



Hong Kong University Students' Union Council,
Session 2013
2nd Emergency Council Meeting [ECM2]
Minutes

Date: 28/4/2013 (Sun)

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

Time: 10:20

Attendance:

CC, HS, P, IVP, EVP, GS, UAS1, EAS1, EAS2, SWS, PPS, SS, CAS, AS, ICAP, CAP, RSA2, RICA1, RICA2, RCA2(sub), HHR*, LHHR, LHTHR, LSKHR, MHR*, RCLHR, RHR(sub), SCSHR(sub), SKYLHR, STHR, SWHR, UHR, WLHR, ASR, AAR, BEAR, DSR, EDSR, ENSR, LAR, MSR, SSR, SSSR, ECU(early leave with apology), CTVC, PC1, PC4, PC5(early leave with apology)

Late:

FS (without apology), SAP (without apology), RSA1 (with apology), LCHHR (with apology), SJCR(without apology), PC3(with apology)

Absent:

RCA1 (with apology), PP (without apology), PC2 (with apology)

0. Meeting called to order and Sing the Union Song

Section A

1. To read out the correspondences

- RCA1 would be absent due to part time job.
- RCA2 would be substituted by Mr. Ching Kam Hung, the Internal Deputy President of CA.
- RSA1 would be late.
- LCHHR would arrive at 12 noon due to sudden family issue.
- MHR needed to leave early at 5:30 pm due to Morrison Hall High Table Dinner.
- RHR would be substituted by Mr. Leung Tit Hei Nixon, the Honorary Secretary of RHSA.
- SCSHR would be substituted by Mr. Tong Cheuk Hang Billy, the Sports Secretary of SCSHSA.

- ECU needed to leave at 1 pm due to important family issue.
- PC2 would be absent due to important family issue.
- PC3 would be late due to private tutorial class.
- PC5 needed to leave early at 2 pm due to personal matters.

2. To receive and adopt the agenda

- AAR suggested that since AECU, Mr. Wong Chun Kit Keyvin had withdrawn his resignation, agendum B6 should be changed “To discuss the resignation of Wong Chun Kit Keyvin (UID: 3035050066) as the Assistant Editor-in Chief of the Undergrad, HKUSU, Session 2013”.

Motion 1

To amend agendum B6 to “To discuss the resignation of Wong Chun Kit Keyvin (UID: 3035050066) as the Assistant Editor-in Chief of the Undergrad, HKUSU, Session 2013”.

Proposer: NG Wai Ka (AAR)

Seconder: LI Chee Wing (LAR)

Time Received: 10:28

No objection.

Resolution: Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 10:29

Motion 2

To receive and adopt the amended agenda.

Proposer: LI Chee Wing (LAR)

Seconder: NG Wai Ka (AAR)

Time Received: 10:29

No objection.

Resolution: Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 10:36

Motion 3

To switch agendum B6 to B1, agendum B7 to B5 and agendum B6 to B7.

Proposer: NG Wai Ka (AAR)

Seconder: LI Chee Wing (LAR)

Time Received: 10:35

No objection

Resolution: Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 10:36

- ECU consulted that since he needed to leave at 1pm, but wanted to be involved in the discussion regarding AECU's resignation, he requested changing the agendum to B5.
- CC explained that since original agenda B1-3 might be time consuming, she suggested changing it to B1 instead.
- SWS wished to move agendum B7 to an earlier time, since he wished to leave early.
- CC decided that agendum B1 would be discussion on the resignation of AECU, B2 would be the discussion of Union financial dispute, B3 would be the discussion of handover dispute, B4 would be the discussion on the statement, B5 would be the establishment of the tendering committee for notebook program, B6 would be the endorsement of the affiliation of IEA, then finally B7 would be the discussion on membership of UEC.

Section B

1. To discuss the resignation of Wong Chun Kit Keyvin (UID: 3035050066) as the Assistant Editor-in Chief of the Undergrad, HKUSU, Session 2013
 - ECU regretted that the resignation was sent before consensus was achieved among the executive committee. Another request of withdrawing the resignation was sent on 27/4. He quoted the Union Constitution Section X Article 5 RESIGNATION that, there were 2 prerequisites to be satisfied before the resignation took effect, i.e. written notice given to CC and a motion should be passed in Union Council by 2/3 majority. However in this case, there was no written notice and the resignation had not yet been carried by a motion, so it should not have any effects taken. Despite that the resignation was withdrawn at last, he would move a regret motion with the identity as ECU.
 - PC5 asked for an interpretation of a written notice, and why an email was not defined as a written notice.
 - GS reminded that councillors'12 sent request for a council meeting to Tam Chun Sing, CC'12 through e-mail, there was even a motion passed to adopt that as a written notice.
 - CC provided information that there was a member who originally ran for PC sending an e-mail to withdraw nomination, the Council passed a motion to adopt his withdrawal. She also suggested that even councillors nowadays sent correspondence through e-mail to satisfy the "written apology" condition stipulated in the By-Laws.
 - AAR believed the discussion on whether there should be a regret motion should be done later, the Council should first discuss on whether AECU could withdraw a resignation.
 - RHR(sub) wanted to invite Mr. Wong to explain the reason of resignation and withdrawal.
 - CC suggested councillors to discuss on the procedures first.
 - PC5 quoted that since the constitution stipulated that "written notice of resignation address to Council Chairperson", he believed that CC could have the decisive power in determining whether or not it was a written notice.
 - CC stated that "written notice" also appeared in the By-laws, so she could not decide.

- LSKHR agreed with GS that, it would be unreasonable if the councillors revoke themselves.
- ECU suggested that using the same means to address and withdraw the resignation, i.e. e-mail to the whole council, has complied with law principle that, it would be sufficient to communicate the revocation of the offer by the same means the offer was made (*Shuey v US 92 US 73 (1875)*).
- PC5 believed that the case of unilateral contract in law of contract would be irrelevant here.
- SSSR suggest that the councillors should first take note of the reason for withdrawal.
- AAR believed that if a motion could be withdrawn, this should also apply to other notices.
- GS differentiated the two by suggesting that withdrawal of motion was actually stated in by-law. In Session 2012, CC'12 also withdrew notices for meeting, which set a negative precedent for council practices, so he believed that it should be discussed with a motion.

Motion 4

To receive and adopt the resignation of Wong Chun Kit Keyvin (UID:3035050066) as the Assistant Editor-in-Chief of the Undergrad, HKUSU, Session 2013.

Proposer: WONG Yee Man (IVP)

Seconder: CHAU Dickson Ka Faat (GS)

Time Received: 10:49

Resolution: Withdrawn

Motion 5

To withdraw motion 4.

Proposer: LI Chee Wing (LAR)

Seconder: NG Chi Hin (EDSR)

Time Received: 10:57

No objection

Resolution: Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 10:59

- AAR agreed that the Union Council should have the rights to decide whether or not a resignation could be withdrawn, the main point lied on council's decisive power.
- ASR wanted AECU to provide reasons for his resignation.
- UHR suggested that the council should discuss on the power to the applicant to withdraw his own resignation first.
- SKYLHR believed the motion should only focus whether he could withdraw his resignation.
- PC5 acknowledged that his withdrawal could only be passed with a motion with 2/3 majority.
- CC clarified that motion 4 would be passed with 2/3 majority if no councillors had other opinion.
- GS hoped it could be discussed in a whole, since he believed that everyone had different concern on whether his resignation should be adopted, some might want him to stay because

of his ability, some might consider his withdrawal as legitimate, so they could just be discussed under one single motion.

- CC emphasized that the discussion on procedural justice should be settled first.
- RCLHR suggested also that the discussion on whether or not the withdrawal could be valid without going through council should be done first.
- CC wanted the focus of discussion to be on whether the council would adopt such a way to withdraw resignation.
- MSR wanted to grant a speaking right to AECU for explanation.
- LSKHR asked for the reason of granting speaking rights at this stage.
- MSR would like AECU to explain on the whole event.
- SSSR believed that AECU could not clarify on the resignation mechanism.
- CC believed there should be settlement on universal practice first.
- AAR stressed again on the need to discuss on universal practice, though he respected some councillors' preference on hearing personal explanation from AECU first.
- RHR (sub) wished to discuss universal practice first.
- PC4 emphasized the need to go back to individual case afterwards.
- EDSR believed that AECU had the power to withdraw resignation, which should be explained with different logic from the notice for council meeting, withdrawal of resignation involved only himself, but notice for council meeting involved all councillors
- SSR cited commercial cases that, once the resignation letter was handed in, it could only be retrieved with the employer's approval.
- PC1 raised that nomination also were provided with a withdrawal period, he believed that reasonable period for withdrawal would be reasonable.
- SSSR believed that councillors could consider the withdrawal when voting on whether the resignation should be adopted, but that should not affect the legitimacy of withdrawal.
- ASR believed that the withdrawal should be discussed in council.
- SKYLHR believed that the power for the council to decide whether or not the withdrawal should be adopted would be exclusive to the action of individual withdrawal.
- AAR reminded that 48 hours could also be given for withdrawal in nomination, even if the nomination is publicly announced.
- ENSR suggested that nomination was based on only individual willingness to run for an election, but resignation concerned also the popular sovereignty carried with the votes cast.
- AAR believed council should have the power to discuss whether or not the withdrawal should be adopted.
- RICA2 reminded that resolution in council would become precedents, if officials kept resigning and withdrawing, it would cause great unreasonable burden to the council.
- EDSR stated that whether or not he had the power of suggesting withdrawal would not be the main point, but instead, whether or not the council had power to decide on adopting the withdrawal or not.
- AAR suggested the discussion to focus on principles, but not administrative procedures.
- PC5 believed that nomination had nothing to do with resignation, based on the same logic ENSR had suggested. If similar case repeats, it might not be appropriate, therefore rules should be set afterwards to state strictly that resignation must not be withdrawn.
- LAR considered the withdrawal as a factor when deciding whether or not the resignation should be adopted.
- PC4 believed that no councillors' and full members' right in withdrawing from their

decisions should be deprived. He agreed with AAR's suggestion on reasonable time interval for withdrawal. He suggested the council to discuss on whether to accept his resignation or not, then move on to whether his withdrawal should be accepted.

- CC asked if councillors agree that withdrawal could not be made on individual base.
- PC4 believed that individual remained the rights to suggest withdrawal, but council had decisive power on whether to accept it or not.
- MSR believed that discussion on different cases should not be neglected on universal practice.
- AAR believed it would be reasonable to let council decide.
- UHR suggested whether or not resignation should be something that could be altered should be the focus of discussion, in this case the decision was too playful.
- SSR cited the regulations of the Legislative council that, once the council recognized the resignation to have been received, then it would be valid.
- SSSR agreed with UHR.
- RCLHR believed that the council should discuss case by case on withdrawal.
- PC5 stated that could be taken into account, but should not be considered as an official document. He personally agreed that resignation should not be allowed to be withdrawn.
- AAR believed that letting council to decide whether the withdrawal was valid would be an action responsible to constituents. He supposed that there was a person who resigned one day after taking office, the council which represented the constituents, also had power to accept, this power shall apply to this case also.
- SSR recognized the great discrepancy between defeating resignation and adopting withdrawal as official document. This was not a decision by individual or even the council already.
- EDSR raised that public figures could also withdraw words and apologize in front of public.
- AAR queried if it was necessary for council to directly borrow the mechanism from Legislative Council. A resignation in LegCo did not require passage with 2/3 majority, the Union Council would not copy all mechanisms from it. Legco members were not even all democratically elected.
- CC questioned the councillors on whether the withdrawal should be handled after it was sent, and whether it was reasonable to let the applicants withdrew.
- PC1 queried if it would be applicable to official bearers or faculty societies/hall associations EV also.
- CC differentiated them as different cases, societies and associations had their own regulations on resignation.

Motion 6

The notice of resignation shall be considered by the Union Council once the notice is received by the Council Chairperson, and no withdrawal of the resignation shall be accepted.

Proposer: CHAU Dickson Ka Faat (GS)

Seconder: SHAM Kwan Ho (SSSR)

Time Received: 11:30

Vote by Simple Majority

Total Vote: 44

<p>For: 32 Against: 9 Abstain: 3 Resolution: Motion Carried. Time Resolved: 11:57</p>
<p>Motion 7</p> <p>Amends Motion 6, by adding the following words in the begging, “To clarify that, under Article 6(b) of Section VIII, Article 6 of Section IX, Article 12 of Section X, and Article 13 of Section XI,”</p> <p>Proposer: WONG Wing Long Leo (PC5) Secunder: CHOW Chun Ming (PC1)</p> <p>Time Received: 11:37 Resolution: Withdrawn</p>
<p>Motion 8</p> <p>To withdraw Motion 7.</p> <p>Proposer: CHAU Dickson Ka Faat (GS) Secunder: WONG Wai Yan Phoenix (MSR)</p> <p>Time Received: 11:51 No objection Resolution: Motion Carried. Time Resolved: 11:52</p>

- GS(proposer) reminded that the motion would state universal practice for office bearer elected by popular elections, but not individual cases.
- AAR requested to make the motion clearer, by stating that “no matter if the notice was received by CC”.
- CC stated that the presumption in the article was “received by CC”.
- PC5 asked whom the notice was from.
- CC reinforced that it was on universal case.
- PC5 suggested amendment for under which office bearers this would apply.
- SSSR queried on such necessity, since only PC, Campus media, ex-cos would hand in resignation to Council.
- SSR differentiated the nature difference between objecting to opposition and adopting withdrawal.
- PC5 reminded that in section 6, notice of resignation was not specified.
- AAR questioned that if CC could resign in the council, whether or not this should apply to the case of CC resigning too.

- EVP reminded the councillors to consider whether or not a 2/3 majority could revoke public decisions equal to reasonable.
- GS raised that PC5 might have written the wrong articles, so that he could not find in Constitution.
- AAR opposed to motion 7, suggested to withdraw motion.
- AS suggested withdrawing motion 7.
- PC5 requested AS to suggest right amendments.

- Motion 7 was withdrawn by motion 8, back to motion 6.
- ECU asked if there could be no flexibility in considering withdrawal.
- GS (Proposer) believed that it could not be accepted, but it could be considered as one of the factors in a basket.
- RCLHR, ECU, EDSR, AAR and EVP were against motion 6, so vote by simple majority was needed.
- LSKHR commented on resolution, and suggested to list it as an important motion.
- LAR was against this idea, querying the degree of importance.
- LSKHR suggested that since whether a resignation could be withdrawn was not mentioned in the constitution, important motion could be passed to fill up the loophole.
- UHR believed that amending constitution would be more reasonable.
- CC clarified that actually whether or not a motion should be listed as an important motion would be determined by how influential it would be. Referring to past important motions, they usually concerned some stance and spirit of the HKUSU, and personally she considered it as unsuitable, she agreed that amending constitution would be a better choice.

- Speaking rights was granted to Wong Chun Kit Keyvin, AECU.
- AECU attributed his resignation to the uneven job distribution among the News Editors, some even showed up only twice for meeting. He commented ECU as usually less strict when dealing with personnel problems, they even held different opinion on whether or not they should be appointed before they took up office.
- DSR asked for the reason for withdrawing the resignation.
- AECU explained that there was unexpectedly vigorous persuasion from previous session of executives.
- SSSR asked if resignation is adopted, what the effects over Undergrad would be.
- AECU predicted that instant news would be borne by only one executive committee member. And as a whole, he believed that Undergrad would be missing a strict coordinator. Having a member quitted would also lower the morale in the team.
- MSR asked for the reason why he did not consult other executives before sending resignation to the Council.
- AECU attributed that to the rushing on the May issue of Undergrad, there was no time for one more executive meeting on this issue. He believed that even if a meeting was called, some executive committee members would not appear no matter what. He stated that he actually had consulted some of the ex-cos before making the resignation.
- SKYLHR asked how would the poor performance of some executives to be dealt with.
- ECU stated that ECU and AECU could resign executives and bring that to the council if there was no improvement observed.

Motion 9

To receive and adopt the resignation of Wong Chun Kit Keyvin (UID: 3035050066) as the Assistant Editor-in-Chief of the Undergrad, HKUSU, Session 2013.

Proposer: WONG Wai Yan Phoenix (MSR)

Seconder: WONG Wai Lun (ASR)

Time Received: 12:09

Vote by 2/3 Majority

Total Vote: 41

For: 0

Against: 39

Abstain: 2

Resolution: Defeated

Time Resolved: 12:11

- MSR(Proposer) suggested councillors to take into account his withdrawal of resignation.
- RHR(sub) commented that he recognized the contribution of Undergrad Instant News, but still it would be too playful to resign simply because of other executives' poor performance, and the complicated mechanism of handling resignation was initiated unreasonably. He clarified that RHSA voted abstain was only aiming at maintaining unity.
- PC1 commented that it was a waste of time.
- PC5 stated that he was already drafting regret motion.
- AAR clarified that regret motions were moved in the past because of councillors' unsatisfactory attendance in CMs, or mistakes made (e.g. UEC's typo on ballots of Annual Election 2013), MSR'12 failed to comply with constitution in carrying out the election of MS'13, he concluded that it was only when an action was against the constitution or the by-laws, then a regret motion shall be moved.

Motion 10

To regret that Wong Chun Kit Keyvin, the Assistant Editor-in-Chief of Undergrad, has not given sufficient and careful consideration before giving a notice of resignation to the Chairman of the Union Council.

Proposer: WONG Wing Long Leo (PC5)

Seconder: CHOW Chun Ming (PC1)

Time Received: 12:17

No objection.

Resolution: Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 12:34

Motion 11

To amend the word “To regret that” as “the council feels disappointed that” on motion 10.

Proposer: NG Wai Ka (AAR)

Seconder: LI Chee Wing (LAR)

Time Received: 12:29

Against: PC1, PC5

Vote by Simple Majority

Total Vote: 46

For: 43

Against: 3

Abstain: 0

Resolution: Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 12:33

- PC5 emphasized on the need to prevent such playful resignation from repeating.
 - EDSR disagreed that this could as a reason to lower the standard of passing a regret motion.
 - PC5 claimed that AECU had got even higher votes than himself (PC5), so he must not resign that playfully. He also stated that AECU had no disagreement towards a regret motion himself.
 - RHR(sub) asked if there were alternatives like motion of disappointment.
 - CC listed “condemn” and “disappoint”, but she reminded that neither of them appeared in the constitution.
 - AAR reminded that “disappoint” was used in CM1’12, when CAC’12 failed to notify all members of CAC 24 hours before the meeting.
 - CC discovered a procedural error on Motion 9, in which proposer and seconder both voted against.
 - ICAP provided information that the issue was discussed in ICA council also.
 - LSKHR suggested that proposer and seconder must vote “for” a motion, then ECU and CTVC should not have the right to move a motion, since they did not even have the voting rights to vote for.
 - CC emphasized the fact that ECU and CTVC could not object, so they were not opposing to something they proposed themselves. She believed that the council need to further discuss on whether there should be other ways to restrict the effect brought by ECU and CTVC’s rights to move and second.
-
- SS suggested grammatical amendment to motion 11: “express disappointment towards Mr. Wong Chun Kit”.
 - AAR suggested that “who” shall be added after "Kit".
-
- CC reminded that it was just a convention that proposer and seconder of a motion must vote for, she asked for councillors’ opinion on whether or not there was a need to bind proposers

and seconders.

- SSR believed that it would be an infringement on ones' voting rights.
- MSR believed a motion was moved for discussion only, but stance might change during the discussion.

2. To discuss the financial dispute of HKUSU

- FS reported that tam chun sing added signatory to the HKUSU bank account on 19/4, then honorary treasurer received notification from Tam Chun Sing on 20/4, honorary treasurer then sent a letter asking for a ground of altering the signatory. HSBC retained record that Tam Chun Sing was still the Council Chairperson. The central ex-cos reported the case to police on 25/4, but to bring the police onto prompt handling, HSBC's proof on the fact that Tam Chun Sing's signatory was added was required, but presently only "the signatory is changed" notice would be available. It was unreasonable that both Honorary treasurer and Tam's signature was needed for cash outtake from the account, past honorary treasurer who had held the post for over 20 years always signed the cheque with one signature only. It would be unreasonable as Jason would still get salary after being fired.
- MSR asked what the Union Council was expected to do.
- FS wished that the Council could endorse the Honorary Treasurer as the one and only one to be responsible for Union Financial affairs.
- STHR asked how long the legal department of HSBC would need to settle the matter, and whether or not the present council should also add in a signatory to ensure control over the account.
- FS stated that several days would be needed, since CC and P were still not yet the office bearer of HKUSU, it would be even more complicated to add one more signature.

Motion 12

To clarify that the Honorary Treasurer is the one and only one person to be responsible for and manage Union Financial resources.

Proposer: HSU Yin Man (FS)

Seconders: TANG Laurence Yat Long (P)

Time Received: 12:49

No objection.

Resolution: Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 12:49

Motion 13

To clarify that the Honorary Treasurer shall be the only signatory holder of the bank account of the Union.

Proposer: HSU Yin Man (FS)

Seconded: TANG Laurence Yat Long (P)

Time Received: 12:49

No objection.

Resolution: Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 12:52

- P(Seconded) disagreed another signatory to be added. Since honorary treasurer had been appointed by the council and over the year it had been his/her sole power, students should never take control of the account.
- STHR agreed that this would probably be an unhealthy practice, but thought that it was the only resolution to maintain a certain degree of control.
- AAR reminded that the honorary treasurer stated in the e-mail that, she would not sign to take cash out at this stage no matter what.
- FS wished to avoid more variables.

- EDSR suggested motions 12 and 13 to be put into important motions.
- CC suggested FS to change financial regulations instead.
- AAR asked if this account referred to the same that Finance and Enterprises Office used to pay salary.
- FS explained the usual practice as financial office paying salary first, then HKUSU would pay back, so Tam would be indirectly controlling SU bank account in this case.
- LAR asked what the recent payment status was.
- P stated the financial office would still pay salary.
- AAR elaborated that the procedure would be after Honorary Treasurer had signed and given the slip to financial office, money would be taken from the account.
- FS explained that concerning salary, the school was on a regular pay role, concerning funding, SU central ex-cos had to submit forms to financial office, then gave them to honorary treasurer for signature.
- RHR(sub) asked if the Union Council should do anything to specifically show stance when a union full member, Tam Chun Sing did this.
- P stated there was already a sentence of condemnation in the statement to be passed. And he would like to remind that Tam was not even a union full member, he was postgraduate but did not register as a union member.
- CC announced a recess for 10 minutes.

3. To discuss the handover dispute of HKUSU

- P wish to clarify that Tam and Chan could not be office bearer of the HKUSU anymore in Union Council, due to the messy representation to outsiders and even the university.
- MSR asked whether or not the office bearers could not be changed in the police record under the Societies Ordinance.
- P explained that due to the results of annual election'12, they became office bearer, but they did not apply the same logic to this year.

Motion 14

To declare Tam Chun Sing's invalidity as the office-bearer of HKUSU since he was removed as Chairperson of Union Council Session 2012 by the resolution duly passed by the Union Council on 20 February 2013.

Proposer: TANG Laurence Yat Long (P)

Seconder: CHAU Dickson Ka Faat (GS)

Time Received: 13:19

No objection

Resolution: Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 13:20

Motion 15

To declare Chan Koon Hong's invalidity as the office bearer of HKUSU since his term of office ended on 18/2/2013 (as stated in the Constitution)

Proposer: TANG Laurence Yat Long (P)

Seconder: CHAU Dickson Ka Faat (GS)

Time Received: 13:20

No objection

Resolution: Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 13:21

4. To discuss the statement clarifying the Union stance on handover disputes

- P stated that he had sent the draft of statement to councillors the previous night. He suggested adding “除卻榮譽司庫” after the words “任何人”.
- AAR believed that it could be issued in the name of HKUSU after being adopted by the Council, but he suggested circulation among sub-organizations, in order to raise full members' attention.
- P had considered and agreed, he also suggested that with cosigns from past councilors (who were in session 2012) and sub-organization, its credibility would be highly increased.
- LSKHR was worried that it would be too complicated if the societies needed to pass the statements in their councils, so he suggested using “executives” to cosign. He asked if there would be any legal actions to claim legal responsibilities from Tam and Chan.
- P explained that if they were sued in form of civil case, it would generate a huge financial burden, and there were also worries of losing which would directly lead to the close down of council. Therefore he wished to have the police as plaintiff, so that they would be sued in

criminal lawsuit.

- AAR responded that cosigns from societies should be more flexible, as they all had their own practices. Concerning legal action, the worst possible outcome might be the termination of sub-organizations, so he agreed that they should be consulted beforehand.
- P emphasized on the need to clarify to full members. Apart from “HKUSU”, he wished councillors would also cosign.
- LSKHR agreed with cosigning, but also asked what the bottom line for legal actions would be.
- P stated that at present stage, the police registry would be the target of suing, but they needed to consult solicitors first.
- AAR wished that the union council could have direct conversation with the lawyer. He quoted Societies Ordinance Article 5, and stated that Chan Koon Hong had already violated.
- P stated that it had not yet been 1 month that he left his office.
- AAR regarded deleting a name from the list of office bearers also a change, so he considered the one month to be counted from 18/2/2013.
- GS clarified that Article 5 referred to non-registered societies, like triad organizations, he believed that article 10 should be more relevant.
- RHR(sub) asked if there would be English version available.
- P stated that he would draft soon and it would be circulated.
- PC5 queried if the phrase "光復" should be used in the title, since the statement was to be issued by the legitimate council and HKUSU.
- LSKHR found no problem in that, as councillors of Session 12 adopted "光復" as a propaganda too, which would help raise more attention.
- P agreed that it was to be a propaganda that could raise more attention and give a clearer image. He stressed that the statement should not be only descriptive, but also should demonstrate a strong stance.
- PC5 asked for the channels it would be released, e.g. press release or statement.
- CC explained that statements passed by council were always given to the press.
- PC5 reinforced that he believed no emotional words should be used by the council. He was afraid that this would get mixed up with some facebook groups. In his mindset, HKUSU was not occupied so should not use such words.
- P emphasized that the statement was supported with a lot of facts. And he stated that occupying did happen in HKUSU, e.g. office bearer, financial accounts, etc. He queried that PC5 had low or even no bottom line.
- PC5 restated that these were not proper wordings used by a students' organization that was already functioning.
- CC explained that Tam and Chan were more destructive to HKUSU than what PC5 might have depicted. She wished to report to councillors on loss of documents when time allowed.
- LSKHR emphasized that the control of financial power might get all sub-organization paralyzed. So he agreed that the statement was in no way overstating the situation.
- MSR also stressed that there were still many obstacles ahead that could not be solved. Even the HKUSU seemed functioning at the moments, it did not equal to occupying were not happening.
- LCHHR asked what faculties and PC would do to help publicizing the statement.
- CC suggested discussing that after adopting the statement.

Motion 16

To endorse the statement of “百年基業 毀於一旦 光復港大 荊棘滿途” in the name of the Hong Kong University Students’ Union.

Proposer: TANG Laurence Yat Long (P)

Seconder: CHAU Dickson Ka Faat (GS)

Time Received: 13:53

No objection

Resolution: Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 13:55

- P stated that he would amend the typo in the words “死纏爛打” and add in “除榮譽司庫外” after “任何人”. The signature at the end would be “HKUSU 28/4/2013”. Central Ex-cos would send mass email to all full members, and issue press release extract. Press conference would be held if there were eventually legal actions. He asked for views towards cosign of councilors.
- PC4 stated that after obtaining consent from other PCs, the statement would be posted to PC facebook page.
- SKYLHR asked when that would need to be released, although councillors might cosign anytime, sub-organizations might take some time to endorse.
- SSSR asked whether or not deadline would be set.
- P proposed 30/4 as deadline.
- ICAP could reply by Tuesday night since they were going to have CM.
- CAP stated that they were not going to have CM and ECM, and he was worried that Cultural Council needed time to call for meeting
- SAP stated that some of the sports club would not even send representatives to attend council meetings.
- P proposed Wednesday as the deadline.
- CC suggested opening for adding cosign after the deadline.
- AAR questioned that it might not be that effective.
- CC asked how many societies P would expect to be cosigning.
- P pledged to send mass email in council’s name, and queried that whether the number of sub-organizations cosigned would be appealing to people inside HKU or outsiders.
- AAR believed both would do.
- P hoped to have around 70 cosigns collected on Tuesday. He emphasized that ad-hoc showing of stance would be important, since there were already too many outside organizations involved, but the Union had not expressed any consensus these days, the last time we had a stance expressed would be when Mr. Yuen Kit Shing was still acting CC’12. He stated that PPS had already edited the statement and councillors could have a check.
- AAR requested to allowed sub-organizations to cosign in the name of executive committee.
- CC asked councillors to collect cosigns from academic societies, then e-mail them to P.

- SWHR asked if councillors should be cosigning in name of their respective executive committees.
- SSSR asked if “Past councillors” meant those who had experienced the transition of sessions.
- P preferred all councillors in Session 2012.
- IVP clarified the entities cosigning should include councillors of Sessions 2012 and 2013, plus executive committees of 2013.
- CC announced a recess for 10 minutes.

4. To establish a tendering committee for notebook program 2013

- SWS introduced the jobs of this committee to be revising terms and conditions for providers, then inviting bids. His intended composition would be 3 exco, i.e. P (since it involved business, so P would like to be involved himself), GS (who would help in venue arrangement) and SWS, then 1 representative each from faculties, halls, PCs and 3As.
- SWHR asked if presentation would be done from post-exam to June.
- SWS promised that the presentation would only take place after all committee members have finished their exam.

Motion 17

To establish Tendering Committee for notebook program 2013.

Proposer: CHOI Hon Pong (SWS)

Seconder: TSANG Chung Hei (UAS1)

Time Received: 13:41

No objection

Resolution: Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 13:41

Motion 18

To appoint Mr. Wong Wai Lun (UID: 3035051424) as a member into the tendering committee for notebook program 2013.

Proposer: WONG Wai Yan Phoenix (MSR)

Seconder: NGAI Ting Hong (SSR)

Time Received: 14:41

No objection

Resolution: Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 14:42

Motion 19

To appoint Yu Lok Nam (UID: 2012531154) as a member of a tendering committee for notebook program 2013.

Proposer: TSO Kwan Yi (LHTHR)

Seconder: NG Chi Hin (EDSR)

Time Received: 14:42

No objection

Resolution: Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 14:42

Motion 20

To appoint Yeung Yat Yee Melody (UID: 3035055901) to be a committee member of the Tendering Committee for Notebook Ownership 2013.

Proposer: CHING Kam Hung (RCA 2(sub))

Seconder: HO Wing Sze (RICA1)

Time Received: 14:43

No objection

Resolution: Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 14:43

Motion 21

To appoint Popularly Elected Councillor So Cheuk Yiu (UID: 2012530095) into the Tendering Committee for Notebook Program 2013.

Proposer: SO Cheuk Yiu (PC4)

Seconder: LEUNG Wing Ho (PC3)

Time Received: 13:53

No objection

Resolution: Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 13:55

5. To endorse the constitution and the affiliation of the Industrial Engineering Association

- ENSR introduced IEA as an association that had set up for over 30 years, originally mainly acted as an organization for students and alumni exchange, but then more and more Union Full members obtained membership. Thus they wished to obtain more resources, and sought to affiliate to HKUSU.

Motion 22

To endorse the constitution and the affiliation of the Industrial Engineering Association to HKUSU.

Proposer: NG Wai Ka (AAR)

Seconder: LI Chee Wing (LAR)

Time Received: 14:48

No objection.

Resolution: Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 14:49

7. To discuss the membership of Union Elections Committee

- CC gave a brief account that MHR was appointed into UEC in CM3, but his identity was not a councillor. Thus the council needed to take measure, like revoking the previous appointment and had another councillor appointed.
- GS stated that MHR desperately wished to help in elections, so he requested to discuss about his status first.
- LSKHR reminded that in Session 2012, councillors once discussed on whether or not MHR could be acting CC'12, as a Union Full Member, he was eventually appointed as acting HS'12.
- CC also reminded in ECM 4' 12, there was a motion to declare MHR to be a councillor, but it was defeated eventually. There must be at least 3 years of observation before turning from partially affiliated to fully affiliated.
- IVP asked whether or not MHR was appointed as member or non-executive councilor. She remembered that after the 312 incident in Session 2012, she was appointed into UEC as CTVC.
- CC stated that she was appointed as a non-voting councilor, but not official observer.
- IVP stated that CC'12 once explained that she was appointed as official observer.
- LSKHR reminded that it was discussed last year in CRC, and he believed it would be up to CC whether or not to discuss on that again at the scene.
- CC believed that if the council had a rough discussion, it would be an abuse of power, since it would be a very influential decision.
- GS referred to the important motion in CM11, 1992, and stated that it would be quite difficult

- to argue that MHR was a non-voting councilor.
- RCLHR asked what the rights of official observer included.
- CC stated that it should be just like a student senator, who should not have any rights to affect council's decision.
- MHR stated that he actually had moved motions in CM and circulation and he hoped to define rights of official observer as soon as possible.
- LHHR asked how "general rights" should be defined.
- CC stated that it referred to resources only, and suggested to discuss on that in next CM.
- ICAP provided information that in ICA council, partially affiliated only enjoyed speaking rights, it should act as a reference for Union Council.

Motion 23

To rescind motion #69 of 3rd Council Meeting of HKUSU Council, Session 2013.

Proposer: CHAU Dickson Ka Faat (GS)

Seconder: WONG Yee Man (IVP)

Time Received: 15:06

Vote by 2/3 Majority (revocation of previous council decision)

Total votes: 46

For: 46

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

Resolution: Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 15:09

Motion 24

To appoint Kuang Kaishan (UID: 3035057351) as a member of Union Elections Committee, HKUSU Council, Session 2013.

Proposer: CHAU Dickson Ka Faat (GS)

Seconder: SO Cheuk Yiu (PC4)

Time Received: 15:10

No objection

Resolution: Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 15:11

- SSSR consulted for the intention of moving motion 24.
- GS explained that as early as during the Central campaign, PC2 had already showed her preference in joining UEC. Just that she was afraid she could not handle it with OAC together. After asking for her consent, he would like the council to appoint her back.

Motion 25

To appoint Yuen Wing Lam (UID: 3035045786) as the councilor of Union Elections Committee, HKUSU Council, Session 2013.

Proposer: CHAN Tsz Chun Rachel (WLHR)

Seconder: TJANG Ming Wai (STHR)

Time Received: 15:12

Resolution: Withdrawn

- MHR stated that final consensus was not just attained among hall representatives, since LSKHR'13 would take his office 4 days later, so they wished to have further discussion.
- GS wished to have amendments in Election regulations ready in next CM, so he would like to finish the appointment ASAP.
- SKYLHR stated that SCSHR did not mind being appointed into 2 standing committees, but needed to consult LSKHR'13 first.

Motion 26

To withdraw Motion 25.

Proposer: YU Lok Nam (SWHR)

Seconder: TSO Kwan Yi (LHTHR)

Time Received: 15:15

No objection

Resolution: Motion Carried.

Time Resolved: 15:16

- LSKHR expressed that this year in council had been a fruitful year in learning, esp. on issues that other students may not touch upon. He could feel that councillors of 2013 abide to rules, this was nice but not enough. Council at present was like a battle field that needed to be reconstructed after a war. He hoped councillors could treasure opportunity to discuss university affairs. In session 2012, university affairs needed to be raised in an agendum, which was very weird to be initiated by a councillor but not ex-cos. He reminded also that, if consensus could be obtained, that would be great, but there was no need to deliberately wait for a consent and avoid voting. Rushing to pass motion in early morning was unhealthy. Minority opinion also worthed some discussion. Councillors were representing 14000 members, thus they should treasure their identities. He dedicated special thanks to councillors in 2012-2013, who taught him much. He concluded by the saying "With great power, comes great responsibility".
- CC appreciated the use of time limit as it increased efficiency. She also reminded councilor

that important motions should not be abused, generating 3 important motions in one council meeting was quite unreasonable.

The meeting ended at 15:24.

Prepared by,

Approved by,

Leung Lai Kwok Yvonne
Honorary Secretary
HKUSU Council, Session 2013

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