

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2) 1860/11-12

Ref : CB2/H/5/11

House Committee of the Legislative Council

**Minutes of the 20th meeting
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
at 2:30 pm on Friday, 27 April 2012**

Members present:

Hon Miriam LAU Kin-ye, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon Fred LI Wah-ming, SBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, SBS, S.B.St.J., JP
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan
Dr Hon David LI Kwok-po, GBM, GBS, JP
Dr Hon Margaret NG
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, GBS, JP
Hon WONG Yung-kan, SBS, JP
Hon LAU Kong-wah, JP
Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, SBS, JP
Hon LI Fung-ying, SBS, JP
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, SBS, JP
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Dr Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP
Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, GBS, JP
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, GBS, JP
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, BBS, JP

Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC
Hon CHIM Pui-chung
Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP
Hon KAM Nai-wai, MH
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, JP
Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai, BBS, JP
Hon CHAN Hak-kan
Hon Paul CHAN Mo-po, MH, JP
Hon CHAN Kin-por, JP
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, JP
Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che
Hon WONG Sing-chi
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, BBS
Hon IP Wai-ming, MH
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yea, GBS, JP
Dr Hon PAN Pey-chyou
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Dr Hon Samson TAM Wai-ho, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Hon Tanya CHAN
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon WONG Yuk-man

Members absent:

Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong, GBS
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP

Clerk in attendance :

Miss Odelia LEUNG Clerk to the House Committee

Staff in attendance :

Ms Pauline NG Secretary General
Mr Jimmy MA, JP Legal Adviser

Mrs Constance LI	Assistant Secretary General 1
Mrs Justina LAM	Assistant Secretary General 3
Mrs Percy MA	Assistant Secretary General 4
Ms Connie FUNG	Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 1
Mr Arthur CHEUNG	Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 2
Mr KAU Kin-wah	Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 3
Mr Stephen LAM	Acting Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 4
Mr Andy LAU	Principal Council Secretary (Administration)
Miss Erin TSANG	Acting Principal Council Secretary (Complaints)
Mr Simon WONG	Chief Public Information Officer
Mr Michael YU	Head (Research)
Dr Yuki HUEN	Research Officer 8
Miss Flora TAI	Chief Council Secretary (2)3
Ms Amy YU	Chief Council Secretary (2)6
Mr Kelvin LEE	Assistant Legal Adviser 1
Ms Wendy KAN	Assistant Legal Adviser 6
Miss Evelyn LEE	Assistant Legal Adviser 10
Miss Josephine SO	Senior Council Secretary (2)7
Ms Judy TING	Council Secretary (2)6
Ms Anna CHEUNG	Senior Legislative Assistant (2)3
Mr Arthur KAN	Legislative Assistant (2)8

Action

I. Confirmation of the minutes of the 19th meeting held on 20 April 2012

(LC Paper No. CB(2) 1810/11-12)

The minutes were confirmed.

II. Matters arising

Report by the Chairman on her meeting with the Chief Secretary for Administration ("CS")

2. The Chairman said that she had conveyed to CS Members' concerns over issues relating to the change of Government. CS had indicated that the Chief Executive ("CE") had stated clearly that he would strive to ensure a seamless transition with the CE-elect. Regarding the CE-elect's proposal to re-organize the policy bureaux, the Administration would follow the arrangements similar to those adopted in 2007 and provide the relevant papers to the Legislative Council ("LegCo") and give notice to move the relevant resolution in due course.

Action

3. The Chairman further said that issues relating to the transition arrangements between the incumbent CE and the CE-elect and their impact on the work of LegCo would be discussed under agenda item VII below.

III. Further business for the Council meeting of 2 May 2012

(a) Government motion

Proposed resolution to be moved by the Secretary for Home Affairs under the Legal Aid Ordinance

(Wording of the proposed resolution issued vide LC Paper No. CB(3) 662/11-12 dated 20 April 2012.)

4. The Chairman said that the relevant Subcommittee had reported at the last House Committee meeting and Members raised no objection to the Secretary for Home Affairs giving notice to move the above proposed resolution at the Council meeting.

(b) Members' motions

Motion on Adjournment to be moved by Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming under Rule 16(4) of the Rules of Procedure

(Wording of the motion issued vide LC Paper No. CB(3) 675/11-12 dated 23 April 2012.)

5. The Chairman said that Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming would move an adjournment debate regarding the upward adjustment to MTR fares at the Council meeting.

Difficulties encountered by the Secretariat in handling the business for the Council meetings of 2 and 9 May 2012

(Letter dated 26 April 2012 from the President to the Chairman of the House Committee (LC Paper No. CB(2) 1852/11-12(01)))

6. The Chairman said that the Second Reading debates on the Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012 ("LC(A) Bill 2012") and the Copyright (Amendment) Bill 2011 ("C(A) Bill 2011") were scheduled to resume at the Council meetings of 2 and 9 May 2012 respectively. Both Bills involved a large number of Committee Stage amendments ("CSAs"). In the case of the LC(A) Bill 2012, over 1 300 CSAs had been proposed. Given the huge number of amendments involved, it was necessary for Members to discuss the arrangements for the Council meetings of 2 and 9 May.

Action

7. At the invitation of the Chairman, Secretary General ("SG") referred Members to her letter dated 26 April 2012 to the Chairman of The Legislative Council Commission ("LCC") on the difficulties encountered by the Secretariat in handling the voluminous CSAs to the LC(A) Bill 2012 and the C(A) Bill 2011. She said that the processing of CSAs to bills involved complex procedures. Upon receipt of notice of CSAs to a bill, the Secretariat staff needed to consult the Department of Justice on the drafting and formatting of the CSAs and to analyze the bill and the CSAs, in order to assist the President in making rulings on the CSAs and advise him on how the various provisions of the bill and the CSAs should be dealt with by the Council. In the process, the Secretariat staff had to study the interdependency of the CSAs in order to work out the debate and voting arrangements for the various provisions of the bill and the CSAs, and to prepare the script for the relevant Council meeting for reference by Members and the Administration to ensure the smooth conduct of the meeting. The procedures involved were complex and time-consuming.

8. SG further said that given the voluminous amendments to the LC(A) Bill 2012, it would not be feasible for the Secretariat to follow the existing arrangements and complete the processing of all the CSAs before 2 May 2012. The Secretariat had therefore proposed for Members' consideration a streamlined approach for the preparation of the script for the Council meeting of 2 May 2012. For instance, the Secretariat would present the CSAs in tabular form and would not set out all possible scenarios in the script.

9. As for the C(A) Bill 2011, SG said that it was anticipated that over 1 000 CSAs would be proposed to the Bill. Since the Bill was more complex and voluminous than the LC(A) Bill 2012, the Secretariat planned to deploy a special team of staff to assist in processing the CSAs. This notwithstanding, it was expected that the special team would need three to four weeks to complete the work. Hence, the Secretariat would like to seek the House Committee's support for requesting the Administration to defer the date of resumption of the Second Reading debate on the C(A) Bill 2011 to allow time for the Secretariat to complete the processing of the CSAs.

10. The Chairman invited Members' views on the proposals put forward by the Secretariat.

11. Mr Albert CHAN referred to SG's letter to the Chairman of LCC dated 26 April 2012 and clarified that it was not his intention to move over 1 000 CSAs to bills at every upcoming Council meeting. He believed that SG had misunderstood what he said. He had only meant

Action

to give an advance notice to the Secretariat that he would likewise propose over 1 000 CSAs to the C(A) Bill 2011. Mr CHAN further said that while he recognized and highly appreciated the hard work and heavy workload of staff members of the Secretariat in processing the large number of CSAs proposed by him and Mr WONG Yuk-man to the LC(A) Bill 2012, he stressed that the CSAs served the important objective of defending the rights of the public. To maintain the rights of Hong Kong people, the staff of his office and Mr WONG Yuk-man's office worked no less diligently than the Secretariat staff. Should the LC(A) Bill 2012 which deprived people of their rights be passed, the ultimate victims would be the seven-million people of Hong Kong.

12. Mr Albert CHAN further said that he and Mr WONG Yuk-man had decided to move over 1 400 CSAs to the C(A) Bill 2011 only a few days ago and would submit them to the Secretariat after the House Committee meeting. They would give their best efforts to facilitate the Secretariat in processing the CSAs, which were more complex than those proposed to the LC(A) Bill 2012. He supported the proposal for requesting the Administration to defer the date for resuming the Second Reading debate on the C(A) Bill 2011. In his view, it might even be better if the Administration decided to shelve the legislative process for the Bill and conduct a comprehensive consultation on its proposals.

13. Dr Margaret NG said that in her letter to the Chairman of LCC, SG was simply pointing out the difficulties faced by the Secretariat in handling the voluminous CSAs and suggesting certain solutions to solve the problem. SG had neither complained about the hard work entailed nor requested the Members concerned not to propose CSAs. She drew Members' attention to the present situation that owing to the tight time frame within which the processing of CSAs had to be completed, the Secretariat would not be able to cope with the enormous workload with its existing manpower unless some flexibility measures were adopted in the processing work.

14. Mr WONG Yuk-man said that he had all along used peaceful means to register his protest. He and Mr Albert CHAN, by moving a substantial number of CSAs, were trying to obstruct the passage of the LC(A) Bill 2012 and the C(A) Bill 2011. He stressed that under the Rules of Procedure ("RoP"), Members had the right to propose CSAs, and the CSAs they had proposed were in accordance with the requirements in RoP. They had no choice but to use this last resort to protest against the Bills. Recognizing that the voluminous amendments to the Bills increased the already heavy workload of the Secretariat, he expressed on behalf of Members belonging to People Power their sincere apology to staff members of the Secretariat.

Action

15. Mr TAM Yiu-chung said that Members belonging to the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong ("DAB") did not agree to individual Members' moving of voluminous CSAs for the purpose of delaying the passage of a bill. He fully appreciated the concerns of the Secretariat, as the substantial volume of CSAs would have serious impacts on the workload of staff members of the Secretariat. He considered the approach taken by the Members concerned an abuse of procedure and as Chairman of the Committee on Rules of Procedure ("CRoP"), he considered it necessary for CRoP to review RoP to avoid such abuse in future.

16. Dr PAN Pey-chyou expressed concurrence with Mr TAM Yiu-chung's view, pointing out that the processing of such a large number of CSAs was extremely difficult and time-consuming. He expressed support for the Secretariat to adopt flexible measures to streamline the process so as to resolve the problem. He also expressed resentment against individual Members' for employing such tactic, which, in his view, was not in the least constructive.

17. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung said that he was supportive of Mr Albert CHAN's and Mr WONG Yuk-man's move as a means to protest against the LC(A) Bill 2012. Hong Kong people should recognize that the moving of voluminous CSAs was the last resort that could be taken by Members to expose the absurdity of the Bill which sought to deprive the public of their right to vote in a by-election.

18. Mr Paul TSE said that the court had case management powers to deal with the use of delaying tactics in court cases. He sought advice from Legal Adviser ("LA") on whether there were any case management or contingency measures under RoP to tackle the problem arising from the substantial number of CSAs proposed by individual Members. He further enquired whether CRoP could convene urgent meetings to deal with the problem.

19. At the invitation of the Chairman, LA said that the business at Council meetings had to be conducted in accordance with the provisions in RoP. The concept and principles of case management used by the courts might not be suitable for application in the case of a legislative body, and it was for Members to discuss and decide how to handle the issues at stake in accordance with RoP.

20. Ms Emily LAU said that the established procedure should be followed should there be a need to amend RoP. As a member of LCC, she considered it necessary to handle the problem of heavy workload and pressure on Secretariat staff arising from the need to process the

Action

voluminous CSAs proposed to the Bills. Noting the Secretariat's proposal to deploy a special team of staff, comprising the Assistant Secretary General as well as one to two staff members at the Chief Council Secretary rank of Council Business Division 1, to undertake the processing work relating to the CSAs to the C(A) Bill 2011, she expressed concern about the impact of the proposal on the work of the Council and committees currently in action.

21. At the invitation of the Chairman, SG said that in relation to the comments made by Mr Albert CHAN in his letter to the President that day, she clarified that her conversation with Mr CHAN was solely on whether he would claim a division for each and every one of his CSAs to the LC(A) Bill 2012 to facilitate planning for the voting arrangements. She had no intention at all of persuading Mr CHAN to withdraw any of his CSAs. After ascertaining Mr CHAN's confirmation that he would claim a division following every vote, she had estimated and alerted the President to the time required for handling the voluminous amendments to the LC(A) Bill 2012 at the Council meeting of 2 May. It was estimated that the voting on all the CSAs would take more than 30 hours should the duration of the division bell be shortened to one minute. That being the case, the Council meeting of 2 May would likely last for at least three to four days and hence would definitely affect the committee meetings originally scheduled for that period. As regards the impact brought about by the large number of CSAs to the C(A) Bill 2011, it had yet to be ascertained as the Secretariat did not have details of the CSAs to be moved by individual Members.

22. In response to Dr Margaret NG, the Chairman clarified that for the Council meeting of 2 May, Members were invited to consider the Secretariat's proposal of adopting a streamlined approach in the preparation of the script in respect of the LC(A) Bill 2012. As the voting on the CSAs to the Bill would take some 33 hours, she wished to seek Members' view on the proposal of dispensing with the ringing of the one-minute division bell in relation to the voting on the amendments to the Bill. Should such a proposal be adopted, the time required for voting on the CSAs could be shortened to about 10 hours.

23. Dr Margaret NG said that the ringing of the division bell was stipulated in RoP. She asked about the procedure to be followed should Members agree to dispense with the requirement to ring the division bell.

24. The Chairman said that should Members agree to the proposal, she would move a motion in her capacity as Chairman of the House Committee to suspend the relevant provision of RoP at the Council meeting of 2 May.

Action

25. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung said that he objected to the proposal for amending RoP in relation to the Council proceedings of the LC(A) Bill 2012. He cautioned that it would arouse controversy and might give rise to litigation.

26. Dr PAN Pey-chyou expressed resentment at some Members' remarks to frustrate the attempt of other Members to resolve the problem on the voting of the large number of CSAs. He was concerned whether arrangements for breaks could be made after voting on a certain number of CSAs.

27. Mr Albert CHAN expressed strong dissatisfaction to the proposal raised by the Chairman for amending RoP for the purpose of dispensing with an established procedure which had been in place for years. In his view, such a move by the majority to suppress the right of the minority was a form of tyranny. He considered the Chairman's proposed approach of handling the voting on the CSAs unfair. He protested against and condemned strongly such a move.

28. Mr TAM Yiu-chung considered the Chairman's proposed approach fair. He said that Members belonging to DAB supported the proposals for adopting a streamlined approach in the preparation of the script for the Council meeting of 2 May and dispensing with the requirement to ring the division bell for voting on CSAs to the LC(A) Bill 2012. Enquiring about the debate and voting arrangements for the Bill, he expressed concern whether the electronic voting system ("EVS") in the Chamber could support such frequent divisions at the Council meeting.

29. At the invitation of the Chairman, Assistant Secretary General 3 ("ASG3") said that as the LC(A) Bill 2012 contained only three clauses, Members could speak on the three clauses in a joint debate during the Committee stage before proceeding to vote on the CSAs. As the voting on the 1 307 CSAs proposed by the two Members and the Administration would continue without any debate in between, the President would consider allowing breaks for Members to take meals. ASG3 further said that in anticipation that there would be a large number of divisions, the Secretariat's Information Technology Office had been working closely with the system contractor to ensure the stability of the EVS during the Council meeting. In the event that the EVS in the Chamber broke down during the Council meeting, the venue of the Council meeting would be changed to Conference Room 1 which served as a back-up venue for Council meetings. ASG3 added that should the EVS in Conference Room 1 broke down, there was no further back-up system.

Action

30. Mrs Regina IP expressed support for the proposal for streamlining the voting procedure given the large number of CSAs involved. In arranging breaks during the Council meeting of 2 May, she considered that regard should be given to the needs of the Principal Officials attending the Council meeting.

31. Mr WONG Yuk-man said that he strongly objected to the proposal for dispensing with the requirement to ring the division bell for voting on CSAs proposed to the LC(A) Bill 2012, and condemned the Chairman for raising such a proposal. In his view, the proposal was a form of violence by the majority and it would bring LegCo into disrepute should it be passed by the House Committee. He and Mr Albert CHAN were among the five Members who had resigned to initiate the referendum campaign and they had proposed a large number of CSAs because of their strong opposition to the Bill. He expressed strong resentment to Dr PAN Pey-chyou's remarks.

32. In response to Mr Paul TSE's enquiry on the procedural basis for the proposal for dispensing with ringing of the division bell, the Chairman said that the proposal did not require amendment to RoP. In accordance with RoP 91, a Member could move a motion to the effect of suspending a Rule after notice or with the consent of the President.

33. Mr Paul TSE sought clarification on the scope of applicability of RoP 91. He also sought information on the rules and procedures adopted in other jurisdictions to deal with this form of delaying tactic by introducing voluminous CSAs.

34. At the invitation of the Chairman, SG clarified that the proposal under discussion did not involve any amendment to RoP and RoP 91 concerned the suspension of a Rule. The Secretariat had made reference to the practices of other jurisdictions and had consulted Sir Malcolm Jack on the practice of the Parliament of the United Kingdom. While the legislature in other countries had mechanisms to deal with filibuster, the existing RoP did not have provisions to handle tactics adopted by Members to prolong unnecessarily the proceedings of the Council.

35. In response to Mr Paul TSE's enquiry on circumstances under which RoP 91 had been invoked in the past, ASG3 said that when LegCo moved to the new Complex, Members agreed to an interim arrangement regarding the duration of the ringing of the division bell at Council meetings. Under the agreed arrangement, the division bell should be rung for five minutes instead of three minutes. This interim

Action

arrangement was effected by way of a motion to suspend the relevant provisions of RoP pursuant to RoP 91 moved by the Chairman of the House Committee at the Council meeting. Members could adopt a similar arrangement to suspend Rule 49(4) should they agree to dispense with the one-minute ringing of the division bell in relation to the LC(A) Bill 2012.

36. At the invitation of the Chairman, LA said that apart from the case quoted by ASG3, RoP 91 had been frequently invoked in the past, until amendments had been made to RoP in 2011, to suspend the relevant provisions of RoP to deal with interdependent amendments to a bill which involved proposed amendments to a schedule to the bill.

37. Mr IP Kwok-him said that while he respected the right of individual Members to propose CSAs, Members should refrain from proposing CSAs which were of a trivial nature. He resented the move of some Members in proposing a large number of CSAs, the handling of which would take a considerable amount of time. He expressed support for the proposal to dispense with the requirement of ringing the division bell for voting on the CSAs concerned.

38. Ms Cyd HO said that she objected to amending RoP in haste to deal with a specific situation without thorough discussions by Members. Given that the CSAs to the LC(A) Bill 2012 were proposed in accordance with the requirements in RoP and should they be ruled in by the President, they should be processed in accordance with the established procedures. Regarding the C(A) Bill 2011, in view of its controversial nature, she supported the proposal for requesting the Administration to defer the resumption of its Second Reading debate to allow sufficient time for the Secretariat to process the large number of CSAs and the community to further discuss the proposals. In her view, it would achieve a win-win situation.

39. Ms Emily LAU said that Members belonging to the Democratic Party did not have a chance to discuss the proposal for dispensing with the ringing of the division bell in respect of the LC(A) Bill 2012. In view of the controversial nature of the proposal, she considered it inappropriate for the House Committee to take a decision on the proposal at this meeting. She pointed out that the moving of a motion by the Chairman of the House Committee at the Council meeting of 2 May to suspend Rule 49(4) of RoP would likely trigger a long debate, defeating the original purpose for the moving of the motion to save time.

Action

40. Regarding the proposal to dispense with the ringing of the division bell, Mr Albert CHAN sought advice from LA on the following issues -

- (a) whether it was procedurally in order for a Member to move at a Council meeting a motion to suspend a Rule in RoP to the effect of changing the voting arrangements on CSAs;
- (b) whether other Members could propose amendments to the motion; and
- (c) the voting arrangement for such a motion.

41. At the invitation of the Chairman, LA said that according to RoP 91, a motion which had the object or effect of suspending a Rule could be moved after notice or with the consent of the President. A motion moved pursuant to RoP 91 to dispense with the ringing of the division bell was, by nature, a procedural motion. According to past practice, as the wording of such motions had normally been discussed and agreed to by the House Committee, no amendments were proposed when the motions were moved at Council meeting. LA added that according to provisions in RoP applicable to motions generally, a Member might move amendments after giving the requisite notice, provided that the amendments were relevant to the subject matter of the motion and conformed with the requirements in RoP.

42. Dr PAN Pey-chyou said that he was furious at the tactics used by some Members to delay the passage of the LC(A) Bill 2012. Given the dissenting views among Members, he anticipated that even if the motion on suspension of Rule 49(4) of RoP was moved at the Council meeting of 2 May, it would unlikely be passed. In his view, CRoP should be requested to review RoP and the Administration to defer the resumption of the Second Reading debate on the LC(A) Bill 2012.

43. Dr Margaret NG stressed that under the Basic Law and RoP, Members had the right to propose CSAs and such right should be respected. When Members exercised their right to propose CSAs, the responsibility of the Secretariat was to ensure the smooth conduct of Council business. As regards the proposal for moving a motion to suspend RoP 49(4), she believed that the President would perform his gate-keeping role in determining whether to give approval for the moving of the motion, having regard to whether Members had consensual view on the matter.

Action

44. Mr WONG Yuk-man said that in view of the controversy over the proposal to dispense with the ringing of the division bell, Members should not push for the moving of such a motion at the Council meeting.

45. Mr Paul TSE noted that a motion to suspend a Rule could be moved under RoP 91 after notice or with the consent of the President. He sought clarification on the notice period required for moving a motion under RoP 91, and whether RoP 91 could be invoked to suspend any Rule in RoP.

46. At the invitation of the Chairman, LA said that the notice period required for a motion moved under RoP 91 was 12 clear days, and such a motion could cover all Rules under RoP. He added that LegCo was vested with the power to determine its own practice and procedure, provided that they did not contravene the Basic Law.

47. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung said that the purpose of ringing the division bell was to facilitate Members to discharge their duty to vote at a Council meeting. He considered it illogical and unreasonable to dispense with the arrangement, which might also lead to disputes.

48. Mr IP Kwok-him expressed concern about the impact on Members' staff caused by the continuous ringing of the division bell during the Council meeting of 2 May. He asked whether arrangements could be made to turn off or lower the volume of the public address system on the floors where Members' offices were located or other floors.

49. At the invitation of the Chairman, SG confirmed that it was technically feasible to do so. The actual arrangements to be adopted were subject to Members' view.

50. The Chairman said that while it was technically feasible to turn off the public address system on certain floors of the LegCo Complex, it would defeat the purpose of the ringing of the division bell, which was to call upon Members to return to the Chamber to vote at the Council meeting.

51. The Chairman said that as there were divided views among Members on the proposal for dispensing with the ringing of the division bell during the Council meeting of 2 May, the proposal would not be pursued.

Action

52. Members agreed to the proposal for adopting a streamlined approach for the preparation of the script in respect of the LC(A) Bill 2012 for the Council meeting of 2 May.

53. The Chairman then sought Members' view on the proposal for requesting the Administration to defer the resumption of the Second Reading debate on the C(A) Bill 2011 by three to four weeks.

54. Ms Cyd HO expressed support for the proposal, adding that the Administration's withdrawal of the C(A) Bill 2011 would be even more welcomed.

55. Mr Albert CHAN said that while he supported the proposal for requesting the Administration to defer the resumption of the Second Reading debate on the C(A) Bill 2011, he considered it important that any subsequent amendments made to RoP should not have retrospective effect which would affect his right to move the 1 400-odd CSAs to the Bill.

56. Ms Emily LAU indicated support for the proposal, given the difficulties faced by the Secretariat in handling the large amount of CSAs.

57. Ms Audrey EU said that while Members belonging to the Civic Party supported the proposal for requesting the Administration to defer the resumption of the Second Reading debate on the C(A) Bill 2011, she was concerned about the impact of the deferral on the resumption of the Second Reading debates on other bills currently under scrutiny by LegCo, such as the Competition Bill or the Companies Bill. She requested the Chairman to relay her concern to CS.

58. Members agreed that the Administration should be requested to defer the resumption of Second Reading debate on the C(A) Bill 2011 by three to four weeks.

59. Members also agreed that the Secretariat should compile information on the practices adopted in other jurisdictions to handle voluminous amendments proposed to legislation and forward such information to CRoP for reference or discussion.

60. As it was already 3:45 pm, the Chairman said that the House Committee meeting had to be suspended and would be resumed after the Finance Committee meeting to deal with the unfinished business.

(The meeting was suspended at 3:45 pm and resumed at 4:53 pm.)

IV. Business for the Council meeting of 9 May 2012

(a) Questions

(LC Paper No. CB(3) 679/11-12)

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

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

Inland Revenue (Amendment) Bill 2012

62. The Chairman said that the Administration had given notice to present the above Bill to the Council on 9 May 2012. The House Committee would consider the Bill at its meeting on 11 May 2012.

(c) Bills - resumption of debate on Second Reading, Committee Stage and Third Reading

(i) Fisheries Protection (Amendment) Bill 2011

(ii) Copyright (Amendment) Bill 2011

(iii) Electoral Legislation (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill 2012

63. The Chairman said that pursuant to Members' discussion under agenda item III above, the Administration would be requested to defer the date of resumption of the Second Reading debate on the C(A) Bill 2011 by three to four weeks. In response to Ms Emily LAU, the Chairman said that it was for the Administration to decide when to resume the Second Reading debate on the Bill.

(d) Government motions

(i) Four proposed resolutions to be moved by the Secretary for Transport and Housing under the following four Ordinances:

- **Eastern Harbour Crossing Ordinance;**
- **Tate's Cairn Tunnel Ordinance;**
- **Western Harbour Crossing Ordinance; and**

- **Tai Lam Tunnel and Yuen Long Approach Road Ordinance**

*(Wording of the proposed resolutions issued vide LC Paper No. CB(3) 671/11-12 dated 23 April 2012.)
(LC Paper No. LS 55/11-12)*

64. The Chairman said that the four proposed resolutions were for seeking the Council's approval to amend four sets of tunnel by-laws (i.e. the by-laws of the Eastern Harbour Crossing Road Tunnel, the Tate's Cairn Tunnel, the Western Harbour Crossing, and the Tai Lam Tunnel and Yuen Long Approach Road) to align the bylaws with similar by-laws and related provisions in existing legislation, including the standardization of signage of autotoll lanes. The Administration had provided an information paper on the proposed amendments to the Panel on Transport in March 2012, and no comment on the paper had been received from Panel members.

65. Members did not raise any objection to the Administration moving the proposed resolutions at the Council meeting.

(ii) **Proposed resolution to be moved by the Secretary for Commerce and Economic Development under the Import and Export Ordinance**

*(Wording of the proposed resolution issued vide LC Paper No. CB(3) 666/11-12 dated 23 April 2012.)
(LC Paper No. LS 54/11-12)*

66. The Chairman said that the proposed resolution was for seeking the Council's approval of the Import and Export (Registration) (Amendment) Regulation 2012 to implement the proposal in the 2012-2013 Budget to reduce the charges for import and export declarations. The Panel on Commerce and Industry had been briefed on the proposal at its meeting on 21 February 2012, and the majority of the members supported it in principle.

67. Members did not raise any objection to the Administration moving the proposed resolution at the Council meeting.

(e) **Members' motions**

(i) **Motion on "Caring about the education, employment and housing problems faced by young people"**

(Wording of the motion issued vide LC Paper No. CB(3) 687/11-12 dated 25 April 2012.)

(ii) **Motion on "Opposing Hong Kong communists ruling Hong Kong"**

(Wording of the motion issued vide LC Paper No. CB(3) 683/11-12 dated 25 April 2012.)

68. The Chairman said that the above motions would be moved by Mr CHAN Hak-kan and Mr Albert CHAN respectively, and the wording of the motions had been issued to Members.

69. The Chairman reminded Members that the deadline for giving notice of amendments, if any, to the motions was Wednesday, 2 May 2012.

Report on study of subsidiary legislation

70. The Chairman invited Members to note the list containing one item of subsidiary legislation tabled at the meeting, the scrutiny period of which would expire on 9 May 2012. Members who wished to speak on the subsidiary legislation should indicate their intention by 5:00 pm on Monday, 30 April 2012.

V. Report of Bills Committees and subcommittees

Report of the Subcommittee on Prevention of Bribery Ordinance (Amendment of Schedules 1 and 2) Order 2012

71. Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Chairman of the Subcommittee, made a verbal report on the deliberations of the Subcommittee. He said that the Subcommittee had held three meetings to study the Order, which sought to designate the following four organizations as public bodies under the Prevention of Bribery Ordinance (Cap. 201) ("the Ordinance"):

- (a) Hong Kong Internet Registration Corporation Limited ("HKIRC");
- (b) Hong Kong Domain Name Registration Company Limited;
- (c) Hong Kong Applied Science and Technology Research Institute Company Limited; and
- (d) Hong Kong Cyberport Management Company Limited

Action

72. Mr CHAN Kam-lam reported that the Subcommittee raised no objection to the proposal. Regarding the inclusion of HKIRC in Schedules 1 and 2 to the Ordinance, members noted that only the employees, office holders (other than honorary ones) and members who were vested with responsibility in conducting the affairs of HKIRC were subject to the regulation under sections 4 and 5 of the Ordinance. Some members were of the view that although not all members of HKIRC had management responsibilities, the members could elect up to half of the number of directors. If the members of HKIRC were not public servants for the purpose of the Ordinance, any bribery acts involving them in the election of directors would not be subject to the provisions which were applicable to public servants under the Ordinance. Members were also concerned that members of HKIRC could come together and try to overturn a decision made by the HKIRC Board by moving a motion at an extraordinary board meeting, thereby influencing the business decisions of HKIRC. Some members had requested the Administration to reconsider whether all members of HKIRC should be made public servants under the Ordinance. After consulting the HKIRC Board, the Administration decided to maintain its original proposal. Mr James TO had indicated that he might propose amendments to the Order to the effect that all members of HKIRC were public servants for the purpose of the Ordinance.

73. Mr CHAN Kam-lam further reported that the Subcommittee had suggested that the Administration should put in place a mechanism to require the policy bureaux to regularly review in accordance with specified criteria whether any organization under their purview should be designated as a public body under the Ordinance. The Administration should also designate a bureau to take a leading role to co-ordinate the review. In response to members' suggestions, the Administration had agreed to remind the policy bureaux and departments to undertake such a review. The Subcommittee decided to refer the matter to the Panel on Security for follow-up. He added that the Subcommittee and the Administration had not proposed any amendments to the Order. The Subcommittee would submit its written report shortly.

74. Ms Audrey EU said that in the course of the scrutiny of the Order, members had raised concern about the absence of a mechanism to regularly review if any publicly-funded organization should be designated as a public body under the Ordinance and the lack of specified criteria to determine which organizations should be so designated. She urged the Administration to discuss the matter with the Panel on Security expeditiously.

Action

75. The Chairman reminded Members that as the deadline for amending the Order was 9 May 2012, the deadline for giving notice of amendments, if any, was Wednesday, 2 May 2012.

VI. Position on Bills Committees and subcommittees

(LC Paper No. CB(2) 1811/11-12)

76. The Chairman said that there were 12 Bills Committees, seven subcommittees under House Committee (i.e. two subcommittees on subsidiary legislation, two subcommittees on policy issues and three subcommittees on other Council business) and eight subcommittees under Panels in action.

77. The Chairman invited Members to note that the Bills Committee on Mandatory Provident Fund Schemes (Amendment) (No. 2) Bill 2011 would have to work beyond three months since commencement of its work.

VII. Issues relating to the transition arrangements between the incumbent Chief Executive and the Chief Executive of the next term and their impact on the work of the Legislature

(LC Paper No. CB(2) 1818/11-12)

78. At the invitation of the Chairman, SG briefed Members on the background brief prepared by the Secretariat at the request of the House Committee at the last meeting, which included the discussions on transition arrangements at the recent meeting of the Panel on Constitutional Affairs ("CA Panel") on 16 January 2012; the establishment of the CE-elect's Office; and information on transition arrangements for change of government in the Macao Special Administrative Region, Taiwan, Australia and the United States. As the Administration had indicated that arrangements similar to those in 2007 would be adopted for re-organization of policy bureaux, the Secretariat had also attached to the background brief a chronology of the relevant events in 2007 for Members' reference. SG pointed out that the CA Panel had held a series of meetings in May 2007 to consider the proposed re-organization. In anticipation of the giving of notice by the Administration to move a resolution on the proposed re-organization, the House Committee formed a subcommittee on 18 May 2007 to study the relevant legislative amendments. The staffing proposal related to the re-organization was endorsed by the Establishment Subcommittee and the Finance Committee on 22 May and 8 June 2007 respectively, while the resolution was passed at the Council meeting of 13 June 2007.

Action

79. Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Chairman of the CA Panel, said that the Secretary for Constitutional and Mainland Affairs wrote to him yesterday requesting the holding of a special CA Panel meeting in early May 2012 for the Administration to brief Members on the proposal of the CE-elect to restructure the Government Secretariat which was intended to take effect on 1 July 2012. He had advised the Panel Clerk to arrange for a special meeting, which was tentatively scheduled for 9 May 2012 at 8:30 am. He proposed adopting the same arrangements as those in 2007, i.e. the CA Panel to discuss the proposed re-organization of policy bureaux first, and the House Committee to consider the need to form a subcommittee to study the relevant legislative amendments after the Administration had given notice to move a resolution on the proposed re-organization. He added that the resolution was to effect the transfer of statutory functions arising from the re-organization and was technical in nature.

80. Mr LEE Wing-tat did not agree that the resolution on the proposed re-organization was technical in nature. He considered it important for the CE-elect to consult the public and relevant stakeholders on the proposed re-organization. In his view, the proposed re-organization did not necessarily have to be implemented on 1 July 2012. He stressed the need to follow the due process for scrutiny of the re-organization proposal and cautioned against rushing it through in haste. Given that the proposal as reported in the media involved various policy bureaux, he was of the view that apart from the CA Panel, other Panels concerned (such as the Panel on Home Affairs) should also discuss the relevant proposed changes. He considered the arrangements adopted in 2007 appropriate.

81. Ms Emily LAU also did not subscribe to the view that the legislative amendments were technical in nature. While not objecting to discussion by the CA Panel, she shared the view that other relevant Panels might also need to discuss the proposal. She stressed the importance of allowing adequate time for public consultation and discussion by LegCo.

82. Ms Audrey EU said that there was so far no formal proposal on the re-organization of policy bureaux and it was unclear as to the number of posts and the amount of resources involved. She pointed out that the creation of the position of Political Assistants had aroused great public controversy and there was no information on whether the proposed re-organization would entail any increase in the number of Political Assistants. She considered it necessary to consult the public and the civil service on the proposed changes, which were certainly not technical

Action

amendments. The proposed re-organization involved not only changes to the organization structure of the Government Secretariat, but also establishment and financial proposals. She considered it important to follow the due process and had grave reservation about adopting a compressed timetable to consider these proposals. She added that to facilitate Members' discussion, the Chairman of the CA Panel should request the Administration to provide before the special meeting full information on the proposal, including the number of posts and resources involved and the consultation procedures to be followed.

83. Ms Cyd HO said that the due process should be followed in scrutinizing the re-organization proposal. The Administration should brief LegCo on the objectives and rationale of the proposed changes and allow adequate time for public consultation. While she had no intention of delaying the implementation of the proposed re-organization, she objected to unreasonably compressing the timetable solely for the purpose of putting in place the new structure on 1 July 2012 when the new term Government commenced. She did not see any urgency in implementing the proposed changes and reiterated the importance of following the due process. Noting from the background brief prepared by the Secretariat that presidential transition in the United States was regulated by the Presidential Transition Act which provided, inter alia, for appropriation of funds and training and orientation to incoming government personnel, she considered that the next term Government should legislate on transition arrangements for change of government.

84. Mr TAM Yiu-chung clarified that he was not suggesting simplifying the scrutiny process of the proposed re-organization. He pointed out that in 2007, the CA Panel had held five meetings to discuss the proposed re-organization and related issues. The special CA Panel meeting tentatively scheduled for 9 May 2012 was only the first meeting to be held and he would make arrangements for holding more meetings to allow Members ample time for thorough discussions and all Members would be invited to attend the meetings. Furthermore, after the Administration had given notice to move the resolution on the proposed re-organization, the House Committee would likely form a subcommittee to study the legislative amendments and issues relating to the re-organization. He expected that the Subcommittee would likely receive public views. The Subcommittee formed to study the proposed resolution in 2007 had held a total of six meetings. He further clarified that he was not saying that the proposed re-organization involved only technical changes. What he meant was that the legislative amendments in the resolution were technical in nature as they concerned the transfer of statutory functions arising from the re-organization.

Action

85. Mr IP Kwok-him said that Members belonging to DAB agreed to the need for adequate discussions on the proposed re-organization. He shared the view that the arrangements in 2007 should be adopted for discussing the re-organization proposal. It was appropriate for the CA Panel to discuss the proposal as matters relating to Government structure were within its purview, and he considered it not necessary to form a subcommittee under the House Committee in the meantime for the purpose. In 2007, the CA Panel had held five meetings to discuss the proposed re-organization and had received public views. He believed that there would also be thorough discussions on the proposal by the Panel this time. In his view, representatives from both the CE-elect's Office and the incumbent CE's Office should attend the meetings of the CA Panel to explain the proposal to Members. When the relevant resolution was submitted to LegCo, the House Committee could consider the need to form a subcommittee to study it.

86. Mr Albert CHAN said that given the significant changes involved and the need to obtain funding approval from LegCo, he considered that the CE-elect should be invited to attend a House Committee meeting to explain the proposed re-organization to Members. The proposal concerned not only the CA Panel, as the policy areas of culture, land planning, transport and information technology were also involved. In his view, the proposal to add two Deputy Secretaries of Departments and two policy bureaux and the appointments in the CE-elect's Office had given the public the perception of transfer of benefits to supporters of the CE-elect. He considered it necessary for the CE-elect to explain his re-organization proposal to the House Committee.

87. Mr WONG Yuk-man said that the proposed re-organization of the Government Secretariat was an important matter which concerned not only the CA Panel. While objecting to the proposed additions of two Deputy Secretaries of Departments and two policy bureaux, which, in his view, were to reward the supporters of the CE-elect, he considered it the duty of the Legislature to monitor the Executive and that the CE-elect should come to LegCo to explain the rationale and details of the proposal. He queried whether the proposed re-organization could be implemented on 1 July 2012 should the due process for scrutinizing the proposals be followed.

88. Mr Fred LI said that the proposed re-organization was on a much larger scale than that in 2007 and he did not agree with Mr IP Kwok-him's view that the matter should be discussed only by the CA Panel. Referring to the arrangements in 2007, Mr LI considered that the CA Panel aside, the House Committee should also form a subcommittee to study the relevant resolution, the membership of which would be open to all Members.

Action

89. Mr LEE Wing-tat said that he noted from media reports that the CE-elect planned to put land planning and housing under one policy bureau. As the Chairman of the Panel on Housing, he considered that a joint meeting of the Panel and the Panel on Development should be held to discuss such a proposal.

90. The Chairman said that it was for the Chairmen of the relevant Panels to decide on the need to convene a joint Panel meeting.

91. Mr IP Kwok-him clarified that he had not said that the proposed re-organization should be discussed only by the CA Panel. What he had said was that the arrangements in 2007 should be adopted, which included the formation of a subcommittee under the House Committee to study the relevant resolution.

92. The Chairman said that in 2007, the proposed re-organization was first studied by the CA Panel. Subsequently, in anticipation of the giving of notice by the Administration to move a resolution on the proposed re-organization, the House Committee had formed a subcommittee to scrutinize the relevant legislative amendments.

93. Mr TAM Yiu-chung said that in his view, the proposal could be discussed by the CA Panel first. After the Administration had given notice to move the resolution on the proposed re-organization, a subcommittee could then be formed under the House Committee to continue the discussions. Such an approach aimed to prevent overlapping of work among committees.

94. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong agreed that the arrangements in 2007 could be adopted as the blueprint for the discussion of the CE-elect's re-organization proposal. Nevertheless, individual Panels could also discuss the proposed changes relevant to their purview as appropriate. He stressed the importance of conducting adequate consultation and following the due process in scrutinising the proposal. Members would decide whether to support the proposal on the basis of its justifications and merits.

95. Members agreed to adopt the arrangements in 2007 to follow up on issues relating to the proposed re-organization.

96. The Chairman invited Members' view on Mr Albert CHAN's proposal of inviting the CE-elect to attend a House Committee meeting to brief Members on the proposed re-organization.

Action

97. Mr KAM Nai-wai indicated support for Mr Albert CHAN's proposal. Referring to the chronology of events concerning the re-organization of policy bureaux in 2007, he said that CE had announced the re-organization proposal at a Question and Answer Session in LegCo on 3 May 2007 before the proposal was discussed by the CA Panel. He considered that a similar arrangement should be made in respect of the CE-elect's re-organization proposal and enquired whether the CE-elect could attend a Council meeting or a committee meeting to brief Members on the proposal.

98. Mr Albert CHAN clarified that his proposal was to invite the CE-elect to attend a House Committee meeting, not a Council meeting.

99. At the invitation of the Chairman, SG said that RoP provided for the attendance of CE and designated public officers, but not CE-elect, at meetings of the Council and its committees. She had just been given to understand by the Administration that the Head of the CE-elect's Office had been designated as a public officer.

100. Mr TAM Yiu-chung considered it inappropriate to invite the CE-elect to a House Committee meeting. He said that when Mr Donald TSANG announced the re-organization proposal on 3 May 2007, he was then both the incumbent CE and the CE of the following term Government. The present situation was different. In his view, it should be for the current term Government to decide who should attend the relevant meetings to explain the re-organization proposal.

101. At the invitation of the Chairman, LA said that the privileges and immunities accorded to CE and designated public officers provided in section 8A of the Legislative Council (Powers and Privileges) Ordinance (Cap. 382) could not be extended to the CE-elect.

102. Mr Albert CHAN said that he was not proposing that the CE-elect should attend a House Committee meeting as a designated public officer. He did not see any legal problem in inviting the CE-elect to attend a House Committee meeting to explain the re-organization proposal.

103. Mr IP Kwok-him sought advice on whether it was legally in order for the CE-elect to attend by invitation a meeting of the House Committee.

104. At the invitation of the Chairman, SG said that the House Committee could decide to invite any person to attend its meetings and RoP did not provide for any restriction in this regard.

Action

105. LA supplemented that RoP 75(11) provided that the House Committee might consider, in such manner as it thought fit, any matter relating to the business of the Council. There was no provision in RoP on the procedure for inviting persons to attend the meetings of the House Committee. As the House Committee could determine its own practice and procedure provided that they did not contravene RoP and the Basic Law, it was for the House Committee to decide whether it was appropriate to invite the CE-elect to attend its meeting.

106. Given Members' divergent views, the Chairman put to vote Mr Albert CHAN's proposal for inviting the CE-elect to attend a House Committee meeting to brief Members on the proposed re-organization. The Chairman ordered a division.

The following Members voted in favour of the proposal:

Mr Fred LI, Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Frederick FUNG, Mr LEE Wing-tat, Dr Joseph LEE, Mr KAM Nai-wai, Ms Cyd HO, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che, Mr WONG Sing-chi, Mr Alan LEONG, Miss Tanya CHAN, Mr Albert CHAN and Mr WONG Yuk-man.
(14 Members)

The following Members voted against the proposal:

Ir Dr Raymond HO, Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mrs Sophie LEUNG, Mr WONG Yung-kan, Mr LAU Kong-wah, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Ms LI Fung-ying, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr Andrew LEUNG, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr IP Wai-ming, Mr IP Kwok-him and Dr Samson TAM.
(19 Members)

The following Members abstained:

Mr Tommy CHEUNG and Prof Patrick LAU.
(2 Members)

107. The Chairman declared that 14 Members voted for and 19 Members voted against the proposal and two Members abstained. Mr Albert CHAN's proposal was not supported.

VIII. Proposal of Hon WONG Yuk-man for discussing ways to follow up on issues relating to the appointment of Miss CHEN Ran in the Chief Executive-elect's Office

(Letter dated 24 April 2012 from Hon WONG Yuk-man to the Chairman of the House Committee (LC Paper No. CB(2) 1819/11-12(01)))

108. Mr WONG Yuk-man said that he raised the matter for discussion at the House Committee because, in his view, Miss CHEN Ran's appointment as Project Officer in the CE-elect's Office was in breach of the Basic Law. The relevant provisions were Article 99 and Article 101 of the Basic Law ("BL 99" and "BL 101"). According to BL 99, public servants serving in all government departments of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("HKSAR") must be permanent residents, except where otherwise provided for in BL 101 regarding public servants of foreign nationalities. BL 101 provided that the HKSAR Government might employ British and other foreign nationals as advisers to government departments and to fill professional and technical posts in government departments. Mr WONG considered that neither BL 99 nor BL 101 applied in Miss CHEN's case. Miss CHEN had not resided in Hong Kong for a continuous period of not less than seven years and was not a permanent resident of Hong Kong under BL 24(2). Neither could BL 101 be used to justify Miss CHEN's appointment as she was not a foreign national and there was no information indicating that she had the right of abode in other foreign countries. In his view, the Civil Service Bureau had no authority to handle applications of non-permanent residents, be they Chinese nationals or foreign nationals, for professional and technical posts in the HKSAR Government. Hence, he considered that the Civil Service Bureau should terminate the appointment of Miss CHEN Ran immediately, review whether the employment of non-permanent residents in the civil service was in breach of BL 99 and BL101, and come up with remedial measures. He was also concerned that the post of project officer was not included in the staff establishment of the CE-elect's Office. He added that his concern was not whether Miss CHEN was a member of the Communist Youth League but whether her appointment was in breach of the Basic Law.

109. Mr IP Kwok-him shared the view that the appointment of Miss CHEN Ran in the CE-elect's Office concerned BL 99, and not BL 101 which provided for the employment of British and other foreign nationals in the HKSAR Government. He suggested referring the matter to the Panel on Public Service for follow-up.

Action

110. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said that it was for individual Members to decide how to follow up on the matter. They could raise questions at Council meetings, write to the Civil Service Bureau to request a written response, or request the Panel on Public Service to discuss the matter. Should Members agree, the Chairman of the House Committee could also convey Members' concerns to CS.

111. Members agreed to refer the matter to the Panel on Civil Service for follow-up.

IX. Any other business

LegCo Fun Day

112. The Chairman reminded Members that the LegCo Fun Day for the Fourth LegCo would be held at 6:30 pm. She appealed to Members to participate actively in the event to enjoy an evening of fun and joy with the LegCo-beat reporters.

113. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 6:04 pm.