

立法會

Legislative Council

LC Paper No. FC252/17-18
(These minutes have been
cleared with the Chairman)

Ref : FC/1/1

Finance Committee of the Legislative Council

**Minutes of special meeting
held at Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Saturday, 6 January 2018, at 9:00 am**

Members present:

Hon CHAN Kin-por, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, GBS, JP
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee, GBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon Claudia MO
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP
Hon Kenneth LEUNG

Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon KWOK Wai-keung, JP
Hon Dennis KWOK Wing-hang
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Hon IP Kin-yuen
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, BBS, JP
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, SBS, JP
Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kiwok, SBS, MH, JP
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin
Hon CHU Hoi-dick
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP
Hon HO Kai-ming
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding
Hon SHIU Ka-fai
Hon SHIU Ka-chun
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH
Hon YUNG Hoi-yan
Dr Hon Pierre CHAN
Hon Tanya CHAN
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP
Hon HUI Chi-fung
Hon LUK Chung-hung
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH
Hon Kenneth LAU Ip-keung, BBS, MH, JP
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai
Hon KWONG Chun-yu
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho

Members absent:

Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Hon Alvin YEUNG
Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, JP
Hon CHAN Chun-ying

Clerk in attendance:

Ms Anita SIT

Assistant Secretary General 1

Staff in attendance:

Ms Connie FUNG

Legal Adviser

Mr Derek LO

Chief Council Secretary(1)5

Ms Ada LAU

Senior Council Secretary (1)7

Mr Raymond SZETO

Council Secretary (1)5

Mr Frankie WOO

Senior Legislative Assistant (1)3

Miss Yannes HO

Legislative Assistant (1)6

Action

Item 1 — Procedure for the Finance Committee to deal with members' motions to amend the Finance Committee Procedure, the Establishment Subcommittee Procedure and the Public Works Subcommittee Procedure

The Finance Committee ("FC") continued with the joint debate on the procedure for dealing with members' motions to amend the Finance Committee Procedure ("FCP"), the Establishment Subcommittee Procedure ("ESCP") and the Public Works Subcommittee Procedure ("PWSCP") (the three sets of procedure collectively referred to as "the Procedures") ("the Handling Procedure").

Speeches of members who proposed amending motions to motions on the Handling Procedure

2. The Chairman called upon members who proposed amending motions ("the Amending Motions") to motions on the Handling Procedure ("the Original Motions"), including Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung, to take turn to speak.

Ms Claudia MO's speech

3. Ms Claudia MO was dissatisfied that the Administration had failed to exercise prudent control over the spending on major infrastructure projects. She also expressed views on FC's process of scrutinizing financial proposals submitted by the Administration. Separately, Ms MO was worried about the impact on FC's operation if the Handling Procedure passed by FC was ruled unconstitutional in due course. She reiterated that she was dissatisfied with the Chairman's direction for each member to speak on the item for only eight minutes.

4. The Chairman reminded Ms MO that her speech should be relevant to the subject matter of the present special meeting, i.e. the Handling Procedure as proposed in the Original Motions and Amending Motions.

Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's speech

5. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen considered the time limit set by the Chairman inadequate for members to express their views on the matter. Mr CHAN took the view that the 1st Original Motion had the following shortcomings:

- (a) the said Original Motion did not specify whether the notice period for members' motions to amend the Procedures should be calculated on the basis of regular or special meetings of FC;
- (b) the said Original Motion did not specify the relative priorities for FC's handling of financial proposals submitted by the Administration and motions to amend the Procedures; and
- (c) the notice period specified in the said Original Motion was too short, such that the public and members would not have sufficient time to scrutinize and consider the motions for amending the Procedures and the amendments thereto.

6. The Chairman said that Rule 36(5) of the Rules of Procedure ("RoP") had clearly provided that subject to RoP 37, a Member shall not, without the permission of the President or the Chairman, make a speech lasting more than 15 minutes. According to FCP 38 and RoP 43, the FC Chairman could issue other orders on the speaking time limit. Considering that the joint debate was confined to the same subject matter (i.e. for FC to establish a set of handling procedures), he decided that the speaking time limit for each member should be eight minutes. In his view, the arrangement was reasonable, and members should be able to fully express their views on various motions within eight minutes.

7. Mr CHU Hoi-dick reiterated that when LC Paper No. FC64/17-18 was issued to members, the circular already stated clearly that the Deputy Chairman had agreed to give notice to move a motion on the proposed Handling Procedure as set out in FCR(2017-18)40. Enquiring about the time when the relevant notice was given by Mr Michael TIEN, Mr CHU considered that under such an arrangement, other members could not possibly propose motions on the Handling Procedure ahead of Mr TIEN. Mr CHU expressed dissatisfaction in this regard.

Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung's speech

8. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung said that the purposes of his Amending Motions were to extend the notice period of members' motions to amend the Procedures and to set deadlines for the making of rulings by the FC Chairman on such motions and their amendments, so that members would have enough time to consider the same. He considered that the purpose of the present special meeting was far from enhancing the protection given to members in the minority for their right to speak; instead, the series of special meetings were held to further tighten the control over the room for discussion allowed for members in the minority.

Speeches of other members concerning the Original Motions and Amending Motions on the Handling Procedure

9. Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr Charles Peter MOK, Mr Andrew WAN, Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Mr KWONG Chun-yu considered that the establishment of the Handling Procedure was the onset of tightening control over the room for discussion allowed for members, paving the way for holding special meetings to deal with members' motions to amend the Procedures. The effect was to undermine the important gatekeeping powers of FC in ensuring the proper use of public funds. Mr James TO opined that no amendments to the Procedures should have the effect of restricting the functions of Members in monitoring the Government. Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr KWONG Chun-yu and Dr KWOK Ka-ki criticized the Administration for its ineffective control over the spending on major infrastructure projects, which had resulted in serious cost overruns. Mr WU Chi-wai expressed views on the motions proposed by Mr Martin LIAO to amend the Procedures. Dr CHEUNG expressed support for the Amending Motions proposed by pro-democracy Members.

10. Mr Jeremy TAM stated support for the Amending Motions to extend the notice period of members' motions to amend the Procedures, as well as to set deadlines for the making of relevant rulings by the FC Chairman. Having heard the Chairman's explanation that the Committee on Rules of Procedure ("CRoP") was of the view that FC should deal with the amendments to the Procedures on its own, Mr TAM opined that members should also take into account CRoP's stance on the matter when considering various motions or amending motions. Mr Andrew WAN expressed doubt as to whether the 1st Original Motion was lawful and justifiable.

11. Mr IP Kin-yuen opined that establishing the Handling Procedure and amending the Procedures were both complicated and difficult tasks. Hence, the Chairman should leave it open for members' discussion so that FC would make its decisions only coming to a consensus view, rather than for the Chairman to make one-sided decisions and directions on how to proceed with the special meetings. Mr IP sought explanation from the Chairman as to whether and when the relevant procedure would be incorporated into FCP after the passage of the Handling Procedure by FC. Mr IP also pointed out that the circular informing members about the notice period of motions on the Handling Procedure (LC Paper No. FC64/17-18) did not specify the factors behind the relevant voting arrangement. Mr IP considered that FC should consolidate the merits of individual Original Motions and Amending Motions into one set of procedures, rather than adopting only one of the Original Motions or such motions as amended.

12. Mr Dennis KWOK held that several questions would need to be addressed first before FC proceeded further with the present special meeting according to the procedures set out in LC Paper No. FC95/17-18 to discuss the Original Motions and Amending Motions proposed by members on the Handling Procedure, including:

- (a) whether FCP had legal effect;
- (b) whether the FCP provisions as amended would need to be published in Gazette; and
- (c) whether the voting procedures specified in Annex II of the Basic Law were applicable to FC.

Mr James TO echoed the concerns expressed by Mr KWOK. The Chairman advised that while the Legal Adviser ("LA") of the Legislative Council ("LegCo") Secretariat would provide a response to Mr KWOK's enquiry after the meeting, the present meeting could not be suspended for that reason.

13. Dr CHENG Chung-tai considered that some provisions in FCP were not set out in detail, so as to provide FC with certain flexibility in the course of its work. The purpose was to ensure the smooth conduct of FC's scrutiny work and the provision of necessary resources for the use of community in a timely manner.

14. Mr LAU Kwok-fan expressed support for the 1st Original Motion because it was necessary for FC establish a set of specific procedures to be followed in amending the Procedures. The 1st Original Motion, with its provisions mostly coming from RoP, was a proposal that was in order. He considered that the requirements concerning notice of meetings as set out in Mr CHU Hoi-dick's Original Motions would be difficult to put into operation. Dr Junius HO supported the adoption of a set of handling procedures to amend the Procedures. He also commented on the development of LegCo's deliberative process in recent years.

Points of order concerning the moving of motions under FCP 37A

15. At 10:00 am, the Chairman stated that requests had been made by some members to move motions under FCP 37A ("FCP 37A motions"). In this connection, the Chairman advised that the present special meeting was held for FC to establish the Handling Procedure, rather than to consider the Administration's financial proposals. The Chairman added that FCP 37A motions were moved in the course of FC's consideration of a financial proposal from the Administration, so that views of members on that particular financial proposal could be expressed in the form of FCP 37A motions. Hence, FCP 37A did not apply to the present FC special meeting. The Chairman suggested that members could make reference to paragraph 13.131 of A Companion to the history, rules and practices of the Legislative Council of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("the Companion") for further information on the purpose of adopting FCP 37A.

16. Mr Dennis KWOK, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Ms Tanya CHAN did not agree with the Chairman's decision to disallow the moving of FCP 37A motions. In their view, the Companion only served as a reference, and the application of FCP 37A was not as restrictive as the Chairman's interpretation, particularly when the term "an agenda item" in the provision had not been defined as only referring to financial proposals. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen also pointed out that as the Chairman had allowed the moving of a motion under FCP 39 to adjourn further proceedings of FC at the special meeting held on 5 January 2018, it was baffling that the Chairman had

disallowed the moving of FCP 37A motions under the same agenda item. Mr CHU Hoi-dick queried whether the Chairman had the power to disallow the moving of FCP 37A motions by members.

17. Mr Paul TSE considered that as far as the purpose of the present special meeting was concerned, members were expressing views on the Original Motions and Amending Motions when they spoke. Hence, there was no need to move any FCP 37A motions. Mr TSE concurred with the Chairman's decision on the applicability of the said provision.

18. The Chairman instructed the Clerk to give a more detailed explanation on FCP 37A. The Clerk informed members that the said provision was passed by FC in the 2007-2008 legislative session. Both section 8 of the Public Finance Ordinance and FCP 27 had clearly provided that members could not amend the Financial Secretary's financial proposals. Before the passage of FCP 37A, there were occasions when the Establishment Subcommittee ("ESC") and FC had, in the course of considering certain controversial financial proposals, agreed to reflect the overall view of ESC/FC on such proposals to the Administration in the form of motions. Considering that similar situations might also arise in future, FC subsequently agreed to adopt FCP 37A, with corresponding amendments also made to ESCP and PWSCP by its two subcommittees. Hence, against the background of adopting FCP 37A, the procedure concerning FCP 37A should only apply to financial proposals considered by FC.

19. The Clerk went on to explain that considering the purpose of the present special meeting was for FC to establish a set of internal procedures, and as members could propose Original Motions and Amending Motions on the Handling Procedure, there was seemingly no need to move motions for the expression of views through FCP 37A. Regarding Mr CHAN Chi-chuen's comment about the Chairman's inconsistent handling of members' motions under FCP 39 to adjourn further proceedings of FC and under FCP 37A, the Clerk explained that when FCP was reviewed in 1996, FC agreed to adopt the provision for members to move motions for the adjournment of further proceedings of FC as FCP 39. According to general practice, FC Chairmen had interpreted FCP 39 as not only applicable to financial proposals.

20. Mr Charles Peter MOK considered that the Clerk had yet to convince members as to why there was no need for members to move "ad hoc" motions during the present discussion in order to express their views through FCP 37A motions.

21. Some members asked for an explanation from LA on the applicability of FCP 37A. The Chairman suspended the meeting at 10:24 am. At 10:35 am, the meeting resumed with LA's attendance.

22. LA pointed out that on 2 November 2007, FC discussed the paper FCR(2007-2008)33 (entitled "Review of the Procedures of the Finance Committee and its subcommittees") and endorsed the practice and procedure for the handling of motions moved without notice. The above procedure was adopted because under section 8 of the Public Finance Ordinance (Cap. 2) and FCP 27, FC could not amend the Financial Secretary's financial proposals. As the situation was considered unsatisfactory (particularly when controversial financial proposals were under discussion), FC took the opportunity to review the Procedures. RoP 71(13) provided that subject to RoP, the practice and procedure of FC and its subcommittees shall be determined by FC. After discussion, FC agreed to establish a mechanism for members to move motions without notice in the course of considering an agenda item by FC and its subcommittees. If such a motion was considered by the Chairman as directly related to the agenda item and agreed by a majority of members present that it should be proceeded forthwith, FC or its subcommittees would then be expressing views on that particular agenda item (i.e. financial proposal) for consideration by the Administration as to whether amendments should be made to the proposal. The provision of FCP 37A was made against such a background, and provisions mirroring FCP 37A were also included in ESCP and PWSCP. Having regard to the above background, "an agenda item" referred to in FCP 37A should be interpreted as meaning financial proposals. The above background and principle had also been elaborated in paragraph 13.131 of the Companion. LA opined that further discussion could be held if members considered that FCP 37A should have a wider scope of application.

23. Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Ms Claudia MO noted LA's explanation on the original intent of FCP 37A. However, Dr CHEUNG considered that FCP 37A, as drafted, did not preclude members' right to move motions on agenda items other than financial proposals. Dr CHEUNG held that notwithstanding the background and original intent of FCP 37A, it did not mean that the provision could only be applied in circumstances as intended originally or that it was wrong to apply the same in circumstances other than those intended originally. He hoped the Chairman could give further consideration to the matter. Ms MO opined that given the legal effect of FCP and having regard to the usual practice of statutory interpretation, "an agenda item" under FCP 37A should not be construed as only meaning the Administration's financial proposals if no specific reference as such had been made. Mr Dennis KWOK considered

that if "an agenda item" was meant to only include the Administration's financial proposals, it should have been clearly provided in the provision. Moreover, members should be able to express views through FCP 37A motions, and such views would be put on record. Mr Jeremy TAM pointed out that members' right to express views on the development of matters under discussion was underlined by the fact that motions could be moved without notice at the meetings. Hence, it should be reasonable for FCP 37A motions to be applicable to any matters discussed by FC and its subcommittees. Referring to the application of FCP 37A "during the deliberation of an agenda item" and that of FCP 39 "when speaking on a proposal", Mr CHAN Chi-chuen asked if there was any inconsistency in the drafting of the two provisions. Mr Charles Peter MOK asked LA to further elaborate the meaning of her view that members could further discuss the scope of application of FCP 37A.

24. LA pointed out that as far as the present FC meeting was concerned, as the agenda item was not a financial proposal from the Administration, pursuant to the original intent of FCP 37A, the relevant provision did not apply to the said agenda item. Nonetheless, if members considered that the scope of application of FCP 37A should not be restricted to FC's consideration of financial proposals from the Administration, members might hold further discussion on the matter, i.e. members could review FCP and consider whether it was necessary to revise the scope of application of the said provision. LA advised that the Chairman had the power to decide on the interpretation of FCP 37A. When interpreting FCP 37A, relevant factors for consideration would be its wording and the background of its inception. As to whether there was any inconsistency in the drafting of FCP 37A and FCP 39, LA said that the two provisions were made against different backgrounds and principles.

The Chairman's decision

25. The Chairman advised that having fully considered LA's explanation, past practices and information set out in the Companion, he came to the view that FCP 37A did not apply to the agenda item of the present special meeting. Dr Fernando CHEUNG raised his objection. Members requested the Chairman to give a written explanation of his decision. The Chairman agreed to the request. Dr CHENG Chung-tai pointed out that the Chairman's approach of disallowing the moving of members' motions under FCP 37A was inconsistent with that adopted by Ms Emily LAU, former FC Chairman, in the handling of similar situations. Dr CHENG considered that it was incumbent upon the Chairman to explain the principles behind his decision to allow the moving of members' motions under FCP 39 to adjourn further discussion or proceedings of FC but not under FCP 37A.

Motion moved by member pursuant to FCP 39 for the adjournment of further proceedings of FC

26. At 12:22 pm, Dr KWOK Ka-ki moved that further proceedings of FC be then adjourned under FCP 39.

27. The Chairman said that a motion for the adjournment of further proceedings of FC was moved at the special meeting held on 5 January 2018. While 13 members had spoken the day before on the adjournment motion, it was not put to vote as the time was up for the meeting. The Chairman cited the revised RoP 40(4) which provided that where the Chairman was of the opinion that the moving of the adjournment of proceedings was an abuse of procedure, he might decide not to propose the question or to put the question forthwith without debate. He opined that when handling members' motions to adjourn further proceedings of FC under FCP 39, reference should also be made to the revised RoP 40(4). In this connection, the Chairman was of the opinion that as Dr KWOK Ka-ki's adjournment motion was moved less than 24 hours from the preceding one on 5 January 2018, and there was no significant development in FC's deliberation on those two days, he therefore held that the moving of such an adjournment motion by Dr KWOK was suspectedly an abuse of procedure. The Chairman directed that members who had not spoken on the motion to adjourn further proceedings of FC on 5 January 2018 might speak once on Dr KWOK's adjournment motion.

28. Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr KWONG Chun-yu, Ms Claudia MO and Dr Fernando CHEUNG criticized the Chairman's decision and direction. They did not agree with the Chairman's view about the lack of significant development for they held that at today's meeting, Mr Dennis KWOK had raised the points about the legal status of FCP and the Chairman's interpretation of FCP 37A, which were both important yet undecided issues. Mr CHU Hoi-dick asked whether the consideration about an abuse of procedure was only applicable to the Chairman's handling of motions for the adjournment of further proceedings of FC; if so, whether members could still move motions for the adjournment of discussion on the item under FCP 39. The Chairman advised that members could still move motions to adjourn discussion on an agenda item in the course of its discussion.

29. There being no request to speak, the Chairman put to vote the motion for the adjournment of further proceedings of FC. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. The Chairman declared that 13 members voted in favour of and 28 members voted against the adjournment motion, and the motion was negatived. The votes of individual members were set out in the **Annex**.

Movers of the Original Motions speaking on the Amending Motions

30. After the motion for the adjournment of further proceedings of FC was vetoed, the Chairman invited, in the absence of Mr Michael TIEN, the mover of the 1st Original Motion, Mr CHU Hoi-dick to speak on the Amending Motions.

31. Mr CHU Hoi-dick explained to members why it was necessary to provide a notice period requirement for the holding of FC special meetings. Separately, regarding the four Amending Motions on the 1st Original Motion which were ruled to be in order by the Chairman, Mr CHU considered that they could all serve to improve the procedures proposed in the said Original Motion and hence, were worthy of support by members regardless of the differences among various political factions. Mr CHU also expressed agreement with Mr IP Kin-yuen's views.

Motion to adjourn discussion on the agenda item

32. At 12:50 pm, Mr CHU Hoi-dick moved under FCP 39 that discussion on the agenda item be adjourned. The Chairman proposed the question and directed that each member might speak once on the motion for not more than three minutes.

33. Mr CHU Hoi-dick explained the reasons for his motion to adjourn discussion on the agenda item as follows:

- (a) he considered the notice period stipulated by the Chairman for the moving of members' motions on the Handling Procedure too short;
- (b) the voting arrangement on the Original Motions and Amending Motions was unsatisfactory;

- (c) he was unconvinced about the rationale behind the Chairman's ruling that certain proposed motions or amending motions were out of order; and
- (d) he held that the Chairman should duly consider the views expressed by Mr James TO and Mr Dennis KWOK concerning the legal status of FCP.

34. Speaking in support of the motion to adjourn discussion on the agenda item, Ms Claudia MO also expressed dissatisfaction about the Chairman's way of handling the present special meeting and his decision to disallow the moving of members' motions under FCP 37A.

35. Mr Paul TSE said that he could hardly understand why the Chairman had allowed Mr CHU Hoi-dick to move the motion for the adjournment of discussion on the item. Mr TSE held that should the motion be passed, the actual effect would be no different from the passage of a motion for the adjournment of further proceedings of FC.

36. The Chairman explained that if he did not allow the member to move his motion for the adjournment of discussion on the agenda item, some members would certainly raise numerous points of order, which also took time to handle. Moreover, the Chairman added that the handling and voting arrangements of the motions were in line with those of the Legislative Council meetings. He held that movers of the Original Motions and Amending Motions had had enough time to lobby support from other members of the same. The Chairman said that he had earlier listened to LA's views on the matter and already explained to members his decision of not allowing members to move FCP 37A motions at the present special meeting. He had nothing further to add.

[Post-meeting note: The Legal Service Division's note responding to Mr Dennis KWOK's enquiry (LC Paper No. LS22/17-18) and the information note prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat on issues raised by members at the special meetings held on 5 and 6 January 2018 (LC Paper No. FC106/17-18) were issued to members vide LC Paper No. FC107/17-18 on 12 January 2018.]

37. The meeting ended at 1 pm.

點名表決DIVISION: 1
日期 DATE: 06/01/2018
時間 TIME: 12:42:45 下午 PM

動議 MOTION: 動議委員會現即休會
Motion that further proceedings of the Committee be now adjourned

動議人 MOVED BY:

出席 Present : 42
投票 Vote : 41
贊成 Yes : 13
反對 No : 28
棄權 Abstain : 0
結果 Result : 否決 Negatived

個別表決如下 THE INDIVIDUAL VOTES WERE AS FOLLOWS:

議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE	議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE
陳健波	CHAN Kin-por	出席	PRESENT	黃碧雲	Dr Helena WONG		
涂謹申	James TO			葉建源	IP Kin-yuen		
梁耀忠	LEUNG Yiu-chung	贊成	YES	葛珮帆	Dr Elizabeth QUAT	反對	NO
石禮謙	Abraham SHEK			廖長江	Martin LIAO		
張宇人	Tommy CHEUNG			潘兆平	POON Siu-ping	反對	NO
李國麟	Prof Joseph LEE	贊成	YES	蔣麗芸	Dr CHIANG Lai-wan	反對	NO
林健鋒	Jeffrey LAM	反對	NO	盧偉國	Ir Dr LO Wai-kyok	反對	NO
黃定光	WONG Ting-kyong	反對	NO	鍾國斌	CHUNG Kwok-pan	反對	NO
李慧琼	Starry LEE	反對	NO	楊岳橋	Alvin YEUNG		
陳克勤	CHAN Hak-kan	反對	NO	尹兆堅	Andrew WAN	贊成	YES
梁美芬	Dr Priscilla LEUNG	反對	NO	朱凱迪	CHU Hoi-dick	贊成	YES
黃國健	WONG Kwok-kin	反對	NO	吳永嘉	Jimmy NG		
葉劉淑儀	Mrs Regina IP			何君堯	Dr Junius HO	反對	NO
謝偉俊	Paul TSE	反對	NO	何啟明	HO Kai-ming	反對	NO
毛孟靜	Claudia MO	贊成	YES	林卓廷	LAM Cheuk-ting		
田北辰	Michael TIEN			周浩鼎	Holden CHOW	反對	NO
何俊賢	Steven HO	反對	NO	邵家輝	SHIU Ka-fai	反對	NO
易志明	Frankie YICK	反對	NO	邵家臻	SHIU Ka-chun	贊成	YES
胡志偉	WU Chi-wai			柯創盛	Wilson OR	反對	NO
姚思榮	YIU Si-wing	反對	NO	容海恩	YUNG Hoi-yan	反對	NO
馬逢國	MA Fung-kyok			陳沛然	Dr Pierre CHAN		
莫乃光	Charles Peter MOK	贊成	YES	陳振英	CHAN Chun-ying		
陳志全	CHAN Chi-chuen	贊成	YES	陳淑莊	Tanya CHAN		
陳恒鑌	CHAN Han-pan	反對	NO	張國鈞	CHEUNG Kwok-kwan		
梁志祥	LEUNG Che-cheung	反對	NO	許智峯	HUI Chi-fung		
梁繼昌	Kenneth LEUNG			陸頌雄	LUK Chung-hung	反對	NO
麥美娟	Alice MAK	反對	NO	劉國勳	LAU Kwok-fan	反對	NO
郭家麒	Dr KWOK Ka-ki	贊成	YES	劉業強	Kenneth LAU	反對	NO
郭偉強	KWOK Wai-keung	反對	NO	鄭松泰	Dr CHENG Chung-tai	贊成	YES
郭榮鏗	Dennis KWOK	贊成	YES	鄭俊宇	KWONG Chun-yu	贊成	YES
張華峰	Christopher CHEUNG			譚文豪	Jeremy TAM		
張超雄	Dr Fernando CHEUNG	贊成	YES				

秘書 CLERK

