

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)2187/14-15

Ref : CB2/H/5/14

House Committee of the Legislative Council

**Minutes of the 31st meeting
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
at 2:30 pm on Friday, 3 July 2015**

Members present:

Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, BBS, MH
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP, PhD, RN
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, SBS, JP
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan, JP
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, JP
Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS
Hon IP Kwok-him, 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, BBS
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, JP
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Kenneth LEUNG
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon KWOK Wai-keung
Hon Dennis KWOK
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Hon SIN Chung-kai, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Hon IP Kin-yuen
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP
Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH
Hon TANG Ka-piu, JP
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

Members absent:

Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC (Deputy Chairman)
Dr Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP
Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, SBS, JP

Clerk in attendance :

Miss Flora TAI Clerk to the House Committee

Staff in attendance :

| | |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Mr Kenneth CHEN, SBS | Secretary General |
| Ms Connie FUNG | Legal Adviser |
| Mrs Justina LAM, BBS | Deputy Secretary General |
| Miss Odelia LEUNG | Deputy Secretary General (Designate) |
| Ms Anita SIT | Assistant Secretary General 1 |
| Ms Dora WAI | Assistant Secretary General 3 |
| Mr Matthew LOO | Assistant Secretary General 4 |
| Mr Timothy TSO | Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 1 |
| Mr Stephen LAM | Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 2 |
| Mr KAU Kin-wah | Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 3 |
| Ms Hallie CHAN | Head (Public Information) |
| Ms Amy YU | Chief Council Secretary (2)6 |
| Ms Debbie YAU | Chief Council Secretary (4)5 |
| Ms Sophie LAU | Chief Council Secretary (4)6 |
| Miss Josephine SO | Senior Council Secretary (2)6 |
| Ms Jasmine TAM | Senior Council Secretary (2)8 |
| Miss Karen LAI | Council Secretary (2)6 |
| Ms Anna CHEUNG | Senior Legislative Assistant (2)3 |
| Mr Arthur KAN | Legislative Assistant (2)7 |

Action

I. Confirmation of the minutes of the 30th meeting held on 26 June 2015

(LC Paper No. CB(2)1816/14-15)

The minutes of meeting were confirmed.

II. Matters arising

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

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

III. Further business for the Council meeting of 8 July 2015

(a) **Tabling of papers**

Report No. 25/14-15 of the House Committee on Consideration of Subsidiary Legislation and Other Instruments
(LC Paper No. CB(2)1818/14-15)

3. The Chairman said that the Report covered 15 items of subsidiary legislation, the period for amendment of which would expire at the Council meeting of 8 July 2015. No Member had indicated intention to speak on the subsidiary legislation.

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

(i) **Supplementary Appropriation (2014-2015) Bill**

(ii) **Kai Tak Cruise Terminal Bill**

(iii) **Promotion of Recycling and Proper Disposal (Product Container) (Amendment) Bill 2015**

4. The Chairman said that the House Committee ("HC") would consider the above three Bills at its last meeting in the current session to be held after the summer recess.

(c) **Government motion**

Proposed resolution under section 34(2) of the Interpretation and General Clauses Ordinance (Cap. 1) in relation to the Road Traffic Ordinance (Amendment of Schedule 10) Order 2015 to be moved by the Secretary for the Environment
(LC Paper No. CB(3)825/14-15)

5. Members noted that the Administration would move the above proposed resolution at the meeting.

IV. Reports of Bills Committees and subcommittees

Report of the Subcommittee on Merchant Shipping (Prevention of Pollution by Garbage) Regulation and Merchant Shipping (Prevention of Pollution by Garbage) Regulation (Repeal) Regulation
(LC Paper No. CB(4)1256/14-15)

6. Ms Cyd HO, Chairman of the Subcommittee, briefed Members on the deliberations of the Subcommittee as detailed in its report. Members noted that the Subcommittee supported the two Regulations.

V. Position on Bills Committees and subcommittees

(LC Paper No. CB(2)1817/14-15)

7. The Chairman said that as at 2 July 2015, there were 11 Bills Committees (two of which would need to work beyond three months since its commencement), six subcommittees under HC and nine subcommittees on policy issues under Panels in action. Five subcommittees on policy issues were on the waiting list.

VI. Proposed duty visit to the United States by the Panel on Food Safety and Environmental Hygiene

(LC Paper No. CB(2)1821/14-15)

8. Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Chairman of the Panel on Food Safety and Environmental Hygiene ("FSEH Panel"), said that the Panel proposed to conduct a duty visit to New York and San Francisco of the United States in September 2015 to study the experience of the two cities in regulation of food truck operations and regulatory control of imported food products. Mr CHEUNG informed Members that a total of four Members (including one non-Panel Member) had indicated interest in taking part in the visit, and that the FSEH Panel had invited relevant government officials to join the visit to facilitate members' understanding of the applicability of the United States's experience to Hong Kong.

9. Ms Cyd HO asked whether, apart from officials from the policy bureaux concerned, officials from the relevant departments responsible for operational matters would also join the visit.

10. Mr Tommy CHEUNG hoped that both bureau officials and officials from the relevant departments (including the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department) could join the visit, to facilitate members' understanding of the policy as well as operational issues relating to the food truck initiative such as licensing requirements.

Action

11. Mr Gary FAN queried whether it was worthwhile to use public monies to conduct the proposed visit to study the experience of the United States in food truck operations, given that such information could be obtained through other means. He objected to the proposed duty visit.

12. Mr Jeffrey LAM, Chairman of the Panel on Economic Development ("ED Panel"), said that some members of the ED Panel had expressed support for introducing food trucks to the Hong Kong's food scene. He supported the proposed duty visit as it could provide an opportunity for Members to obtain more information on the operation of food trucks in other places.

13. Dr Helena WONG stressed that studying the experience of food truck operations in the United States was only one of the objectives of the proposed duty visit. The other key objective was to study the measures adopted by the regulatory authorities of the United States in ensuring safety of imported food products. The proposed programme included meeting with the officials of the United States Food and Drug Administration and on-site visits to understand surveillance on imported food products at the ports of entry.

14. The Chairman said that in view of the long agenda for the meeting, he would "draw a line" on the discussion of this agenda item after Members who had indicated intention to speak had done so.

15. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung said that he supported conducting a duty visit to study the measures for ensuring safety of imported food products in the United States, but not its experience in food truck operations, which he considered a waste of time.

16. Ms Claudia MO said that since information on the operation of food trucks and the laws to regulate safety of imported food products in the United States was readily accessible through the internet, she questioned the need to use public monies to conduct the proposed duty visit which, in her view, would give the public a bad impression of the Legislative Council ("LegCo").

17. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung queried the Chairman's decision to "draw a line" on the discussion of this agenda item. He considered that it should be for Members to decide which agenda item(s) deserved more time for discussion. He added that he agreed to the views of Mr Gary FAN and Ms Claudia MO on the proposed duty visit.

Action

18. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen said that he was a member of the FSEH Panel. He did not support the proposed duty visit on the grounds that the food truck initiative, which was announced by the Financial Secretary during his 2015-2016 Budget speech, was still at the inception stage and the Administration had not yet undertaken any detailed study on it, let alone drawn up any concrete proposals for LegCo's consideration. He also queried whether the experience of the United States in regulation of food truck operations, such as mode of operation and size of food trucks, was applicable to Hong Kong given the differences in geographical environment between the two places.

19. The Chairman put to vote the proposed duty visit to the United States by the FSEH Panel. At the request of Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, the Chairman ordered a division.

The following Members voted in favour of the proposal:

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Ms Emily LAU, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Frederick FUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Prof Joseph LEE, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr James TIEN, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Mr SIN Chung-kai, Dr Helena WONG, Mr IP Kin-yuen, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan and Mr Tony TSE.

(33 Members)

The following Members voted against the proposal:

Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che, Mr Alan LEONG, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN, Ms Claudia MO, Mr Gary FAN, Mr Charles MOK, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr Dennis KWOK and Dr Fernando CHEUNG.

(13 Members)

The following Members abstained from voting:

Mr Paul TSE, Mr NG Leung-sing and Mr MA Fung-kwok.

(3 Members)

20. The Chairman declared that 33 Members voted for and 13 Members voted against the proposal, and three Members abstained from voting. The Chairman declared that the proposal was supported.

Action

(*Post-meeting note*: Members were informed vide LC Paper No. CB(2)2032/14-15 on 18 August 2015 that having regard to the latest developments including the withdrawal of two delegation members from the duty visit and the unavailability of some receiving organizations to meet with the delegation, the Chairman of the FSEH Panel cum leader of the delegation had decided not to proceed with the duty visit scheduled for September 2015.)

VII. Proposed duty visit to Germany and Switzerland by the Panel on Education

(*LC Paper No. CB(4)1232/14-15*)

21. Mr IP Kin-yuen, Deputy Chairman of the Panel on Education, said that the Panel proposed to conduct a duty visit to Germany and Switzerland from 20 to 26 September 2015 to study the policy aspects and implementation experience of vocational education in these two countries. He referred Members to the Panel's paper for details of the proposed visit.

22. Dr Fernando CHEUNG considered it necessary to strengthen vocational education in Hong Kong's education system to provide an attractive articulation pathway for young people to prepare for their future career in addition to traditional academic education. He supported the proposed duty visit to enable Members to acquire first-hand understanding of the experience of Germany and Switzerland in the provision of vocational education.

23. The Chairman suggested that the delegation should, before the visit, study the current situation in the provision of vocational education in Hong Kong, so as to facilitate more fruitful discussions between the delegation and the parties concerned during the visit.

24. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung also expressed support for the proposed duty visit. He hoped that the delegation could also take the opportunity to learn about the provision of vocational education for students with special education needs in the two countries.

25. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan said that Members belonging to the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong ("DAB") supported the proposed duty visit as it would provide Members with an opportunity to study the vocational education systems of Germany and Switzerland and gain insights into ways to enhance vocational training for young people in Hong Kong.

26. Members agreed that permission be given for the Panel on Education to conduct the proposed duty visit.

VIII. Proposal of Hon CHAN Chi-chuen to seek the House Committee's agreement for him to move a motion of no confidence in the President of the Legislative Council at the Council meeting of 8 July 2015
(*LC Paper No. CB(2)1828/14-15(01)*)

27. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen said that he proposed to seek the agreement of HC, under rules 13(a) and 14(i) of the House Rules, for allocation of a debate slot for him to move, at the Council meeting of 8 July 2015, a motion of no confidence in the President, as the contents of a WhatsApp chat group published in a newspaper showed that the President had given instructions to Members of the pro-establishment camp on the strategy they should adopt during the debate in Council on the motion on constitutional reform on 18 June 2015 and had failed to maintain his neutrality when presiding over the Council meeting. Mr CHAN further said that although the President had stressed in his reply letter dated 29 June 2015 to 23 Members belonging to the pan-democratic camp that he had handled the Council business strictly according to the Rules of Procedure ("RoP") and had shown no bias towards any Member, the incident had called into question the impartiality of the President. Mr CHAN appealed to Members to support his proposal.

28. Mr Gary FAN expressed support for Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's proposal. Mr FAN said that the WhatsApp messages, which showed that the President had acted as the leader of Members belonging to the pro-establishment camp, were evidence contrary to the President's claim that he was neutral and impartial in presiding over Council meetings. In his view, the President should resign from the presidency of LegCo, thus saving the need for Members to move a motion of no confidence in him.

29. Ms Claudia MO considered the President's act in question a violation of political ethics. She stressed that there should be no compromise on the fundamental principle of maintaining the neutrality and impartiality of the President, and expressed support for Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's proposal.

30. Mr WONG Kwok-hing opposed Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's proposal. He considered it inappropriate for Members belonging to the pan-democratic camp to overplay the incident as the President had already, on several occasions, explained clearly to the public that he had handled the Council business strictly according to RoP and had shown no bias towards any Member when chairing the Council meeting. Mr WONG trusted that members of the public would understand that the President had to ensure order and safety within and outside the Chamber during the proceedings on the motion on constitutional reform.

Action

31. Mr Alan LEONG said that 23 Members belonging to the pan-democratic camp wrote to the President on 25 June 2015 requesting the President to give a full account of the matter; to apologize to the public for presiding over the Council meeting in an unfair manner; and to make suggestions on how to avoid making the same mistake again and pledge to uphold political neutrality in the future. Mr LEONG further said that as the President, in his reply letter dated 29 June 2015, had refused to apologize to the public and had failed to make any suggestion to convince the 23 pan-democratic Members that he could uphold political neutrality in the future, the 23 Members supported Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's proposal.

32. Dr Helena WONG said that the President, on assuming the presidency, had undertaken to maintain political neutrality, refrain from attending meetings of DAB, and refrain from voting in Council. The President's communication with Members belonging to the pro-establishment camp through WhatsApp on 18 June 2015 was a clear breach of his undertakings. In Dr WONG's view, the incident showed that the President was saying one thing but doing another and had called his integrity into question. She added that given the importance of safeguarding the neutrality and impartiality of the President of LegCo, Members belonging to the Democratic Party supported Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's proposal.

33. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung said that the content of the WhatsApp messages showed that the President was giving instructions behind the scene to Members belonging to the pro-establishment camp during the debate on the motion on constitutional reform on 18 June 2015. He criticized the President for failing to preside over the Council meeting in a fair manner and saying one thing but doing another. In his view, the President should apologize to the public and step down for his wrongdoing. He expressed support for Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's proposal.

34. Ms Emily LAU said that she could not understand why the President refused to apologize to the public while admitting that it was a mistake on his part to have taken part in the discussions in the WhatsApp chat group of Members belonging to the pro-establishment camp during the Council meeting on 18 June 2015. She stressed that the President was expected to preside over the Council meetings in a fair, objective and impartial manner. She considered it unacceptable for the President to join the WhatsApp chat group set up by Members belonging to the pro-establishment camp and give instructions to these Members through WhatsApp during the debate on the motion on constitutional reform.

Action

35. Mr James TIEN said that while Members belonging to the Liberal Party considered that the President had acted inappropriately, they could not subscribe to the view that the President had manipulated the debate behind the scene. Furthermore, the President had already tendered an apology over the incident. They therefore would not support Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's proposal. Mr TIEN further said that the President had been doing a good job over the past years in ensuring the efficient and fair conduct of Council business, and it would not be in the interest of the Council to press for the President's resignation when there was only one year left in the current term of LegCo.

36. Ms Cyd HO said that while the President had for most of the time honored his election pledge of not voting and not commenting on controversial issues during his presidency, he had broken his pledge by joining the WhatsApp chat group discussions of Members belonging to the pro-establishment camp during the Council meeting on 18 June 2015. She expressed support for Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's proposal, as she found it unacceptable that the President had, while presiding over the Council meeting, given advice to Members of the pro-establishment camp in private via WhatsApp on how they should act during the debate.

37. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan said that the President had communicated with Members of the pro-establishment camp through WhatsApp during the debate on the motion on constitutional reform for the purpose of ensuring that the motion could be put to vote during day time, so as to avoid possible siege and storming of the LegCo Complex by the large number of protesters gathering outside the Complex if the vote was to take place during night time. As the President, he had the responsibility to ensure safety and order within and outside the Chamber during the Council meeting. In her view, the President had all along maintained impartiality and neutrality in handling Council business.

38. Dr Fernando CHEUNG stressed that as a matter of procedural fairness, it was important for the President to maintain his impartiality and neutrality and to be seen as such. In his view, the President, in communicating with Members belonging to the pro-establishment camp through their WhatsApp chat group when presiding over the Council meeting with a view to controlling the timing for the vote on the motion on constitutional reform, had compromised such impartiality and neutrality. Dr CHEUNG added that while some members of the public who were very concerned about the constitutional development in Hong Kong had gathered in the demonstration area outside the LegCo Complex on 18 June, there were no signs that they would take radical actions such as storming and occupying the Complex.

Action

39. Mr Jeffrey LAM said that while the President had joined the WhatsApp chat group of Members belonging to the pro-establishment camp, he seldom participated in their discussions. As explained by the President on several occasions, he had taken part in the discussions of the WhatsApp chat group on 18 June 2015 to ensure that the vote could be held during day time to avoid outbreak of violence, such as what happened when protestors stormed the LegCo Complex during the Finance Committee ("FC")'s consideration of the North East New Territories Development Project in June 2014. In addition, the President had all along maintained impartiality and neutrality in handling Council business during his presidency. Having regard to the above considerations, Members belonging to Business and Professionals Alliance for Hong Kong did not support the proposal to move a motion of no confidence in the President.

40. Mr WONG Yuk-man said that he had, in 2012, proposed the moving of a motion of no confidence in the President to protest against his curtailing the debate during the Committee stage of the Legislative Council (Amendment) Bill 2012, but the motion could not be dealt with before the prorogation of the Fourth LegCo. As the WhatsApp incident had called into question the President's impartiality and neutrality in handling Council business and given the President's admission of his foolishness, Mr WONG expressed support for Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's proposal.

41. Mr IP Kwok-him said that Members belonging to DAB opposed the proposal. Mr IP stressed that although the President had admitted that there were problems with his act of communicating with Members of the pro-establishment camp through their WhatsApp chat group during the proceedings on the motion on constitutional reform, there was no evidence to substantiate the allegation that the President had presided over the Council meeting in an unfair manner.

42. Mr Paul TSE shared the view that there was no evidence to support the allegation that the President had acted unfairly when presiding over the Council meeting. He pointed out that before the motion was put to vote on 18 June 2015, the President had turned down Mr Jeffrey LAM's request for suspending the Council meeting, which showed that the President was not biased towards any Member. While the President's participation in the WhatsApp chat group discussions of Members belonging to the pro-establishment camp was, in his view, inappropriate, he considered that Members should not rush into moving a motion of no confidence in the President at this stage because of a single incident and account should be taken of the President's past record in discharging his duties.

Action

43. Mr Kenneth LEUNG stressed that the reason for raising the proposed motion was the President's acts in the WhatsApp incident, and not his performance over the past years. He considered that the President had acted unfairly during the debate in that he had communicated with only one side of the two camps in an attempt to control the tempo of the debate and the timing for the vote. In his view, the President owed the public an explanation and a formal apology.

44. Mr Abraham SHEK said that he did not support Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's proposal, which was made on the basis of Members' private chat group conversations that had been leaked to the media and published in a newspaper without authorization. He stressed that he did not see any unfairness in the President's handling of Council business in the past seven years. Mr SHEK added that the President had joined the WhatsApp chat group of Members of the pro-establishment camp on invitation. It was his understanding that the President had never been invited to join the chat group of Members belonging to the pan-democratic camp.

45. Ms Starry LEE said that the President had all along maintained impartiality and neutrality in handling Council business, and she considered it unfair to move a motion of no confidence in the President based on a single incident. She shared the view that during the Council proceedings on the motion on constitutional reform, the President had shown no bias towards any Member and had presided over the Council meeting in accordance with RoP. Further, she considered that the President had not broken his election pledge. In view of the foregoing considerations, she did not support Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's proposal.

46. Mr Charles MOK wondered whether the President was under pressure from DAB not to apologize to the public. Mr MOK stressed the importance of maintaining the impartiality of the President and considered it necessary to hold a debate on the proposed motion in Council.

47. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung was of the view that the President had failed to uphold political neutrality in the discharge of his duties and had broken his election pledge of not voting and not commenting on controversial issues while serving as the President.

48. Mr Albert CHAN said that the crux of the matter was that the President had violated the principle of neutrality, as evidenced by his giving instructions to Members belonging to the pro-establishment camp through WhatsApp during the Council meeting and disclosing to the pro-establishment camp the action plan of Members belonging to the pan-democratic camp which, in his view, was privileged information.

Action

49. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan said that the President's attempt to exert control over the length of the debate and the timing for the vote, and his disclosure to the pro-establishment camp the action plan of Members belonging to the pan-democratic camp had shown clearly that he had failed to preside over the Council meeting in a fair, impartial and neutral manner.

50. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen reiterated his view that the President should step down from his presidency because of the WhatsApp incident. He added that in the interest of upholding the dignity of LegCo, he requested allocation of a debate slot at the Council meeting of 8 July 2015, which was the last Council meeting in the current session, to enable a debate to be held on his proposed motion as early as possible.

51. The Chairman put to vote the proposal of Mr CHAN Chi-chuen to seek HC's agreement for him to move a motion of no confidence in the President at the Council meeting of 8 July 2015. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen requested a division.

The following Members voted in favour of the proposal:

Mr Albert HO, Mr LEE Cheuk-yan, Mr James TO, Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, Ms Emily LAU, Mr Frederick FUNG, Prof Joseph LEE, Ms Cyd HO, Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che, Mr Alan LEONG, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr Albert CHAN, Mr WONG Yuk-man, Ms Claudia MO, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr Gary FAN, Mr Charles MOK, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr Kenneth LEUNG, Mr Dennis KWOK, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr SIN Chung-kai, Dr Helena WONG and Mr IP Kin-yuen.
(24 Members)

The following Members voted against the proposal:

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr Abraham SHEK, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Dr LAM Tai-fai, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr Paul TSE, Mr James TIEN, Mr NG Leung-sing, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan, Mr Christopher CHUNG and Mr Tony TSE.
(36 Members)

52. The Chairman declared that 24 Members voted for and 36 Members voted against the proposal, and no Member abstained from voting. The Chairman declared that the proposal was not supported.

IX. Proposal of Hon WU Chi-wai to seek the Council's authorization at its meeting of 8 July 2015 for the Select Committee to Inquire into the Background of and Reasons for the Delay of the Construction of the Hong Kong section of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of the Legislative Council (Powers and Privileges) Ordinance in the performance of its duties

(LC Paper No. CB(2)1828/14-15(02))

53. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr WU Chi-wai said that as the Select Committee to Inquire into the Background of and Reasons for the Delay of the Construction of the Hong Kong section of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link ("the Select Committee") had not been authorized to exercise the powers under the Legislative Council (Powers and Privileges) Ordinance ("the P&P Ordinance") in the performance of its duties, it had encountered difficulties in obtaining the key information relevant to the inquiry from the Administration and the MTR Corporation Limited ("MTRCL"). For instance, in response to the Select Committee's request for provision of the entrustment agreement ("EA") entered into between the Administration and MTRCL in relation to the construction of the Hong Kong section of the Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link ("the XRL project"), the Administration had indicated that the provision of the entrustment agreement would be subject to the conditions that the agreement be restricted to the reference of members of the Select Committee and that the agreement be examined by the Select Committee at closed meetings only.

54. Mr WU Chi-wai further said that as the entrustment fee provided to MTRCL for carrying out the XRL project was expected to be exhausted by around March 2016 and the Administration would likely seek additional funding from LegCo to complete the XRL project, he considered it necessary and timely for the Administration and MTRCL to come clean about the reasons and the party/parties responsible for the delay and cost overrun of the project, so as to facilitate Members' consideration of the Administration's request for additional funding. He appealed to Members to support his proposal to seek the Council's authorization at its meeting of 8 July 2015, which was the last Council meeting in this session, for the Select Committee to exercise the powers

Action

under section 9(1) the P&P Ordinance to order attendance of witnesses and production of documents so as to find out the truth of the matter.

55. Mr TANG Ka-piu said that he was a member of the Select Committee. He informed the meeting that the Select Committee had invited the Chief Executive Officer ("CEO") of MTRCL to attend a three-hour public hearing scheduled for 15 July 2015 and further hearings could be scheduled should members of the Select Committee consider it necessary to do so. Given that the proposed resolution under the P&P Ordinance had not been discussed by the Select Committee and the Secretary for Transport and Housing ("STH") had already indicated that the EA could be provided for discussion by the Select Committee at closed meetings, he considered it premature at this stage to seek the Council's authorization for the Select Committee to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance. Furthermore, even if the Select Committee came to a conclusion after the completion of the inquiry that MTRCL should bear the responsibility for the delay and cost overrun of the project, it had no power to hold MTRCL liable for the overrun costs. He added that he did not support Mr WU Chi-wai's proposal.

56. Mr Gary FAN said that while he had in the last year proposed invoking the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance to inquire into the causes for the delay in the construction works of the XRL project at the meetings of the Subcommittee on Matters Relating to Railways ("the Subcommittee on Railways"), HC and the Council respectively, his proposals were not supported as Members belonging to the pro-establishment camp claimed that the proposed inquiry would only result in further delay of the XRL works. Although the Select Committee had subsequently been formed and it had sought to obtain various important information relevant to the inquiry such as contractors' fees and detailed provisions of the EA, the Administration and MTRCL had refused to release the relevant documents to the public on the grounds that such documents contained commercially sensitive information. Given that the Select Committee had not been able to carry out its investigation work effectively, he supported the proposal to confer on the Select Committee the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance so as to facilitate the Select Committee to find out the truth for the public.

57. Mr Tony TSE said that he was the Deputy Chairman of the Select Committee. He informed the meeting that the Select Committee had so far conducted five public hearings at which four former and incumbent government officials were invited to give evidence to the Select Committee. In addition, the CEO of MTRCL had been invited to attend the next public hearing of the Select Committee scheduled for 15 July

Action

2015. He further said that during the public hearings and closed meetings held by the Select Committee, no member had expressed concern that the Select Committee was unable to perform its duties without being authorized to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance. In his view, the Select Committee was making good progress in its work. According to the work plan of the Select Committee, it would complete its work and submit a report to the Council by April 2016. He therefore considered it neither necessary nor appropriate to make any major change to the work of the Select Committee at the present stage. He did not support Mr WU Chi-wai's proposal.

58. Mr CHAN Han-pan said that he was also a member of the Select Committee. He further said that as the Select Committee had already drawn up a work plan, should Mr WU Chi-wai wish to make any proposal in relation to the work of the Select Committee, the proper procedure would be for Mr WU to raise the proposal for discussion by the Select Committee first before putting it forward to HC. He shared Mr Tony TSE's view that the Select Committee had generally not encountered difficulties in inviting witnesses and obtaining information from the Administration and MTRCL. As regards Mr WU's concern about the Administration's request that certain documents to be provided to the Select Committee be examined at closed meetings only, it was note-worthy that such a request could also be made by the Administration and be acceded to by the Select Committee even if it had been authorized to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance. He therefore did not see any imminent need to invoke the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance at the present stage and he did not support Mr WU Chi-wai's proposal.

59. Mr Charles MOK said that he was also a member of the Select Committee. He considered it necessary to confer the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance on the Select Committee so that it could obtain key information essential for the effective conduct of the inquiry. Mr MOK pointed out that when the delay of the XRL project came to light last year, some Members had already proposed to set up a select committee with the powers under the P&P Ordinance to inquire into the project delay but were unsuccessful because of the opposition of the pro-establishment camp. In view of the further escalation in the cost and further delay of the XRL project as announced by the Administration and MTRCL recently, there was urgency to seek the Council's authorization for the Select Committee to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance to find out the truth of the matter.

Action

60. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok said that he was a member of the Select Committee. He pointed out that the Select Committee was established under Rule 20(6) of RoP pursuant to the presentation of a petition without being authorized to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance. The Select Committee was proceeding with its work according to its terms of reference, work plan and practice and procedures. The relevant government officials and representatives from MTRCL had attended the meetings of the Select Committee as requested. He saw no problem in its work and considered it improper to make such a significant change in the mode of operation of the Select Committee during the course of its work.

61. Mr Frankie YICK said that he was a member of the Select Committee. He did not see any need for the Select Committee to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance as proposed by Mr WU Chi-wai for two reasons. First, the government officials concerned had so far been co-operative in facilitating the work of the Select Committee; second, the question of which party/parties should bear the responsibility for the cost overrun of the XRL project was not one to be determined by the Select Committee. He shared the view that Mr WU should have raised the proposal for discussion by the Select Committee first before putting it forward to HC.

62. Mr Albert HO said that in view of the significant cost overrun of the XRL project, there was an urgent need to confer on the Select Committee the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance to enable it to obtain more information so that a decision could be made on whether or not the XRL project should continue. Mr HO further said that if the Select Committee was provided with the powers under the P&P Ordinance, it could, when the need arose, exercise such powers to summon witnesses or order the Administration/MTRCL to produce the relevant documents. He could not see any reason why members of the Select Committee would oppose the proposal.

63. Ms Cyd HO said that given the significant extent of the cost overrun of the XRL project, it was necessary to decide whether the project should continue or be brought to a halt. In her view, the Select Committee, if authorized to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance, could obtain the information necessary for consideration of the way forward for the XRL project. Ms HO further said that as government officials and representatives from MTRCL had conflict of interests in the matter under inquiry, they might not be willing to give a full account of the matter to the Select Committee. If the Select Committee was authorized to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of

Action

the P&P Ordinance, "whistle blowers" might be willing to come forward to give evidence with the legal protection afforded under the P&P Ordinance. She appealed to Members to support Mr WU Chi-wai's proposal.

64. Mr Kenneth LEUNG did not consider that there was any impropriety with expanding the investigative powers of a select committee established under Rule 20(6) of RoP. Mr LEUNG stressed that the Select Committee, if authorized to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance, had the discretion to decide whether and when to exercise such powers. Given the gravity of the cost overrun problem of the XRL project, he considered that the Select Committee should be authorized to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance in the performance of its duties.

65. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung said that given the serious delay and cost overrun of the XRL project, it was necessary for the Select Committee to be authorized to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance in order to discharge its duties effectively. Mr LEUNG further said that while some Members had indicated that so far the government officials concerned had been co-operative with the Select Committee, it could not be ruled out that some officials from the Administration or representatives of MTRCL might refuse to attend meetings of the Select Committee or provide certain information to the Select Committee in future. He could not see how the proposed authorization for the Select Committee to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance would in any way adversely affect its work.

66. Dr Helena WONG said that at the meeting of the Subcommittee on Railways held in the morning of the day of the HC meeting, the Administration indicated that the commissioning of the Hong Kong section of XRL would have to be further delayed from 2017 to the third quarter of 2018 and the cost estimate of the project had increased from \$65 billion to \$85.3 billion. Furthermore, in view of the acute shortage of construction workers to carry out the works of the XRL project, she was highly doubtful whether the project could be completed according to the latest revised schedule. She supported Mr WU Chi-wai's proposal to seek the Council's authorization for the Select Committee to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance to investigate the problems of significant delay and overspending of the XRL project, including ascertaining which party/parties should bear the responsibility for the problems.

Action

67. Mr YIU Si-wing noted from the discussion that most of the members of the Select Committee were of the view that the Select Committee had been carrying out its work smoothly; hence he did not see any need for the Select Committee to invoke the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance. He further said that in accordance with the proper procedure, Mr WU Chi-wai should have sought the views of the Select Committee before submitting his proposal to HC for consideration. He indicated objection to Mr WU's proposal.

68. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan said that he was a member of the Select Committee. He pointed out that the Administration and MTRCL had refused to provide certain information requested by members of the Select Committee on grounds of commercial confidentiality, and he did not subscribe to the view expressed by some members of the Select Committee that it had been carrying out its work smoothly. He considered it hypocritical of some Members to criticize the Administration and MTRCL over serious delay and cost overrun of the XRL project on the one hand but oppose the proposal to seek the Council's authorization for the Select Committee to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance to investigate the matter on the other hand.

69. Dr Fernando CHEUNG was of the view that without being authorized to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance, the Select Committee would not be able to find out the truth about the serious delay and cost overrun of the XRL project. He expressed strong dissatisfaction that the Administration had not sent government officials concerned to attend the meeting of the MTRCL Board and had been trying to evade its responsibility in monitoring MTRCL's work in the XRL project.

70. Mr WONG Kwok-hing said that at the meeting of the Subcommittee on Railways held in the morning of this HC meeting, the Administration and MTRCL had provided papers to members on the latest cost estimate and schedule of the XRL project and their representatives had also responded to members' questions. Given that STH had clearly indicated that the Administration would initiate discussions with MTRCL over the matter next week, Mr WONG considered that the Administration should be given time to deal with the matter and it was inappropriate at this stage for Members to seek the Council's authorization for the Select Committee to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance, which, in his view, would only serve to stir up more troubles.

Action

71. Mr James TO said that if the Select Committee was not authorized to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance, the Administration and MTRCL might not be willing or able to give a full account of the matter to the Select Committee for several reasons. First, there might be an intention to cover up dereliction of duty on the part of the Administration in monitoring the XRL project. Second, both the Administration and MTRCL had conflict of interests in the matter under inquiry. Third, the Administration and MTRCL might have difficulty in providing certain commercially sensitive information to the Select Committee unless they were ordered to do so by the Select Committee pursuant to section 9(2) of the P&P Ordinance. In Mr TO's view, given the magnitude of and the grave public concern about the problems with the XRL project, it was necessary for the Select Committee to be authorized to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance, the absence of which would render the inquiry currently conducted by the Select Committee ineffective.

72. Mr Alan LEONG pointed out that when the funding application for the construction works of the XRL project was approved by FC in 2010, the overall project cost estimate was around HK\$66.9 billion with a target completion date in 2015. In April 2014, the cost estimate was revised to HK\$81.7 billion and the target commissioning time deferred to 2017. On 30 June 2015, MTRCL advised that the project cost estimate was further revised to HK\$85.3 billion and the completion time further delayed to the third quarter of 2018. Mr LEONG stressed that the persistent delay and the ever increasing cost of the XRL project was unacceptable. He expressed support for Mr WU Chi-wai's proposal, given the urgent need for the Select Committee to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance to order the production of the relevant information and summon witnesses. He also considered it important that parties giving evidence on the matter be afforded the legal protection under the P&P Ordinance.

73. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen expressed support for Mr WU Chi-wai's proposal. Given the XRL project's further delay and cost overrun, Mr CHAN considered it incumbent upon Members, particularly those pro-establishment Members who had voted for the Administration's funding application for the project back in 2010, to make their best endeavours to find out the truth for the public. He could not subscribe to the view of some Members that it was inappropriate to expand the powers exercisable by the Select Committee at this stage. He stressed that the Select Committee, if authorized to exercise the powers under the P&P Ordinance, had the discretion to decide whether and when to exercise such powers in the performance of its duties and he trusted that the Select Committee would invoke such powers only when necessary.

Action

74. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung said that he could not understand the rationale of some Members for not supporting Mr WU Chi-wai's proposal, given the huge sum of public monies involved. He considered that compared to the investigation committee appointed in the Fourth LegCo in respect of the motion to censure Mr KAM Nai-wai, the present case was far more serious and had much stronger grounds to warrant an inquiry by LegCo.

75. Mr Frederick FUNG said that when the funding proposal for the XRL project was considered and approved by FC in 2010, he had expressed worries that the decision was made in haste. In view of the huge cost overrun of the project, the uncertainty about the extent of the cost overrun and the significant delay in completion time, he considered that Members were duty-bound to monitor the Executive Authorities by supporting Mr WU Chi-wai's proposal to seek the Council's authorization for the Select Committee to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance to enable the Select Committee to find out the truth and ascertain whether any parties or public officers should be held accountable.

76. Mr CHAN Kam-lam, who was a member of the Select Committee, considered that the Select Committee was making good progress in its work and had so far encountered no difficulties in obtaining information or inviting witnesses to the hearings. He therefore did not support the proposal to seek the Council's authorization for the Select Committee to exercise the powers under the P&P Ordinance at this stage. He criticized Mr WU Chi-wai for not paying due respect to the Select Committee in putting forward the proposal for HC's consideration, as the proposal had not been discussed by the Select Committee nor brought to its attention beforehand.

77. Ms Claudia MO said that she was a member of the Select Committee. In her view, the work of the Select Committee was not as smooth as depicted by some Members. The Administration and MTRCL had on various occasions declined to provide certain information sought by the Select Committee on such grounds as confidentiality and commercial secrets. She also expressed grave concern that the cost of the XRL project seemed to have become a "bottomless pit". She considered it necessary for the Select Committee to be provided with the powers under the P&P Ordinance so that it could probe into the causes for the cost overrun while affording protection to all parties to speak out on the matter.

Action

78. Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che said that it was his understanding that the Administration and MTRCL had refused to provide certain key documents requested by the Select Committee on the grounds that the documents contained commercially sensitive information. In view of the need to ascertain which party/parties should be held responsible for the works delay and project cost overruns, he considered that the Select Committee should be authorized to exercise the powers under the P&P Ordinance, so that the Select Committee could find out the truth and do justice to all parties concerned, including those Members of the Fourth LegCo who had voted in favour of the funding application for the XRL project.

79. The Chairman said that as there was still one more agenda item pending discussion and having regard to time constraint, he would "draw a line" on the discussion of this item. He invited Members who had not yet spoken but wished to speak to so indicate. He also reminded Members that the matter under discussion was whether HC supported the proposal to seek the Council's authorization for the Select Committee to exercise the powers under the P&P Ordinance, and Members should refrain from debating at length the policy issues concerned.

80. In response to Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung's enquiries, the Chairman said that the HC meeting was scheduled to end at 5:00 pm and the FC meeting to begin at 5:00 pm. The Chairman added that it was the long-standing practice that no ending time would be specified in the agenda for an HC meeting.

81. Mr Albert CHAN said that the XRL project involved significant sums of public funds and LegCo was duty bound to monitor the Government's spending on public funds. He expressed strong dissatisfaction with the Chairman's decision to "draw a line". He requested a quorum call.

(In the absence of a quorum, the Chairman directed that Members be summoned to the meeting. A quorum was then present.)

82. Ms Emily LAU said that in order to effectively discharge its duties of conducting an inquiry into the problems with the XRL project, the Select Committee must be given the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance to summon witnesses and order the production of information as it deemed necessary. She further said that while a committee chairman could exercise certain powers in conducting a meeting, she considered that the chairman should consult members on matters such as speaking arrangements.

83. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen requested a quorum call.

(In the absence of a quorum, the Chairman directed that Members be summoned to the meeting. A quorum was then present.)

84. Mr SIN Chung-kai expressed support for Mr WU Chi-wai's proposal, having regard to the wide public concern about the huge cost overrun of the XRL project. He considered that there was urgency to deal with Mr WU's proposal at the Council meeting of 8 July 2015 as it was the last Council meeting of the current session; otherwise Members would have to wait until the beginning of the next session in October 2015 before the matter could be dealt with by the Council.

85. Mr WU Chi-wai said that MTRCL made public the latest revised cost estimate of the XRL project only a few days ago. He reiterated that there was urgency for him to submit the proposal to HC for consideration as the next meeting of the Select Committee would not be held until 15 July 2015, which was already after the last Council meeting in the current session. He stressed that without being authorized to exercise the powers under the P&P Ordinance to summon key witnesses, such as Mr Jay WALDER (former CEO of MTRCL) and Ms Eva CHENG (a former STH), and order the production of the relevant information, the Select Committee would not be able to conduct the inquiry in an effective manner.

86. The Chairman put to vote the proposal of Mr WU Chi-wai to seek the Council's authorization at its meeting of 8 July 2015 for the Select Committee to exercise the powers under section 9(1) of the P&P Ordinance in the performance of its duties. At the request of Mr WU Chi-wai, the Chairman ordered a division.

87. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen requested that the meeting be suspended for five minutes. The Chairman advised that he could not accede to the request as he had already ordered a division. In response to Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, the Chairman further said that the chairman of a committee generally had the power to extend a meeting for not more than 15 minutes, and he had already secured the consent of the FC Chairman for the HC meeting to continue for not more than 15 minutes beyond 5:00 pm. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, the FC Chairman, confirmed that he had no objection to the Chairman's request.

Action

88. Mr Alan LEONG said that according to rule 20(e) of the House Rules, when a FC meeting was scheduled to be held in the same afternoon, the HC meeting concerned would, if necessary, be suspended at such time when the FC meeting was scheduled to begin and resumed to deal with the unfinished business on the agenda after the FC meeting. Mr LEONG further said that as it was already past 5:00 pm, which was the scheduled starting time of the FC meeting, the HC meeting should not be allowed to continue and the vote should not be proceeded with.

89. At the invitation of the Chairman, the Clerk explained that there were occasions in the past where, with the consent of the FC Chairman, the HC meeting concerned had continued for not more than 15 minutes beyond the scheduled starting time of the FC meeting, in order to allow HC to conclude its business on the agenda. In response to Mr Alan LEONG's enquiry, the Clerk further said that as far as she could recall, no Member had raised objection to such an arrangement on those occasions.

90. Some Members indicated that they objected to the arrangement of extending the meeting beyond 5:00 pm and considered that the division should not be proceeded with as it was beyond the scheduled meeting time. The Chairman ordered that the division be proceeded with.

The following Members voted against the proposal:

Mr CHAN Kam-lam, Mr TAM Yiu-chung, Mr Tommy CHEUNG, Mr Vincent FANG, Mr WONG Kwok-hing, Mr Jeffrey LAM, Mr WONG Ting-kwong, Ms Starry LEE, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Mr CHAN Kin-por, Dr Priscilla LEUNG, Mr WONG Kwok-kin, Mr IP Kwok-him, Mr Steven HO, Mr Frankie YICK, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr MA Fung-kwok, Mr CHAN Han-pan, Miss CHAN Yuen-han, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung, Miss Alice MAK, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG, Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr TANG Ka-piu, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok, Mr Christopher CHUNG and Mr Tony TSE.

(30 Members)

91. The Chairman declared that no Member voted for and 30 Members voted against the proposal, and no Member abstained from voting. The Chairman declared that the proposal was not supported.

(The meeting was suspended at 5:03 pm and resumed at 7:18 pm.)

Action

X. Proposals to seek the House Committee's agreement for asking urgent oral questions at the Council meeting of 8 July 2015 on issues relating to dust explosion

- (a) **Letter from Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT**
(LC Paper No. CB(2)1828/14-15(03))
- (b) **Letter from Dr Hon Helena WONG**
(LC Paper No. CB(2)1828/14-15(04))

92. Members agreed to the proposals of Dr Elizabeth QUAT and Dr Helena WONG to ask urgent oral questions under Rule 24(4) of RoP at the Council meeting of 8 July 2015 on issues relating to dust explosion.

XI. Any other business

93. The Chairman said that this meeting was the last HC meeting attended by the Deputy Secretary General ("DSG"). On behalf of Members, he thanked DSG for her dedication and contribution to LegCo over the past many years and wished her a happy retirement.

94. The Chairman further informed Members that the next HC meeting would be held on 9 October 2015 after the summer recess.

95. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 7:19 pm.