



**Hong Kong University Students' Union Council,**  
**Session 2013**  
**5<sup>th</sup> Council Meeting [CM5]**  
**Minutes**

Date: 5/7/2013 (Fri)

Venue: Union Council Chamber, 2/F, Union Building

Time: 19:12

**Attendance:**

CC, HS, P, IVP, EVP, GS, FS, EAS1, EAS2, SWS, CAS, AS, SAP, ICAP, CAP, RSA1, RICA1 (Early Leave with apology), RICA2, RCA1 (Early Leave with apology), RCA2, HHR\* (Early Leave with apology), LCHHR (Early Leave with apology), LHHR, LHTHR, LSKHR, MHR\*, RCLHR, RHR (Early Leave with apology), SCSHR (Early Leave with apology), SJCR, SKYLHR, STHR, SWHR, UHR, WLHR, ASR, AAR (sub), BEAR (Early Leave with apology), DSR, EDSR, ENSR, LAR, MSR, SSSR (sub), CTVC

**Late:**

ECU (without apology), PC2 (without apology, early leave with apology),

**Absent:**

UAS1 (with apology), PPS (with apology), SS (with apology), RSA2 (with apology), SSR (with apology), PP (without apology), PC1 (with apology), PC3 (With apology), PC4 (with apology), PC5 (with apology)

0. Meeting called to order and Sing the Union Song

**Section A**

1. To read out the correspondences

**Absent**

- UAS1 would be absent due to academic program.
- SS would be absent since she is in Singapore.
- PPS would be absent since she is not in HK.
- RSA2 would be absent due to overseas internship.
- SSR would be absent due to society functions.

- PC1 would be absent due to overseas internship.
- PC3 would be absent due to personal issues.
- PC4 would be absent due to family issues.
- PC5 would be absent due to overseas internship.

#### Substitution

- RCA2 would be substituted by Ching Kam Hung, Internal Deputy President of Cultural Association, HKUSU.
- AAR would be substituted by Mr. Chan Lit Man, Floppy, the chairman of Arts Association, H.K.U.S.U.
- SSSR would be substituted by Au Wai Chung, the Academic Secretary of Social Sciences Society, HKUSU. (UID 3035064533)

#### Late

- CAP would arrive late at 10pm due to internship.
- RICA1 would arrive late at 8pm due to working issues.
- LCHHR would arrive late at 8pm due to family matter.
- LSKHR would arrive late at 8pm due to family issues.
- RHR would arrive late at 7:30pm due to internship.
- SWHR would arrive late at 9pm due to preparation for the pre camp tomorrow.

#### Early Leave

- SAP would leave early at 2am due to preparation of hall function.
- RCA1 would leave early at 2am due to preparation of part time job.
- HHR would leave early at 1am due to preparation of society function.
- LCHHR would leave early at 12am since he needed to attend a camp the next morning.
- SCSHR would leave early at 2am due to hall's touch camp the next day.
- RHR would leave early at 2am for upcoming hall function.
- BEAR would leave early at 9 pm for preparation of the upcoming Society function.
- PC2 would leave early at 10pm due to family issues.

#### 2. To receive the maiden speech of new councillor(s)

- SWS introduced himself as a Year 2 student of Account & Finance. The largest project of his year plan would be setting up an online second hand book trading platform, while he was currently working on a notebook tendering program.
- SAP described it as fortunate that he did not have a chance right at the beginning of the Council session to deliver his maiden speech, since he could really speak with experience. He asked for the councillors' understanding to use only voting right, because don't want to misrep all SA organizations

#### 3. To report the motion(s) carried by circulation

- CC reported that there was originally 1 motion pending for passage by circulation, but due to the objection of EDSR, it was at last discussed and passed in ECM5.

4. To receive and adopt the agenda

Motion 1

To receive and adopt the agenda of CM5.

Proposer: TANG Laurence Yat Long (P)

Seconder: WONG Zoi Lam (EAS2)

Time Received: 19:23

No objection.

Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 19:23

5. To receive and adopt the minutes of CM4 and ECM5

Motion 2

To receive and adopt the minutes of CM4 and ECM5.

Proposer: TANG Laurence Yat Long (P)

Seconder: WONG Zoi Lam (EAS2)

Time Received: 19:24

No objection.

Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 19:24

**Section B**

1. To endorse the constitution and the affiliation of Chinese Orchestra and American Society

- RCA1 reported that the affiliation and the proposed constitution of the Chinese Orchestra were approved in CA council last month.

Motion 3

To endorse the constitution and affiliation of Chinese Orchestra.

Proposer: KWONG Wai Ting (RCA1)  
Seconder: CHING Kam Hung (RCA2(sub))

Time Received: 19:28

No objection.

Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 19:29

- AAR(sub) reported that 50% of students who took American Studies cosigned to show their support towards the setting up the American Society. passed in AA council

#### Motion 4

To endorse the constitution and affiliation of American Society, HKUSU.

Proposer: CHAN Lit Man (AAR(sub))

Seconder: LI Chee Wing (LAR)

Time Received: 19:30

No objection.

Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 19:30

## 2. To discuss the selection of the next University's Vice-Chancellor

- Speaking rights was granted to 2011 UAS Mr. Wong Tik Lung (黃迪龍).
- WONG introduced him as a member of the committee of electing vice chancellor and the composition of the committee would be a chairman who was the university treasurer, a secretary, a professor from the humanity subjects and science subjects respectively, the Dean of Student Affairs, Dr. Albert Chau, the representative of alumni, the representative of officers and the representative of students who would be Wong himself.  
Firstly, concerning reason of the incidents happened, in his personal opinion, 818 incident was the beginning of the turmoil. In early Aug, Wong received call from reporters of Economic Daily News, it would be weird for him to respond since he was only UAS, he asked him to call P'11. He evaluated that the matter should have been reported and discussed in Facebook group for Central Ex-cos, and considered the negligence as mistake which responsibility shall be upheld. He believed that there could be 2 methods of petitioning or reception, which would be either inside the venue or outside the venue, but should not have done both, i.e. it was a mistake to have P'11 speaking inside the venue and CAS'11 protesting outside. This incident would have been the main reason for Mr. Tsui Lap Chee to give up in renewing his contract. He considered that as a pity, since Tsui was such a good school leader, and he was so sorry that the flash lamp by the press at the following night assembly had cost permanent damage to Mr. Tsui's eyes. He personally considered that to be

CAS'11's mistake, as he had never mentioned to any of the then ex-cos of the actions he planned to take that night, and it also made him consider that CAS'11 was an untrustworthy person. Since there had been no fixed mechanism to elect a vice chancellor, he wanted to make good use of the opportunity to be appointed into the committee and put in effort for fostering a regular electoral method. He discussed with P'11 and heard that CAS'11 would like to run for the post, which he personally could not tolerate, so he decided to run himself. He believed that he could function better than CAS'11, since CAS'11 studied political science while he studied science, and he considered that political science would not be an actual science.

Secondly, he concluded on how the report was generated. The methodology would be interviewing the 3rd person passed by a certain spot, to avoid the similarity in sampling when a group of friends in similar background passed by, and non-local would not be unintentionally excluded. To ensure the quality, he collected the opinion himself.

Thirdly, the results of the investigation would be that, apart from having the chancellor, 1 professor chosen from humanity and science subjects respectively to look for appropriate candidate, he believed students should also have representative. Nevertheless, the Committee members used excuses to avoid having student representatives, and he eventually gave up since members did not care actually according to the results of the investigation. He reported to HKU council before the HKUSU council, due to the turmoil on legitimacy in Session 2012. He indicated that it was only part of the report, since the remaining was written by other members of the committee, and they were very brief and useless in his opinion. He highlighted the last sentence on the second last page, i.e. the personal wish that Mr. Tsui could be appointed as Vice Chancellor again, it was not an opinion collected in the investigation, but he wished that the HKU Council could have received such message through this report.

- P asked for more details of the confidentiality requirement mentioned.
- WONG stated that actually a confidentiality agreement had been signed. If asked by reporters, he would only mention personal opinion, since he was not the chairman.
- P commented that Dr. Leung Chi Hung had already sent out a mass email, which mentioned about the details of the committee meeting, he would keep releasing message on the affairs. There would be no need to worry about HKU repeating the mistake found in The Lingnan University at this stage, since many non-school side members were currently in the committee, including staff and students in the 11-person committee. He asked if WONG had any suggestion to him, as a student representative.
- WONG quoted his experience of having done a questionnaire, with great open end questions. He suggested P to have a random selection when collecting opinion, like in campus interview/ phone calls.
- EDSR suggested expanding member base and believed that open end questions still had limitation.
- WONG suggested that councillors should make use of this chance to comment.
- LAR asked what the confidentiality clause would include.
- P pointed out that the candidates' identities shall not be revealed, others would be yet to be discussed.
- WONG was confident that the report would be "representing" but not "being represented".
- P pointed out that only 10 responses were collected, which was a lot less than the orientation series leaders recruited. He wished that councillors could help publicize in their respective

subordinate organizations.

- UHR suggested that the survey should not be biased in any context.
- LAR asked about confidentiality to clarify on the extent that council could help.
- CC wished that P would report frequently, as WONG had done in Session 2012.
- EDSR expressed his wish that ex-cos could report on any concrete criteria they thought of later.

### 3. To discuss the Orientation Affairs

#### i. Orientation Regulation

- RCA1 asked what would be included in 6.3.2, “other than the reasons raised in 6.3.1”.
- AS responded that it would be because of the impossibility to list out all that the clause would be there.

#### Motion 5

To endorse the Orientation Regulation 2013 (迎新守則二零一三年度) .

Proposer: LO John (AS)

Seconder: CHAU Dickson Ka Faat (GS)

Time Received: 20:19

No objection.

Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 20:20

#### ii. Orientation Affairs Arbitration Regulation

- AS stated that there were only changes in the penalty, in which subordinate organizations and academic societies would have the same level of penalty.

#### Motion 6

To endorse the Orientation Affairs Arbitration Regulation 2013. (2013 年度香港大學學生會評議會迎新事情仲裁機制)

Proposer: LO John (AS)

Seconder: CHAU Dickson Ka Faat

Time Received: 20:22

No objection.

Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 20:22

iii. Orientation Affairs Arbitration Committee (OAAC), HKUSUC, Session 2013

Motion 7

To establish Orientation Affairs Arbitration Committee, HKUSU Council, Session 2013. (2013 年度香港大學學生會評議會迎新事情仲裁委員會)

Proposer: LO John (AS)

Seconder: CHAU Dickson Ka Faat (GS)

Time Received: 20:23

No objection.

Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 20:24

- CC asked if the roster would be drawn beforehand.
  - AS stated that it should be released several days before.
4. To receive and adopt the amendment of the Internal Regulation of HKUSU
- GS reminded that “明華綜合大樓 一樓” should be kept.
  - EDSR asked why the lots drawing system adopted in the Orientation period could not be used also in the internal regulation as an usual practice.
  - AS stated that the lots drawing process could only take place after all applications have been received. The online system at this stage could only sustain for 2-3 months. After orientation period, the ex-cos would try to contact outside coordinator to build up a more sustainable system.
  - LAR asked if the old system had been cut, and whether or not the reason of abandoning it the password being stolen.
  - AS explained that the old system was taken away by IVP'12 Ernest Cheung.
  - IVP stated that the old system was with a number of errors.
  - RICA1 asked whether or not outside coordinators would really be needed, since the old system was built up by Ernest Cheung, whether or not it would be feasible for the Ex-cos to build up a system themselves.
  - IVP raised 2 considerations: the first would be the stability of the system without the contracted maintenance service by an outside coordinator, the second would be the possibility for a certain student to take over the whole system even after he ended his term of office.
  - STHR asked how much it would possibly cost if the system was handled by an external organization.
  - AS answered that it would cost at least \$100000. For an amount less than that, the license would stay with them, and a regular maintenance cost would need to be paid from time to time.
  - EDSR asked if it would be crowded at Union Building in September and October. He

suggested doing it as if LSDC.

- AS confessed that that could possibly happen, but September would be still under orientation period, so the existence of queues should be acceptable.
- LAR queried that small societies might have disadvantages in drawing lots, since certain subordinate organizations might be good at generating more applications for lots drawing. And it might still take half a year or even a year to set up new systems.
- GS clarified that Google excel would be the tool used to draw lots at present. Lung (the Union Staff) would do a lot, and release results afterwards.
- AS clarified that 3 months should already be enough to set up a new booking system.

#### Motion 8

To receive and adopt the amendment of the Internal Regulation of HKUSU.

Proposer: TANG Laurence Yat Long (P)

Seconder: WONG Zoi Lam (EAS2)

Time Received: 20:52

No objection.

Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 20:53

#### Motion 9

To put agenda 12 and B13 after agendum B4.

Proposer: CHAU Dickson Ka Faat (GS)

Seconder: WONG Yee Man (IVP)

Time Received: 20:57

No objection.

Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 20:58

#### 5. To discuss the external affairs

- EVP suggested that deliberation day 2 would be held in different organizations. The universities would be the first bunch of organizations holding so, and the temporarily date set would be a Saturday in late September and early October, with promotion to be done in late August. In late July and Aug, street stations would be set up with the assistance of subordinate organizations. Helpers would be recruited among the university students, and at least 100 students in each institute should be recruited, a video will be recorded for the details of universal suffrage.
- UHR asked how many helpers should be recruited, and how should they be recruited.
- EVP said 100 would be recruited in the name of hkusu, and 100 per institute, so it would be 1000 in total.
- LAR asked if discussion groups would be formed in form of random selection or the general



discussion.

- EVP stated that it would not be random selection, but an email invitation.
- RCLHR asked if HKUPOP would help.
- EVP responded that at this stage it would involve HKUSU only, but all external organizations would be welcomed.
- UHR stated that the method of Universal suffrage would be discussed on Deliberation Day 2, in case the results of Deliberation Day 2 did not match with that of GM, while HKUSU already had some stance, e.g. it would be an inborn right to stand for election, which side will be followed.
- EVP confirmed GP having a higher status, and asked if the Council preferred the motion to be compromised on Deliberation Day, or council wrote it with other institutes.
- WLHR asked the ex-cos to evaluate on the possible legal responsibility.
- EVP stated that there might be criminal consequence if a process of influencing people to join in organizing the event was observed, but solely discussion would not.
- RCLHR worried that some helpers might not be able to learn about the responsibility issue, he suggested having them clearly briefed beforehand.
- LAR wished that legal responsibility could be discussed in the council.
- EVP concluded that CAC had consensus that civil disobedience would be acceptable, but not yet had the time to be discussed in council.

6. To endorse the press statement “香港大學學生會七一宣言” issued by Current Affairs Committee, HKUSU Council, Session 2013

- CAS described this statement as short and non-academic, being descriptive on the picture of the society and listed out the possible consequence of the absence of democracy. It was passed on 28/6 in the 3rd ordinary meeting of CAC, then publicized through mass email & Facebook. However it was different from 6.4, in the sense that not much press attention was raised.
- EDSR recommended that split-voting would also be a deep-rooted problem, and there was lack of policy research in policy making.
- CAS stated that the declaration had been brief and concise, which hopefully would raise some response. It would be included in promotion of political reform.

Motion 10

To endorse the press statement “香港大學學生會七一宣言” issued by Current Affairs Committee, HKUSU Council, Session 2013.

Proposer: TANG Laurence Yat Long (P)  
Seconder: WONG Zoi Lam (EAS2)

Time Received: 21:24

No objection.

Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 21:24

Motion 11

To move agendum B7, B10 and B11 after agendum B13.

Proposer: CHAU Dickson Ka Faat (GS)

Seconder: WONG Zoi Lam (EAS2)

Time Received: 21:25

No objection.

Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 21:25

7. To discuss the arrangement of the second By-Election for the Election of Undergraduate Student Memberships to the Board of Faculties 2013

- CC reported that Mr. Wai had said that HKU Council should have sent an email to UEC Chair'12 and CC'13 in April, but both could not receive. A re-election was called and the settlement should not be waited till September.
- Speaking right was granted to Tsui Lee Ka, UEC Chair'12.
- CC stated that the Nomination period should be at least 21 days, which happened to be less in the by-election. Faculty of Business and Economics and Faculty of Engineering had differences from other faculties in terms of regulation. Re-election should happen 7 days after election, which would be impossible now, since the email was not received in April.
- LAR said not much guidelines were given by HKU Council.
- CC stated that it was mentioned in another email that, "if a re-election is necessary, and time limit should be waived, recommendation could be made".
- TSUI stated that it was clear that a re-election was recommended; she requested the council to pass a recommendation.
- P believed it should not be re-election, but a by-election, since 2 months had passed after the by-election already, and the problem lied on the nomination part, if it was re-election with the same candidates in the election, it would be useless.
- TSUI raised that the nomination was endorsed in council together with annual election by-election, so there would be no need to hold another by-election.
- UHR observed shortened nomination in all faculties, and asked if only FBE and Faculty of Engineering need by-election or re-elections should be held for all faculties.
- CC confirmed it would be all faculties.
- DSR asked if it was a by-election, whether it would be handled by UEC'12.
- CC responded that UEC'13 could take that up.
- GS could not understand why it would be a re-election, since re-election could not possibly help remedy the problem of nomination period being too short.
- TSUI clarified that by-election should be used to tackle vacancies, while re-election on remedying mistakes made, so conceptually it should be re-election.

- CC asked if councilors had any objection on holding a re-election.
- TSUI wanted to clarify whether it could start from nomination.
- GS asked for the election regulation of the Undergraduate Membership to the Boards of Faculties as reference. He reinforced that if re-election was chosen, due to having the same candidates, it would be meaningless.
- TSUI stated that reopening the nomination period would actually be very administrative, thus could be waived. She preferred asking for clear clarification from HKU Council.
- P believed that it would be quite clear already that HKU Council did not want to comment much.
- GS believed that HKU Council did not really intend to ask for a re-election/by-election, since no articles on re-election were included.
- CC stated that articles were actually included in the email sent on 23/4.
- GS suggested that waiving stated regulations would not bring good impression.
- TSUI highlighted that it was actually HKU Council who were suggesting waiving the regulations.
- LAR believed that the main point would not be on whether there should be a restart of nomination, but the reason of opening another election.
- TSUI pointed out that if they offered to waive, and the HKUSU Council had made a recommendation to judge whether this was appropriate, it would be illogical not to accept.
- GS preferred sending another email to HKU Council for further suggestion.

#### 8. To receive and adopt the amendment of the Financial Regulation of HKUSU

- FS introduced that the value of previous years was used as base value. For the Original 1, it was calculated using the accumulative CPI, while in the Original 2, the CPI was added year by year. UFC preferred using original 1 and suggested amending every 3 years for inflation. In 2013-2015, the expenses on funding subordinate organizations would be 830 thousands. Afterwards, it would be considered again year by year. He suggested putting in the Financial Regulation that CPI should be considered.
- RICA2 quoted from the previous acting financial secretary that the lump sum of current year should be calculated by lump sum of last year  $\times (1 + \text{CPI})$ .
- FS identified that as the difference between reality and ideal. He described this method of calculation as very rare. He also stated that even introducing increase in membership fee would make not much difference, since membership fee made up only a very little proportion.
- RICA2 wished that the funding could hopefully be reviewed in the following year.
- EDSR asked if it would be possible to change the review once every 3 years system into an annual review.
- FS stated that if the lump sum of funding was reviewed every year, 3% may sound reasonable, but after 3 years, accumulatively it might have added 10%, causing heavy financial burden to the Union.
- RCA2(sub) suggested that not only membership fee could be reviewed, but also the rental.
- IVP defined that 2-3 years of rental contract had been signed.
- RCA2(sub) commented that the average 3% per year might be too little.
- FS pointed out that the Union could not support a greater increase, as presumably it could not raise membership fee.
- RCA2(sub) pointed out that FS had conflict in himself. He could not understand that, if

membership fee was not making up a big proportion, why this presumption would be important.

- FS explained that membership fee made up less than 50%, but of course the total income would be larger than the 830 thousands.
- SAP asked for the criteria to decide on whether to review every 3 years or each year.
- GS explained that if every 3-year adjustment was chosen, there would be a huge change on the base value. In this system, actual value actually changed every year, only in 3 years' time base value must stay the same and vary within 10%.
- SJCR clarified it as compound interest.
- FS raised another suggestion of adding one co-operative store staff's signature to SWS' for purchase of goods.
- PC2 asked how much money co-operative store used last year.
- FS explained that record had not yet been received from the financial office, but with reference to the goods, it must have been a great sum.
- SWS pointed out that actually the lump sum is not the main point, but the "dead goods" the ex-cos of Session 2012 purchased caused great burden to the store, so he thought it would be necessary to monitor on the type of goods ex-cos purchased.
- FS added in a contingency amount to rationalize the contingency expense. The expense to issue the "Black Gold Statement" in 818 incident was put into the items in contingency expense. For fundraising, the correct procedure should be handing in proposal to UFC, but it should not only be binding on union subordinate organizations, but also union ex-cos, thus he suggested removing "fundraising" in 3.11, making the regulation more reasonable.
- LAR asked if there would be any specific consequence apart from reporting.
- GS confirmed that it would be necessary to get approval from UFC before actually carrying out the fundraising.
- LAR asked how about those did not intend to make profit but eventually generated profit, whether or not it would be equal to having no consequence.
- GS considered it as a bug, and suggested letting UFC to further discuss, the only change to make on this would be expanding the coverage to union ex-cos this time.

#### Motion 12

To receive and adopt the amendment of the Financial Regulation of HKUSU.

Proposer: TANG Laurence Yat Long (P)

Secunder: WONG Zoi Lam (EAS2)

Time Received: 23:48

No objection.

Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 23:48

9. To discuss the Union Finance

i. Union Budget

- FS asked councilors to refer to the version of 19:00 last night. There would be difference between on book and actual numbers. If there is 1 more vacant shop, it would generate more income, so the number would be 4000000+540000. He reminded that the 436000 did not include \$800000 legal expenses. For welfare, it included Union diary and welfare week products. For council, it had already included the expenses for both elections handled by Allen or and Vanessa Tsui. He further introduced the expenses of 3As. In the case of SA, \$~230000 was reduced to \$~70000, because some did not claim in the previous years. For CA, some did not hand in the receipt. For ICA, \$ 190000 was the estimated number, it was reminded that only 23.17% was claimed the previous year. He moved on to some general expenses, for example on the photocopy machines in the glass room, although the Union was paying for it monthly, but no income had been generated at this stage and they might not be used in the future, with around \$4000000 lost on book, the actual loss was around \$~1000000. And the electricity cost had increased from \$200000 to 800000 last year, after moving to the centennial campus. Especially at the two points of Apr'12 and Jan'13, the bank balance dropped a lot, \$380000 expense was spent on "black gold statement". For the HKU 100 Catering, it referred to the Centennial Dinner, however he could not confirm if all entrance fee had been collected, or the reasons for such a huge expense. For the Union Development Fund, he would try to delay payment, with \$1700000 yet to be paid. The last resolution would be selling investment, but it would affect University Treasurer, so not preferred. He reminded subordinate organizations that financial regulation was not being complied with from time to time. For example in the FRAM, SA's proposal exceeded last year by \$76452.
- SAP opposed to using last year's amount as a reason to discourage this year's sports clubs.
- ICAP hoped not to sacrifice the amount sub orgs spend on organizing committees.
- FS clarified that he used actual expense as reference, but not last year's amount. He discussed with SA financial secretary for some unreasonable expenses, like travel cost over a thousand dollars for one single event, and also coach fee which was unreasonably expensive. SA actually did not need that much in his observance, so the amount was transferred to ICA
- ICAP expressed that as a councillor, she considered that as acceptable, but clubs might not accept "mutually exclusive" as a reason for cutting budget.
- RSA1 asked if the sports clubs spent more in the previous year, whether or not they could have more pleasant budget this year.
- FS stated that actually the expense of SA was not that little, it was only because they happened not to claim at last.
- ECU stated that it was due to the miscommunication between honorary treasurer, FS and Undergrad executives in Session 2012, that caused the budget of 2012 to have been reduced, \$~200000 would be the regular expenses apart from last year, the cost of cutting was the cancellation of one issue.
- FS pointed out that the long term fund was with less limitation, so he still would like to suggest Undergrad to make good use of it,
- P pointed out that union exco'12 did not put in effort to cut increase income, but this year the Union Ex-cos did put in effort. He requested 3As also put in efforts, and found it unreasonable to ask FS to help explaining to their clubs.
- CTVC also pointed out that they had tried every way to cut expenses. He found it really rare for Campus Media to collect money, but he would still do so.
- CAP found it unfair to comment that CA did not try their best to increase income, as they did

not aim at earning money. He quoted examples that some of the CA Clubs spent \$100000, but only claimed about \$10000.

- SAP agreed that the sum of this year had been fixed and not intended to ask for changes, but he hoped that the concept of copying last year's number to fix this year's budget would not be flowed to next session.
- GS insisted that last year's number had reference effect, and requested SA Council to investigate.
- CC asked whether or not the Union Council should bear the electoral cost by the "UEC" led by Or Man Chun.
- IVP asked if the cost of ex-cos printing ballots themselves included.
- FS said that he used invoice as reference.
- GS pointed out that he found some letters sent to Union Building 1/F, entitled to Honkou Services, so it was probably included.
- DSR asked if the electoral subsidy to candidates was included in the sum.
- P believed that it should not be borne by HKUSU, as if a staff who had done something ridiculous and extra, not required by boss, he could not understand why it should be claimed.
- DSR believed that no matter what, electoral subsidy should be paid, since the candidates were innocent.
- LAR pointed out that some of the expense was spent before rejecting their legitimacy, they should be recovered.
- CC provided information that Allen Or was vacated in ECM9. The printing cost for ballots would not be claimed, after abandoning the original UEC. For the Electoral Subsidy, it could be decided at the discretion of UFC, in contingency.
- RCLHR asked for the reason of it to be put in the category of contingency.
- FS explained that it should not be a regular expense, letting UFC decide would ensure flexibility.
- RCLHR asked what if a re-election was held for the Undergraduate Membership to the Boards of Faculties at last, would the budget be included.
- FS amended the item into "/Re-election".
- GS suggested that the words "led by Tsui Lee Ka" should be cancelled, since it was the legitimate one, no need to specify.
- ECU clarified the bottom line of Undergrad is the sufficiency for publishing 5 issues, and pointed out that it was already less frequent and having less pages than other institutes. He highlighted that a Campus Media should provide with students with publication of good quality. The executives were already paying themselves, and he could not accept general expense to be borne in this way.
- FS pointed out that the Union Finance would be unbearable if media further added budget.
- ICAP stated that the cutting from \$230000 to \$190000 was already a compromise.
- RSA1 stated that the past executives of SA were also paying themselves. When the budget of Session 2013 was first handed in, it was over \$500000 and already being severely cut upon.
- AS pointed out 2 main points: For the initial budget of \$500000, a proportion of that was against the Financial regulation; SA fin sec did not attend any of the 3 UFC meetings.
- RCA2(sub) disliked using the word "sacrifice", he considered that only as a compromise.
- CC asked councilors to only comment on the ratio.

- DSR queried if the problem would be not enough discussion in UFC.
- FS pointed out that actually the discussion in UFC was very repetitive already.
- EVP pointed out that media was already at a passive role with highly limited budget.
- CAP agreed to stick to the present distribution. He considered the increase in media budget as acceptable, since he agreed that last year was a special situation.
- SAP still found it difficult to explain to the Sports clubs.
- ECU highlighted that it should be rule by system, not men.
- SWS suggested giving sponsors to subordinate organizations, and promised to help as much as possible.

#### Motion 13

To receive and adopt Union Budget 2013.

Proposer: HSU Yin Man (FS)

Seconder: WONG Yee Man (IVP)

Time Received: 02:29

No objection.

Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 02:29

- ICAP regretted that some of the wordings ex-cos used might not be respecting subordinate organizations. She found that there was discrepancy when ICA Clubs communicate with ICA council and ICA Ex-cos.
- FS felt sorry and highlighted that the comment was not intended to be pointing at anyone, but 3As financial secretaries were really working a bit slow. He hoped that other representatives from 3As could also help.

#### ii. The application of Union Development Fund by Campus TV

- Speaking right was granted to the CTV Vice Chairperson (Outlet Development), Mr. Poon.
- CTVC introduced that the system was installed 6/7 years ago and only 2 out of 8 were still functioning. CTV nearly had no television sets in campus. They had quoted 3 companies, with the most inexpensive plan costing \$256000-282000 (10% buffer).
- EDSR asked if they had only quoted price or also the qualities.
- CTVC pointed out site visit and recommendation had also been included towards the plan.
- POON pointed out they had actually sent out 6 requests for quotation, in which only 4 replied.
- IVP asked when the payment would need to be done, and what if there were damages made.
- CTVC responded that the payment should be settled within a month after the installation has been finished. For those installed outdoor, e.g. the one outside main library, they would be stored in waterproof cages.
- MSR asked for the proposed lifespan.

- POON replied that it would be 10 years according to quotation.
- LAR asked if CTV had ever considered splitting the installation plan into phases, she would like to know if it would be more costly.
- CTVC stated that it would be around \$20000 more expensive, which CTV could accept if the Council agreed.
- POON explained that the extra cost would go to the extra travelling cost of the construction workers at the site.
- MSR asked if there would be any cedars fund applicable.
- CTVC stated that they had applied but had been rejected, since CEDARS could not benefit much from the installation.
- EDSR believed that the quotation from 3 companies would not be enough.
- POON stated that they had already tried the best, and the price was even almost half-cut after all discussion.
- AAR (sub) asked if there could be any data provided on the popularity of CTV.
- CTVC stated that it would be difficult to count, since without television sets, CTV could only function like a YouTube channel.
- SWS shared that with his past experience, the response of quotation was quite good already. But he heard some sponsor offer which could be even cheaper. He would like to see if councillors considered the price now to be acceptable, or else he could help enquiring.
- CTVC said that he was happy to hear that but he reminded that the plan could not wait for long.
- ECU asked SWS if there would possibly be any sponsor in printing.
- SWS stated that he could help in searching.

#### Motion 14

To approve the application of Union Development Fund by Campus TV, HKUSU.

Proposer: MOK Ka Hei (CTVC)

Seconder: LEUNG Kai Ping (ECU)

Time Received: 03:07

No objection.

Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 03:08

#### 10. A.O.B.

- EVP introduced the work of the representative of HKUSU to the Joint Committee on Student Finance (JCSF) as having meeting once a year. Last year, PP (the then P) was appointed without approval from Union Council.

#### Motion 15

To appoint CHOW YONG KANG ALEX (UID: 3035018721) as the representative of HKUSU to the Joint Committee on Student Finance (JCSF).



Proposer: WONG Zoi Lam (EAS2)  
Seconder: TANG Laurence Yat Long (P)

Time Received: 04:30

No objection.

Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 04:31

- P reported the progress of the Labor Tribunal Case with Mr. Jason Lam: Allen Or took the authorization letter to pretend to be the defendant. Jason asked for \$50000, he had already prepared cheques of around \$20000 before attending the hearing. The judge held a pile of newspapers and asked Lam what did he want and asked him to prepare the documents required before attending hearings.
- CC pointed out that 15 days prior notice had already been given and reminded councilors that attending CM should be a responsibility. She also expressed her discontent with councillors not reading working papers beforehand.
- The meeting ended at 6/7/2013 4:39am.

Prepared by,

Approved by,

---

Leung Lai Kwok Yvonne  
Honorary Secretary  
HKUSU Council, Session 2013

---

Li Wai Yan, Vivian  
Council Chairperson  
HKUSU Council, Session 2013