation. Thus, if one brings stand-alone action, one can deal a heavy blow to one's competitor even if the case is eventually dismissed.

That is why the DAB suggests that the Government should eliminate the stand-alone right of action. If so, even though no stand-alone action can be brought without a decision from the Tribunal, SMEs would not be kept on the run by litigation. If anyone wants to make claims, he can still bring follow-on action after the Tribunal has made a decision. The Administration agrees with this argument and will only consider introducing the stand-alone right of action after the business sector is more familiar with the system of the new competition law. The Administration will review whether there is a need to introduce the stand-alone right of action in a few years' time.

Regarding the "*de minimis* approach", in terms of competitive conduct of lesser significance under the second conduct rule, the Administration initially proposed that the rule would not apply to undertakings whose annual turnover did not exceed \$1.1 million. In this respect, I told the Administration that if the average annual turnover of undertakings to be exempted from this law is below this amount, it would mean that their monthly turnover is \$900,000, and their daily turnover is \$30,000, without deducting costs and expenditure. With such a small turnover, they cannot be defined as SMEs, and can only be called mini businesses. Hence, I opposed the Government's amendment. After listening to our views, the Government studied the matter again. According to statistics of the Census and Statistics Department, after discounting mini businesses such as street stalls selling salted peanuts, the average turnover of Hong Kong SMEs between 2006 and 2010 was \$40 million. After the Administration amended the amount according to the above figure, 95% of SMEs will be exempted. This will further reassure the industry. The DAB thinks this is reasonable.

As for serious anti-competitive conduct including fixing prices, allocating markets, bid-rigging and controlling production, they will not be exempted under the "*de minimis* approach".

As for the provision to exempt statutory bodies, there are some views that while Hong Kong is seen as a free market, the Government's "invisible hand" is everywhere, interfering with many businesses. The Government actively participates in the provision of basic services to the public and in economic sectors such as tourism, logistics, shipping and conventions and exhibitions. If the competition law does not apply to some 500 organizations and 60 government departments, market operation would be seriously distorted. The Government would be competing with the people for profit, resulting in unfair competition.

Actually, among the organizations targeted in these views, the Hong Kong Trade Development Council (TDC) is the most controversial. Many representatives of the business sector told me that the TDC provides efficient and reasonably priced services to local enterprises, especially SMEs. Whether the economic environment is good or bad, the TDC has to fulfil its statutory function of promoting the development of Hong Kong's industries and trade. If the exhibition events of the TDC are regulated by the competition law, it may abolish the concessions to SMEs under the pressure of fair competition, which would undoubtedly hurt Hong Kong's SMEs. In addition, altering this kind of

established mode of development and market structure would produce risks and uncertainty that must not be underestimated.

In the DAB's view, all public and statutory bodies, whether they are engaged in economic activities, should be exempted. However, if there are sufficient grounds, the Chief Executive in Council may apply the law to public bodies that significantly prevent competition. We support the suggestion that the Government should regularly review all public and statutory bodies, and consult the views of enterprises and members of the public that are in direct competition with the public and statutory bodies. The Administration should also ensure sufficient transparency in the vetting of the public and statutory bodies.

Some Members have proposed amendments to the clauses on the exemption of statutory bodies. The DAB has the following views. Mr Albert HO and Mrs Regina IP have both proposed amendments to sections 3 and 5 on the exemption of statutory bodies. Mr Albert HO proposes that the relevant sections shall cease to have effect three years after they come into operation. Since the Administration has pledged to review the relevant operation and effectiveness a few years after the Bill is enacted, we do not think this amendment is necessary.

As for Mrs Regina IP, she proposes to amend section 3, adding three conditions to the clause stating the provisions that do not apply to statutory bodies — the first condition is: the statutory body is not engaging in an economic activity in direct competition with another undertaking; the second condition is: the economic activity of the statutory body is not affecting the economic efficiency of a specific market; and the third condition is: the economic activity of the statutory body is directly related to the provision of an essential public service or the implementation of public policy. It is worth noting that statutory bodies can only be exempted if they fulfil these three conditions. We can imagine how difficult it is to fulfil them. Thus, it is not much different from Mr Ronny TONG's proposal to delete the relevant clauses.

Mrs Regina IP also proposes to amend section 5, substituting it with "The Chief Executive in Council may, on being satisfied that there are exceptional and compelling reasons of public policy, by regulation disapply the provisions referred to in subclause 3(1) to any person; or to any person, to the extent that the

person is engaged in an activity specified in the regulation." In the DAB's view, deleting the exemption arrangement or setting a very high threshold for it will subject all statutory bodies to regulation by the competition law, including some organizations that provide public service to the people, such as the Hospital Authority, the Hong Kong Housing Authority, direct subsidy scheme schools and subsidized schools. These statutory bodies that fulfil important functions in the areas of education, health service, social welfare and public housing may have to temporarily suspend or delay the provision of these services due to potential legal uncertainties. Such amendments are detrimental to the implementation of public policy by statutory bodies to meet society's needs and in conflict with the interest of the public. In our view, the Bill has struck a balance between ensuring the effective operation of the exempted bodies and regulating them. Since the nature of statutory and non-statutory bodies may be different, it is impractical to apply one set of standards to decide whether they should be exempted.

With the passage of the Bill, the DAB hopes it can suitably combat anti-competitive conduct with significant impact on the market, so as to promote real competition in Hong Kong, without hurting the economy and the consumer environment and allowing law-abiding businesses to operate with assurance. This way, consumers can pay reasonable prices *(The buzzer sounded)*

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): Mr WONG, your time is up.

MR WONG TING-KWONG (in Cantonese): Thank you, President. These are my remarks.

MRS REGINA IP (in Cantonese): President, I am speaking to oppose the Competition Bill (the Bill), because I do not think this Bill can achieve what many colleagues who support it hope it will achieve, such as protect consumers' rights, promote competition, or enhance Hong Kong's competitiveness as Mr Albert HO said, or combat monopoly. Actually, anyone who has studied economics would know that competition and competitiveness are two different matters. Hong Kong has never had a competition law or a competition commission. However, according to the findings of international studies, Hong Kong has ranked first in competitiveness many times. This shows that

competitiveness has nothing to do with the setting up of a competition commission.

How come I think that this Bill may not necessarily protect consumers' rights? If you look at the long title of the blue bill, there is no mentioning of consumers at all. The long title of the bill says: "A bill to prohibit conduct that prevents, restricts or distorts competition in Hong Kong; to prohibit mergers that substantially lessen competition in Hong Kong; to establish a Competition Commission and a Competition Tribunal; and to provide for incidental and connected matters."

I know that many people who eagerly anticipate this legislation hope that it will help to advance consumers' interest. Thus, as if doing an autopsy, I went through the whole Bill with microscopic attention. In the end, I could only find one part on C893 that makes reference to consumers. Section 21(2)(b) states that the conduct being prohibited includes "limiting production to the prejudice of consumers". How come this Bill does not mention anything about promoting fair competition or repeatedly emphasizes the protection of consumers? This is because the lawyers who drafted this Bill are very smart and they know that one law is not enough to ensure fair competition or protect consumers.

I will try to illustrate this with a few examples. Just now, Mr Albert HO mentioned the bid-rigging incident involving the cooked food stalls in Tai Po Market two years ago. At the time, the Government could not prosecute, since a competition law had yet to be enacted. Imagine who the people that operate these cooked food stalls are. They are the disadvantaged and cannot be compared with the owner of Tsui Wah Restaurant. These poor operators of cooked food stalls could only conspire in Tai Po Market, hoping to lower the bids through bid-rigging, so as to lower their costs.

If they manage to lower their costs, I am sure they will also sell their cooked food at cheaper prices. If they manage to win the bid at a lower price through bid-rigging, and hence supply cooked food at lower prices, is this a good or bad thing for consumers? I think this is a good thing for consumers. Of course, you might say that they could still raise their prices even after lowering their costs. But I believe that in places like Tai Po Market, price increases are

regulated by economic rules. In other words, if consumers cannot afford prices that are too high, stall owners cannot possibly raise their prices at will.

Many people think that this Bill can solve all problems of wealth disparity in society. For instance, some think that with the passage of the Competition Bill, they can sue the supermarkets for joining together to force prices down. Actually, some television programmes have been studying this issue. As a result, we have seen that large supermarkets can openly send their staff to check the prices of their competitors before fixing their own prices. This way, it is hard to prove that they engage in a concerted practice to fix prices.

Maybe some people want to sue those big supermarkets for selling cheap pork, on the pretext that they are hurting SMEs. However, in economics, any large group can lower their selling prices through the economy of scale. If large supermarkets can sell pork at cheaper prices, are they helping or hurting consumers? I think they are helping consumers. If you force large supermarkets to raise their pork prices just because SMEs or street pork stalls complain, is this helping or hurting consumers? I think it is hurting consumers.

A lawyer working for a prestigious firm in London wrote to *South China Morning Post*, pointing out that the objectives of our Bill are self-contradictory. On the one hand, we want to enhance economic efficiency. On the other hand, we want to improve consumers' interest. Actually, these objectives are self-contradictory and might not be attainable.

I will give some more examples. Many people think that with the passage of the Bill, some common infuriating problems will be solved, such as the petrol stations' failure to lower petrol prices after the reduction of oil prices. Another example is the Link REIT's monopoly of almost all markets in addition to monopolizing the shopping malls in Tin Shui Wai. It owns seven out of eight markets, or six out of seven markets. The rent it collects might be even higher than that of the International Financial Centre (IFC). In that case, with the passage of the Bill, can we sue the Link REIT for monopoly?

We asked Ms Linda LAI, Deputy Secretary for Commerce and Economic Development in the Bills Committee. She dared not say yes to this question. She had no idea and could not give us an answer at all. In other words, even if this Bill is passed, it cannot solve many infuriating problems that many people

come across, and may not necessarily advance consumers' interest. However, the Competition Commission and the Competition Tribunal will certainly be set up. This means that two huge organizations will be established. The Government will certainly create two new bureaucracies. I believe the Government will start a global recruitment for the creation of these two bureaucracies.

Just now, I heard Mr Ronny TONG say that we should learn from successful societies — that is more or less what he meant — learn from the example of successful societies. Undoubtedly, competition legislation originated in large economies like the United States and the European Union. However, we have to understand why these countries need a competition law. They need it because they have a number of giant corporations.

Which United States enterprises were first accused of forming trusts? They were the iron and steel companies, railroads and telecommunications companies, all those "Baby Bells" in the United States. In the end, the United States Justice Department used the antitrust law to break up these big businesses into many "Baby Bells". Anyone who understands the United States economy knows about this. The situation in Europe is the same, since there are also big businesses in European countries. How come these countries need to enact competition laws? It is because Europe and the United States are in a "wrestling" match.

If you pay attention to international business news, you would know that whenever United States big corporations, whether Microsoft or Oracle, carry out mergers in Europe, they will be prosecuted by the European Union, such as for harming the interest of the German software company SAP. The business environment in Hong Kong is completely different. As Mr WONG Ting-kwong said, SMEs are Hong Kong's backbone. There are at least 300 000 SMEs in Hong Kong. If some people think that we can combat trusts by having a competition law, it is just wishful thinking. President, this is just an illusion, or even a fantasy of the people. Even though the long title of the Bill refers to prohibiting mergers, if you look at Schedule 7 of the Bill, you will know that the relevant provisions only apply to industries that are already being regulated, that is, the telecommunications and the broadcasting industry, so that there will be concurrent jurisdiction over these two industries. However, as some

associations (whether the Law Society or chambers of commerce) have pointed out, this kind of concurrent jurisdiction is most inappropriate.

In other words, it is still uncertain whether this law can further consumers' interest. As for prohibiting mergers, it does no such thing, since it only regulates industries that are already being regulated, that is, the broadcasting and telecommunications industry. To a certain extent, this law can encourage competition and prohibit certain anti-competitive conduct. But do not forget that with the passage of the Bill, the Competition Commission and the Competition Tribunal will come into existence. If we do not pay attention and watch the operation of these two huge organizations closely, they might easily become a new scourge. If an expert who is very competent and capable is appointed as Chairperson of the Competition Commission or the President of the Competition Tribunal — the candidates are all judges, he might look into everything and actively investigate every case, thus making all businesses "unprofitable".

President, another thing that worries me a great deal is that we have repeatedly asked the officials of the Bureau for Commerce and Economic Development in the Bills Committee to estimate how much it would cost enterprises to comply with the law, and the litigation costs that they might incur in order to deal with this law. The Government could not answer. We have also asked about many important concepts, such as the definition of a market, market power and a substantial degree of market power. But the Government had no answer either.

Sometimes, government officials tell us that the market cannot be differentiated by district or segment. However, President, of course the market can be differentiated by district and segment. A handbag bought from Tung Choi Street is of a different grade from one bought at Gucci in IFC, and so their markets are different, since the market can be differentiated by district and the grade of goods. That is to say, if someone runs a 759 Store in Siu Sai Wan and does great business, experts would think that Siu Sai Wan is his market. This way, SMEs might easily be targeted. That is why I am so worried.

Finally, I would like to talk about the issue of conflict of interest. Even though I know some colleagues may be displeased upon hearing it, I have to say it. Some friends from the legal sector told me that the Bar Council in England

and Lincoln's Inn used to have a professional code of conduct that advice their practicing barristers not to vote on legislation which might help them make profit or gain an advantage. Of course, no one knows whether a Member or a trade would gain advantage from a certain piece of legislation. But as I said, data shows that the competition law is one of the most profitable areas of litigation in the United Kingdom. According to the data I have on hand, even a pupil barrister could make 60 000 pounds a year, while Queen's counsels and competition law experts could make several million pounds a year. President, it is several million in pound sterling, not Hong Kong dollars.

This is to say that the competition law is not just any policy, but a policy that would allow some trades to make big profit and considerably boost the number of certain lawsuits. Thus, after the passage of the Bill, if members of the legal sector in this Council are interested in taking part in litigation in future, I urge them to declare an interest and tell all Hong Kong people whether they would take part in litigation in this area in future. If so, it is best for them to abstain. If they insist on voting and deny any conflict of interest, maybe they should make a pledge not to participate in this kind of lawsuits within five years after the passage of the bill.

I so submit.

NEXT MEETING

PRESIDENT (in Cantonese): It is almost 10 pm. I now adjourn the Council until 11 am on Wednesday, 6 June 2012.

Adjourned accordingly at one minute to Ten o'clock.

Annex I

No. 1141

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee Stage

Amendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk Man

Clause

Amendment Proposed

3

By adding—

{NEGATIVED}

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 April 2014.”.

No. 1142

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 May 2014.”.

No. 1143

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee Stage

Amendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk Man

Clause

Amendment Proposed

3

By adding—

{NEGATIVED}

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 June 2014.”.

No. 1144

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 July 2014.”.

No. 1145

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee Stage

Amendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk Man

Clause

Amendment Proposed

3

By adding—

{NEGATIVED}

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 August 2014.”.

No. 1146

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 September 2014.”.

No. 1147

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee Stage

Amendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk Man

Clause

Amendment Proposed

3

{NEGATIVED}

By adding—

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 October 2014.”.

No. 1148

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 November 2014.”.

No. 1149

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee Stage

Amendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk Man

Clause

Amendment Proposed

3

{NEGATIVED}

By adding—

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 December 2014.”.

No. 1150

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 January 2015.”.

No. 1151

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee Stage

Amendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk Man

Clause

Amendment Proposed

3

By adding—

NEGATIVED

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 February 2015.”.

No. 1152

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 March 2015.”.

No. 1153

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee Stage

Amendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk Man

Clause

Amendment Proposed

3

By adding—

{NEGATIVED}

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 April 2015.”.

No. 1154

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 May 2015.”.

No. 1155

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee Stage

Amendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk Man

Clause

Amendment Proposed

3

By adding—

{NEGATIVED}

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 June 2015.”.

No. 1156

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 July 2015.”.

No. 1157

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee Stage

Amendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk Man

Clause

Amendment Proposed

3

By adding—

{NEGATIVED}

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 August 2015.”.

No. 1158

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 September 2015.”.

No. 1159

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee Stage

Amendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk Man

Clause

Amendment Proposed

3

By adding—

{NEGATIVED}

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 October 2015.”.

No. 1160

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

NEGATIVED

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 November 2015.”.

No. 1161

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee Stage

Amendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk Man

Clause

Amendment Proposed

3

By adding—

{NEGATIVED}

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 December 2015.”.

No. 1162

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 January 2016.”.

No. 1163

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee Stage

Amendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk Man

Clause

Amendment Proposed

3

By adding—

{NEGATIVED}

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 February 2016.”.

No. 1164

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 March 2016.”.

No. 1165

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee Stage

Amendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk Man

Clause

Amendment Proposed

3

By adding—

{NEGATIVED}

“(2B) Subsection (2A) is to expire on 6 April 2016.”.

No. 1183

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

NEGATIVED

By adding—

“(2B) If any person’s resignation from office as a Member is because he suffers from terminal hepatocellular carcinoma but it is verified within one month after his resignation takes effect by a registered medical practitioner that he does not suffer from terminal hepatocellular carcinoma within one month after his resignation takes effect, subsection (2A) does not apply to him .”.

No. 1184

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

[NEGATIVED]

By adding—

- “(2B) If any person’s resignation from office as a Member is because she suffers from terminal malignant breast neoplasm but it is verified within one month after her resignation takes effect by a registered medical practitioner that she does not suffer from terminal malignant breast neoplasm within one month after her resignation takes effect, subsection (2A) does not apply to her.”.

No. 1185

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

[NEGATIVED]

By adding—

“(2B) If any person’s resignation from office as a Member is because he suffers from terminal prostate cancer but it is verified within one month after his resignation takes effect by a registered medical practitioner that he does not suffer from terminal prostate cancer within one month after his resignation takes effect, subsection (2A) does not apply to him.”.

No. 1186

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

NEGATIVED

By adding—

- “(2B) If any person’s resignation from office as a Member is because he suffers from terminal colorectal cancer but it is verified within one month after his resignation takes effect by a registered medical practitioner that he does not suffer from terminal colorectal cancer within one month after his resignation takes effect, subsection (2A) does not apply to him.”.

No. 1187

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

NEGATIVED

By adding—

- “(2B) If any person’s resignation from office as a Member is because he suffers from terminal lung cancer but it is verified within one month after his resignation takes effect by a registered medical practitioner that he does not suffer from terminal lung cancer within one month after his resignation takes effect, subsection (2A) does not apply to him.”.

No. 1188

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

NEGATIVED

By adding—

- “(2B) If any person’s resignation from office as a Member is because he suffers from terminal stomach cancer but it is verified within one month after his resignation takes effect by a registered medical practitioner that he does not suffer from terminal stomach cancer within one month after his resignation takes effect, subsection (2A) does not apply to him.”.

No. 1189

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

NEGATIVED

By adding—

“(2B) If any person’s resignation from office as a Member is because he suffers from terminal nasopharyngeal cancer but it is verified within one month after his resignation takes effect by a registered medical practitioner that he does not suffer from terminal nasopharyngeal cancer within one month after his resignation takes effect, subsection (2A) does not apply to him.”.

No. 1190

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

NEGATIVED

By adding—

- “(2B) If any person’s resignation from office as a Member is because he suffers from terminal lymphoma but it is verified within one month after his resignation takes effect by a registered medical practitioner that he does not suffer from terminal lymphoma within one month after his resignation takes effect, subsection (2A) does not apply to him.”.

No. 1191

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

NEGATIVED

By adding—

“(2B) If any person’s resignation from office as a Member is because he suffers from terminal skin cancer but it is verified within one month after his resignation takes effect by a registered medical practitioner that he does not suffer from terminal skin cancer within one month after his resignation takes effect, subsection (2A) does not apply to him.”.

No. 1192

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

NEGATIVED

By adding—

- “(2B) If any person’s resignation from office as a Member is because he suffers from terminal esophagus cancer but it is verified within one month after his resignation takes effect by a registered medical practitioner that he does not suffer from terminal esophagus cancer within one month after his resignation takes effect, subsection (2A) does not apply to him.”.

No. 1193

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

[NEGATIVED]

By adding—

“(2B) If any person’s resignation from office as a Member is because she suffers from terminal cervical cancer but it is verified within one month after her resignation takes effect by a registered medical practitioner that she does not suffer from terminal cervical cancer within one month after her resignation takes effect, subsection (2A) does not apply to her.”.

No. 1194

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

[NEGATIVED]

By adding—

“(2B) If any person’s resignation from office as a Member is because she suffers from terminal ovarian cancer but it is verified within one month after her resignation takes effect by a registered medical practitioner that she does not suffer from terminal ovarian cancer within one month after her resignation takes effect, subsection (2A) does not apply to her.”.

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

NEGATIVED

By adding—

- “(2B) If any person’s resignation from office as a Member is because he suffers from terminal pancreatic cancer but it is verified within one month after his resignation takes effect by a registered medical practitioner that he does not suffer from terminal pancreatic cancer within one month after his resignation takes effect, subsection (2A) does not apply to him.”.

No. 1196

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

NEGATIVED

By adding—

- “(2B) If any person’s resignation from office as a Member is because he suffers from terminal brain cancer but it is verified within one month after his resignation takes effect by a registered medical practitioner that he does not suffer from terminal brain cancer within one month after his resignation takes effect, subsection (2A) does not apply to him.”.

No. 1197

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

NEGATIVED

By adding—

- “(2B) If any person’s resignation from office as a Member is because he suffers from terminal testicular cancer but it is verified within one month after his resignation takes effect by a registered medical practitioner that he does not suffer from terminal testicular cancer within one month after his resignation takes effect, subsection (2A) does not apply to him.”.

No. 1198

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

NEGATIVED

By adding—

“(2B) If any person’s resignation from office as a Member is because he suffers from terminal leukaemia but it is verified within one month after his resignation takes effect by a registered medical practitioner that he does not suffer from terminal leukaemia within one month after his resignation takes effect, subsection (2A) does not apply to him.”.

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

NEGATIVED

By adding—

- “(2B) If any person’s resignation from office as a Member is because he suffers from terminal bone cancer but it is verified within one month after his resignation takes effect by a registered medical practitioner that he does not suffer from terminal bone cancer within one month after his resignation takes effect, subsection (2A) does not apply to him.”.

No. 1200

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) If not less than 2 Members of any geographical constituency or the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1201

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) If not less than 3 Members of any geographical constituency or the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1202

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

[NEGATIVED]

By adding—

- “(2B) If not less than 4 Members of any geographical constituency or the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1203

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) If not less than 5 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1204

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) If not less than 6 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1205

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

[NEGATIVED]

By adding—

“(2B) If not less than 7 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1206

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) If not less than 8 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) If not less than 9 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1208

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) If not less than 10 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1209

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

{NEGATIVED}

“(2B) If not less than 11 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1210

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) If not less than 12 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) If not less than 13 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1212

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

[NEGATIVED]

By adding—

“(2B) If not less than 14 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1213

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) If not less than 15 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1214

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) If not less than 16 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1215

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

NEGATIVED

By adding—

“(2B) If not less than 17 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1216

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

[NEGATIVED]

By adding—

“(2B) If not less than 18 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1217

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

NEGATIVED

By adding—

“(2B) If not less than 19 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1218

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) If not less than 20 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1219

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) If not less than 21 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1220

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) If not less than 22 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1221

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

NEGATIVED

By adding—

“(2B) If not less than 23 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1222

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) If not less than 24 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1223

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

NEGATIVED

By adding—

“(2B) If not less than 25 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1224

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

[NEGATIVED]

By adding—

“(2B) If not less than 26 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1225

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

NEGATIVED

By adding—

“(2B) If not less than 27 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1226

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) If not less than 28 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1227

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

[NEGATIVED]

By adding—

“(2B) If not less than 29 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1228

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) If not less than 30 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1229

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

NEGATIVED

“(2B) If not less than 31 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1230

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

[NEGATIVED]

“(2B) If not less than 32 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1231

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

By adding—

NEGATIVED

“(2B) If not less than 33 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.

No. 1232

Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012

Committee StageAmendment moved by the Honourable WONG Yuk ManClauseAmendment Proposed

3

[NEGATIVED]

By adding—

“(2B) If not less than 34 Members of any geographical constituency or not less than 4 Members of the District Council (second) functional constituency resign from office as Members on the same day, subsection (2A) does not apply to them.”.