

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. FC184/12-13
(These minutes have been
cleared with the Chairman)

Ref : CB1/F/1/2

Finance Committee of the Legislative Council

Minutes of the 21st meeting
held at Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Friday, 4 January 2013, at 2:50 pm

Members present:

Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, SBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, SBS, JP
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH
Dr Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP
Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, GBS, JP
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, SBS, JP
Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, JP
Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, BBS
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP

Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon WONG Yuk-man
Hon Claudia MO
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP
Hon NG Leung-sing, SBS, JP
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon YIU Si-wing
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Hon CHAN Han-pan
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Kenneth LEUNG
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, JP
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon KWOK Wai-keung
Hon Dennis KWOK
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Hon IP Kin-yuen
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, JP
Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH
Hon TANG Ka-piu
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen

Members absent:

Hon LEE Cheuk-yan
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Dr Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP

Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, JP
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming
Hon Charles Peter MOK
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, JP
Hon SIN Chung-kai, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan

Clerk in attendance:

Mr Andy LAU Assistant Secretary General 1

Staff in attendance:

Mr Jimmy Y T MA, JP	Legal Adviser
Ms Connie FUNG	Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 1
Mr Derek LO	Chief Council Secretary (1)5
Mr Daniel SIN	Senior Council Secretary (1)7
Mr Ken WOO	Council Secretary (1)5
Miss Queenie LAM	Senior Legislative Assistant (1)2
Mr Frankie WOO	Senior Legislative Assistant (1)3
Ms Christy YAU	Legislative Assistant (1)7

Item No. 1 – MOTION ON THE NOTICE REQUIREMENT IN RESPECT OF AMENDMENTS TO THE FINANCE COMMITTEE PROCEDURE, PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE PROCEDURE AND ESTABLISHMENT SUBCOMMITTEE PROCEDURE

The Chairman advised members that two meetings had been scheduled for the day to deal with the unfinished business carried over from the meeting on 2 November 2012 on the motion on the notice requirement in respect of amendments to the Finance Committee (FC) Procedure, Public Works Subcommittee (PWSC) Procedure and Establishment Subcommittee (ESC) Procedure ("motion on the notice requirement").

2. The meeting noted that –

- (a) On 10 October 2012, Mr IP Kwok-him gave notice to include an agenda item in the FC meeting on 19 October 2012 to amend the FC Procedure, PWSC Procedure and ESC Procedure. Having regard to the notice requirement set out in paragraphs 21 and 22 of the FC Procedure, the Chairman agreed to include Mr IP's proposed motion in the agenda for the meeting on 19 October 2012. Members were informed of the Chairman's decision on 12 October 2012;
- (b) By a letter dated 17 October 2012, Mr Albert CHAN notified the Chairman that he, Mr WONG Yuk-man and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen might consider moving amendments to Mr IP's motion in accordance with the Rules of Procedure ("RoP"), related rules and past practices;
- (c) The Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen of FC, PWSC and ESC held a meeting on 17 October 2012 to discuss the issues relating to the procedures for handling amendments to the FC Procedure, PWSC Procedure and ESC Procedure;
- (d) While paragraph 37 of the FC Procedure, which incorporated Rules 29 to 35 of RoP with necessary modifications as might be determined by the Chairman but subject to the decisions of FC, applied to the proceedings of FC in dealing with motions, given the importance of the FC Procedure, PWSC Procedure and ESC Procedure, the Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen were of the view that in considering any amendment to the three sets of procedure, Rules 29 to 35 of RoP, and practices governing the dealing of motions and amendments to motions with legislative effect in Council should be adopted; and
- (e) As regards the notice requirement for amending the three sets of procedure, the Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen of FC, PWSC and ESC agreed at the internal meeting on 17 October 2012 that the notice requirement for a motion and its amending motion should not be less than five and two clear days respectively before the day on which the motion was to be considered by FC (i.e. "the '5+2' proposal"). This would enable FC to have established provisions in respect of the notice requirement, format and mode of delivery for handling proposals to amend the three sets of procedure. At the

meeting on 19 October 2012, members noted the views of the Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen of FC and its two subcommittees and agreed that the FC Chairman should move a relevant motion on behalf of the Committee at the meeting on 2 November 2012 to reflect the views of the Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen.

3. Pointing out that seven members had already spoken at the meeting on 2 November 2012, the Chairman said that he would invite other members to speak on the motion on the notice requirement and the 1 244 amending motions, and each member would be allowed to speak for not more than 15 minutes.

Motion to adjourn the discussion of the motion and the amending motions

4. Following the Chairman's briefing on the meeting arrangements, Mr IP Kwok-him raised a point of order and moved a motion under paragraph 39 of the FC Procedure to adjourn the debate on the motion on the notice requirement and its amending motions.

5. Ms Emily LAU sought clarifications from the Chairman about the effect of the adjournment motion on the motion on the notice requirement and its amending motions the debate of which was in progress.

6. At the invitation of the Chairman, the Clerk said that at the meeting on 19 October 2012, members agreed that the Chairman should move a motion on the notice requirement on behalf of the Committee at the meeting on 2 November 2012. If the motion to adjourn discussion on the item was passed at the current meeting, it would mean that FC was unable to reach a decision on the notice requirement in respect of the motions to amend the procedures of the FC and its two subcommittees in accordance with the consensus reached by the Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen at the internal meeting on 17 October 2012. In the absence of a clear decision from the Committee on the notice requirements and with the passage of the adjournment motion, the Chairman might not resume the debate on the matter for the time being. Notwithstanding, the Chairman still had a duty to ensure that the items already included in the agenda would be transacted in a proper manner. To do so, the Chairman might need to make reference to Rules 29 to 35 of RoP, with necessary modifications, to deal with the motions proposed by Mr IP Kwok-him and Mr Ronny TONG to amend the three sets of procedure as provided for in Paragraph 37 of the FC Procedure.

7. Ms Emily LAU further asked whether members were allowed to move a motion on the notice requirement again at the next meeting should the motion to adjourn the debate was passed at the present meeting.

8. Legal Adviser advised that a debate adjourned under paragraph 39 of the FC Procedure might be resumed at a subsequent meeting of the FC provided that the Member who moved the motion for that debate should give notice in writing to the Clerk of his intention to resume the debate in accordance with the notice requirements set out in the RoP and the FC Procedure.

9. Mr James TO was concerned whether members were allowed to move a motion on the notice requirement, be it the same as the original motion moved by the Chairman or different from it, in case Mr IP Kwok-him's adjournment motion was passed at the meeting and that the Chairman decided not to resume debate on the motion on the notice requirement.

10. Legal Adviser advised that the matter would require further examination given the lack of the relevant provision in the RoP to deal with the scenario posed for consideration. As a general principle, however, a member was allowed to move a motion on a different question if the motion had satisfied the relevant notice requirement.

11. Mr Albert HO asked, in the event that the adjournment motion was passed at the meeting, whether the Committee would start to debate on Mr IP Kwok-him's motion to amend the three sets of procedure prior to the debate on the motion on the notice requirement.

12. Mr Kenneth LEUNG pointed out that in view of the fact that there was no specific provision in the FC Procedure on proposed amendments to the three sets of procedure, the Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen of FC, PWSC and ESC agreed that a set of procedure for dealing with motions to amend the three sets of procedure and their amending motions should be adopted. In line with the decision of FC made at the meeting on 19 October 2012, a set of procedure including notice requirement should first be developed for inclusion into the FC Procedure before the motion to be moved by Mr IP Kwok-him to amend the three sets of procedure was to be considered.

13. As to when the motions to amend the three sets of procedure handed in separately by Mr IP Kwok-him and Mr Ronny TONG would be dealt with by the FC, the Chairman said that this would depend on the result of the debate on the notice requirement at the present meeting. Regarding the debate arrangements for the motions to be moved by Mr IP Kwok-him and Mr Ronny TONG, he said that the former motion would first be disposed of, followed by

the latter. Members would be allowed to move amending motions according to the decision on the notice requirement made at the meeting. In the event that a decision could not be made with regard to the "5+2" proposal, he would allow reasonable time for amending motions to be proposed in accordance with the relevant provisions of RoP and FC Procedure.

14. Referring to the Chairman's remark, Mr Kenneth LEUNG sought clarifications from the Legal Adviser on whether the moving of a motion by the Chairman on the notice requirement for decision by the Committee would imply that the Chairman had already given up his right to exercise his discretionary power on the matter.

15. In response, the Chairman stressed that the reason for the Committee to debate on the motion on the notice requirement before debating on Mr IP Kwok-him's motion was attributable to the consensus reached amongst the Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen of FC, PWSC and ESC at the internal meeting on 17 October 2012 for developing the relevant procedures for handling proposals to amend the three sets of procedure. This did not involve giving up the right of discretion exercisable by the FC Chairman.

16. Mr Ronny TONG pointed out that the Committee did reach a consensus to make available an appropriate framework on the notice requirement prior to handling Mr IP Kwok-him's motion to amend the three sets of procedure. He sought clarifications from the Legal Adviser on whether Mr IP's motion could be given precedence for inclusion in the agenda over other motions on the notice requirement to be moved by members, if any, should the Chairman decide not to resume discussion on the motion on the notice requirement after the passage of the adjournment motion.

17. Legal Adviser advised that, unless otherwise decided by the Committee, all motions on the same subject matter should be dealt in an order according to the timing when the relevant notices were given.

18. Ms Emily LAU reiterated the decision of the Committee to put in place a framework on the notice requirement prior to handling Mr IP Kwok-him's motion to amend the three sets of procedure. Noting the Chairman's indication for not resuming the discussion of the motion on the notice requirement and the amending motions if the adjournment motion was passed at the meeting, she was concerned about the absence of an appropriate framework to deal with future motions to amend the three sets of procedure.

19. The Chairman explained that since members had expressed divided views over the motion on the notice requirement by proposing more than 1 000

amendments, it was inappropriate to resume debate on the motion should the Committee pass the adjournment motion. Ms Emily LAU was unconvinced, saying that members were allowed to move amendments to a motion subject to the satisfaction of the relevant notice requirements provided under RoP. She opined that the amendments to the motion on the notice requirement, irrespective of their number, should not defeat the broad consensus reached by the Committee to put in place an appropriate framework for notice requirement prior to handling Mr IP Kwok-him's motion to amend the three sets of procedure.

20. Mr Martin LIAO said that he did not take part in arriving at the consensus view as mentioned above by other members. He opined that the Chairman's right of discretion exercised in respect of Mr IP Kwok-him's motion to amend the three sets of procedures should not be affected by the consensus reached among the Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen of the relevant committee and subcommittees and the subsequent moving of a related motion to reflect their consensus view.

21. Ms Cyd HO asked whether the meeting would proceed to debate on Mr IP Kwok-him's motion to amend the three sets of procedure immediately if the adjournment motion was passed at the meeting, and whether an appropriate notice period would be given for members to propose amendments if not.

22. The Chairman reiterated that Mr IP Kwok-him's motion to amend the three sets of procedures would not be discussed at the current meeting even though the adjournment motion was passed. Mr IP's motion would not be debated at the upcoming FC meeting scheduled for 11 January 2013 either as the Administration had already proposed to discuss funding proposals at the meeting. Regarding notice requirements for handling motions and their amending motions to amend the three sets of procedure at future meetings if the adjournment motion was passed, the Chairman said that he would allow members to move new motions and amendments to Mr IP Kwok-him and Mr Ronny TONG's motions on the basis of the "5+2" proposal which was being debated by the Committee.

23. Ms Cyd HO pointed out the controversy with Mr IP Kwok-him's motion to amend the three sets of procedure and asked whether he would consider withdrawing the motion for the time being to facilitate a more fruitful discussion between the various camps. Mr IP Kwok-him said that he would respond to Ms HO's view after all members had raised their concerns on the motion to adjourn the debate on the motion.

24. Pointing out that the consensus reached among the Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen of FC, PWSC and ESC on making available an appropriate framework on the notice requirements for dealing with motions and their amending motions prior to handling Mr IP Kwok-him's motion was also supported by the Committee, Mr Alan LEONG commented that the adjournment motion, if passed, would mean a complete denial to the above consensus as well as the effort and time spent by all members over the relevant discussions.

25. The Chairman explained that in the light of the lack of relevant precedents, he had exercised the discretionary power conferred on him under the FC Procedure to decide that the notice requirement in respect of the original motions to be moved by Mr IP Kwok-him and Mr Ronny TONG to amend the three sets of procedure had been complied with. He also decided that there would be a notice requirement of not less than two clear days for the related amending motions that were to be considered by FC.

26. Mr James TO raised a point of order. Referring to paragraph 39 of the FC Procedure which provided that "A member when speaking on a proposal in the Committee may move without notice that discussion on an item or further proceedings of the Committee be now adjourned", Mr TO questioned if Mr IP Kwok-him should be allowed to move a motion to adjourn the discussion as, according to the agenda, Mr IP should only be given an opportunity to speak when all other members who proposed amendments to the motion on the notice requirement had spoken.

27. Legal Adviser advised that since the Chairman had given Mr IP Kwok-him an opportunity to speak upon his raising a point of order, it would be for the Chairman to decide if Mr IP was allowed to move a motion to adjourn the discussion. Pursuant to paragraph 31 of the FC Procedure, the Chairman was responsible for the observance of the rules of order in the Committee, and his decision on a point of order shall be final. The Chairman added that, in the course of the deliberation of the Old Age Living Allowance funding proposal in December 2012, he had similarly allowed Mr LEE Cheuk-yan to move a motion to adjourn the discussion of the item while Mr LEE was allowed to speak out of turn.

28. Mr Albert CHAN expressed his suspicion that the motion to adjourn the debate on the motion on the notice requirement might be a conspiracy to prevent members from proposing amendments to the motion proposed by Mr IP Kwok-him to amend the three sets of procedures. He enquired about the mechanism and the relevant notice requirements for proposing amendments to

Mr IP's motion, and whether further amendments would be allowed to amend the amendments made to Mr IP's motion.

29. The Clerk advised that given the importance of the procedures and hence the need to ensure clarity of the motions and their amendments, members were earlier on advised that amendments to amendments should not be allowed. The Chairman added that under the "5+2" proposal, the notice requirement for a motion and its amending motions should not be less than five and two clear days respectively before the day on which the motion was to be considered by FC. It would therefore be quite impossible for members to propose further amendments to amend the amendments in such a short period of time. He assured members that a reasonable time would be allowed for amending motions to be proposed.

30. Mr WONG Yuk-man disagreed with the motion to adjourn the debate on the notice requirement, and forewarned that he would continue to filibuster at future meetings when Mr IP's motion to amend the three sets of procedure was discussed.

31. In response to Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung's enquiry on whether it was in order for him to propose amendments to the adjournment motion and to propose postponement to the voting of the adjournment motion, Legal Adviser said that while amendments to an adjournment motion was not in order under RoP and the FC Procedure, there was no provision under the procedure on postponing the voting of an adjournment motion.

Deliberation on the motion to adjourn discussion

32. The Chairman ordered that the Committee should proceed to debate on the adjournment motion and that each member could speak once on the motion for not more than three minutes.

33. Mr IP Kwok-him pointed out that the debate on the notice requirement held so far had not been centered around the motion itself and that the vast majority of the 1 244 amendments to the motion were frivolous and were in essence an attempt to filibuster. For example, a great number of amendments were made by various combinations of 6 to 55 days and 1 to 24 hours for the notice requirement for motions and amending motions respectively. He envisaged that a consensus on the "5+2" proposal would not be reached shortly and considered that discussion time could instead be spent more effectively on the debate on the motions to amend the three sets of procedure.

34. In response to Ms Cyd HO on whether Mr IP Kwok-him would consider withdrawing his motion to amend the three sets of procedure to facilitate a more fruitful discussion between the various camps, Mr IP Kwok-him said that Ms HO's view could be given consideration provided that Mr Ronny TONG would withdraw his motion, and that discussion of the matter between the various camps would be based on the same starting point.

35. Mr Ronny TONG pointed out that the amendments as proposed by the Civic Party, such as 12 and 5 days for the notice requirement for motions and their amending motions respectively, were in line with the provisions of RoP. It was therefore procedurally unjust to adjourn the debate on the notice requirement. Responding to Mr IP Kwok-him's remarks above on withdrawal of the motion to amend the three sets of procedure, Mr TONG said that he was willing to discuss the matter further with Mr IP on other suitable occasions.

36. Mr WONG Yuk-man opined that the motion to adjourn the debate on the notice requirement would in effect deprive the right of members who had proposed amendments to express their views. Referring to Mr IP Kwok-him's comment that the large number of amendments to the motion on the notice requirement was in fact a filibuster, he emphasized that filibuster was necessary so long as the composition of the Legislative Council ("LegCo") remained unjust.

37. Ms Cyd HO pointed out that it would greatly restrict members' right of expression and role in scrutinizing government funding proposals if each member was, as proposed by Mr IP Kwok-him, allowed to move only one motion under paragraph 37A of the FC Procedure in respect of a funding proposal. She highlighted the contention about the Hong Kong Section of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link project and stressed the importance of motions in recording members' concerns and expediting follow-up actions by the Administration. Ms HO also considered the present approach for FC to make decisions on all matters by a majority of the members present and voting undesirable as it infringed the rights of the minority. She was of the view that the FC Procedure should be reviewed by the Committee on Rules of Procedure for subsequent endorsement by LegCo by means of a resolution.

38. Mr Albert CHAN said that since 1991 when members were directly elected to LegCo, it was the very first time in its history that a proposal to amend a committee procedure was put for the discussion of the whole committee without a preliminary consensus being reached between the pro-establishment camp and at least some members of the opposition camp. He considered Mr IP Kwok-him's proposal to amend the three sets of procedure

poorly argued and the adjournment motion procedurally unjust, and requested to put on record his anger and condemnation to members who showed support to Mr IP's motions.

39. Mr Alan LEONG emphasized the importance to preserve the function and power of FC to monitor and ensure proper use of public monies. He shared Mr James TO's concern on allowing Mr IP Kwok-him to move the adjournment motion while Mr IP was only supposed to speak after all members who had proposed amendments to the motion on the notice requirement had spoken. Pointing out that it was illogical to consider Mr IP's motion to amend the three sets of procedure in the absence of an appropriate framework on the notice requirement, he called on members to object to the adjournment motion.

40. Ms Emily LAU highlighted that the motion on the notice requirement was moved by the FC Chairman upon a consensus view reached among its members, and the appropriate way of handling the motion was for FC to continue the debate on the motion and its amendments. She therefore considered the motion to adjourn the debate on the notice requirement unjust and unreasonable. Expressing similar views, Mr WU Chi-wai indicated that amendments proposed by members of the Democratic Party to the motion on the notice requirement were in fact modelled on and thus similar to the notice requirement stipulated under RoP.

41. Mr Paul TSE was of the view that Mr IP Kwok-him would not have anticipated that the motion on the notice requirement would give rise to such a large number of amendments and widely divided views among members. The motion to adjourn the debate, if passed, would allow members to focus on the debate on the motions to amend the three sets of procedure, where their right to propose amendments and even to filibuster would not be affected at all.

42. Mr Gary FAN said that he was opposed to the adjournment motion as well as Mr IP Kwok-him's motion to amend the three sets of procedure as the latter would restrict members' room for expression. Prior to handling Mr IP's motion to amend the three sets of procedure, Mr FAN considered it logical to put in place a proper mechanism on the notice requirement in the FC Procedure and to cater for the systematic handling of amendments in the future.

43. Dr KWOK Ka-ki was gravely concerned that Mr IP Kwok-him's motion to amend the three sets of procedure, if endorsed, would restrict members' right of expression and weaken FC's function in monitoring public finance.

44. Ms Claudia MO opined that the Chairman had set a dangerous precedence by allowing Mr IP Kwok-him to move the motion to adjourn the debate while it was not his turn to speak. Referring to the Legal Adviser's response to Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung that there was no provision under RoP and the FC Procedure on postponing the voting of an adjournment motion, she queried the Chairman's refusal to accede to Mr LEUNG's request as in her view what was not forbidden under RoP should be allowed.

45. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen stressed that the "5+2" proposal was a consensus view reached only among the Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen of FC, PWSC and ESC, and so it was in order for the rest of the 63 members to propose amendments, irrespective of their number, to the "5+2" proposal, as long as the relevant notice requirement was observed. He therefore did not subscribe to the Chairman's rationale of not resuming the debate if the adjournment motion was passed.

46. Mr TAM Yiu-chung disagreed with the criticism that Mr IP Kwok-him's motion to amend the three sets of procedure would have a damaging effect on the functions of FC. Pointing out that members of the pro-establishment camp had discussed and found the "5+2" proposal agreeable, he was disappointed that the pan-democratic camp held an opposite view and prolonged the debate unnecessarily. He called on members to support Mr IP's motion to adjourn the debate on the motion on the notice requirement.

47. Mr Albert HO said that the reason for members of the pan-democratic camp to resort to the power conferred by RoP to fight for a more in-depth debate on the related matters was attributable to Mr IP Kwok-him's motion to amend the three sets of procedure which did not receive the support of the public. He maintained that such kind of resistance would persist as long as the pro-establishment camp showed support to proposals unacceptable to the general public.

48. In concluding the debate on his motion to adjourn discussion on the item, Mr IP Kwok-him said that of the seven members who had spoken in the joint debate at the meeting on 2 November 2012, none of them had expressed views on the motion on the notice requirement but on his proposal to amend the three sets of procedure. Pointing out that it would likely take another 36 hours for the rest of the 22 members to speak in the joint debate as well as the handling of the 1 244 amendments, he considered it necessary to adjourn the debate on the motion on the notice requirement with a view to focusing on the debate on the motion to amend the three sets of procedure.

Voting result

49. The Chairman put to vote the motion to adjourn the debate on the motion on the notice requirement moved by Mr IP Kwok-him. At the request of Mr IP Kwok-him, the Chairman ordered a division. The voting bell was rung for five minutes. The Chairman announced that of the 52 members who were present and voted, 32 members voted for and 20 members against the motion. The voting results of individual members were as follows –

For:

Mr CHAN Kam-lam	Mr TAM Yiu-chung
Mr Vincent FANG Kang	Mr WONG Kwok-hing
Mr Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen	Mr WONG Ting-kwong
Dr LAM Tai-fai	Mr CHAN Hak-kan
Mr CHAN Kin-por	Dr Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun
Mr WONG Kwok-kin	Mr IP Kwok-him
Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee	Mr Paul TSE Wai-chun
Mr Michael TIEN Puk-sun	Mr NG Leung-sing
Mr Steven HO Chun-yin	Mr YIU Si-wing
Mr MA Fung-kwok	Mr CHAN Han-pan
Ms CHAN Yuen-han	Mr LEUNG Che-cheung
Ms Alice MAK Mei-kuen	Mr KWOK Wai-keung
Dr Elizabeth QUAT	Mr Martin LIAO Cheung-kong
Mr POON Siu-ping	Mr TANG Ka-piu
Dr CHIANG Lai-wan	Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok
Mr Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun (32 members)	Mr Tony TSE Wai-chuen

Against:

Mr Albert HO Chun-yan	Mr James TO Kun-sun
Ms Emily LAU Wai-hing	Dr Joseph LEE Kok-long
Mr Ronny TONG Ka-wah	Ms Cyd HO Sau-lan
Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che	Mr Alan LEONG Kah-kit
Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung	Mr Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Mr WONG Yuk-man	Ms Claudia MO
Mr WU Chi-wai	Mr Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Mr CHAN Chi-chuen	Mr Kenneth LEUNG
Dr KWOK Ka-ki	Mr Dennis KWOK
Dr Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung (20 members)	Mr IP Kin-yuen

50. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried and the debate on the motion was adjourned.

51. The meeting was adjourned at 4:59 pm.

Legislative Council Secretariat
3 October 2013