



Minutes of the Extraordinary General Meeting, after incorporation, of the Members of the Craigengower Cricket Club, duly convened and held at 188 Wong Nai Chung Road, Happy Valley, Hong Kong on Friday, 29 April 2022 at 5:00pm.

Present

Mr. Frederick Keung, President in the Chair

Mr. Marco Wu, Vice President

Mr. Eric Lam, Honorary Secretary

Dr. Cheung Ching Yet, Honorary Treasurer

Members of the GC: Messrs. David Chan, Chin Pak Hing, Ho Ping Kuen, Henry Hui, James Kwan, James Lau, Kenny Leung and Paul Tam

Special Voting Members: Messrs. Dr. Bong Shu Chun, Anthony Chok, Cheung Wing Sang, Horace Cheung, Darsy Chan, Chu Kwok Lau, Philip Chok, William Chui, Danny Chan, Edwin Chok, Benny Cheung, Eugene Chan, Albert Chan, Chow Pak Sum, Fung Kee Tong, Fung Yuen, Herman Hu, Kam Chan Yiu, Keung Ka Wah, Frank Lam, Andrew Liu, Lam Wing Kam, Paul Lee, David Leung, Sunny Lau, Lam Chung Lau, Martin Lai, David Lu, Mak Kai Kau, Peter Mak, Mak Sheung, Benny Ng, Boris Ngai, Shiu Wai Hung, Stephen Sum, Thomas Haweis Sundjaja, David Tsoi, Thomas Tam, Jacky Tso, Lucas Tsung, David Tso, Dr. James Wong, Wong Chung Fat, Harry Wong, Robert Wong, Dr. Stephen Wong, Peter Wong, Samuel Wong, Philip Wee, Paul Yik, Benedict Yeung, Yiu Wing Sum and Danny Yau

Ordinary Voting Members: Messrs. Osman Adem, Au Chi Wai, Chu Hon Fai, Philip Cheung, Toni Chan, Larry Chiang, Grace Chiang, Micro Cheung, William Chan, Chung Lai Che, Alain Chu, Dominic Chan, Chow Kar Fai, Dominic Cheng, Chow Hing Wing, Chow Kar Chung, Choi Chung Hang, Hobby Chen, Gordon Chiu, Robin Chok, Thomas Chan, Ken Chiu, Choi Siu Ping, Chung Kwok Kit, Peter Chan, Chan Kim Fai, Michael Chan, Rose Cheung, Dr. Sharon Chu, Louis Chan, Samson Chui, Christina Chan, Chu Shuet Ying, Kevin Fung, Helen Fok, Chu Kwok Wai, Paul Lee, Sunny Fok, Fok Pui Kwong, Peggy Fung, Frankie Ho, Rick Ho, Yu May Ling, David Ho, Karen Ho, Cevia Hui, Carson Ho, Imthanavanich Visit, Ip Kin Fung, Ip Ki Cheung, Ko Kam Sun, Ko Kam Yin, Edward Kan, Sammy Kwan, Dominic Kwong, Kwong Kong Siu Lai, Kelvin Kwai, Kelvin Kwok, Ko Sai Hong, Edward Lau, Luk Chung Shing, Stephen Leung, Arthur Li, Tony Lee, Lee Hon Ki, Law Shui Yung, Leung Cheuk Tim, Victor Liu, Liu Siu Ho, Larry Lam, Bruno Li, Tommy Lok, Leo Lee, James Law, Lam Siu Yuen, David Lo, Norman Lai, Chan Sau Ying, Li Kar Cheung, Vivian Yan, Peter Liu, Lau Chi Ming, Lai May Tan,

Kenneth Lee, Francis Lau, Lee Kar On, Raymond Li, David Lam, Lugi Lee, James Lee, Henry Lau, Albert Lam, Albert Leung, Susan Cheng Lai, Winnie Lee, Lam Kin Keung, Annie Leung, Ella Lo, Frank Lam, Philip Lo, Ling Chart Lum, Jordi Lo, Joyce Li, Kenneth Lau, Mok Kam Kwan, Sam Ma, Paul Mak, York Mok, Man Ying Leung, Steven Ng, Mendel Ng, Kenneth Ng, John Ng, Linus Ng, Ng Lai May, Lawrence Ng, Nelson Poon, Pong Yu Ying, Poon Sze Man, Plato Poon, Gary Pun, Alfred Poon, Sidney Shum, So Chaun Hune, Susanna Sham, Shao Bao Qiong, Siu Kui Cham, Sammy Shei, Ting Yin Kwan, Tsui Hing Chi, Tse Hon Kin, Tang Wai Ho, Arthur Tsoi, Peter Tsang, Henry Tam, Mary Tam Wong, Stephen Leung, Tang Ping Wing, Marshall To, Tang Pok Yan, Tammy Tam, Albert Tong, Tong Kai Lap, Tam Pak Chuen, Tong Koon Hung, Samuel Tsang, Tong Mee Yin, Tsui Fung Ying, Joseph Tsang, Wingle Wong, Steven Wong, Wong Chun Ah, Wong Yun Wah, Johnny Wong, Ken Wong, Wong Kwok Keung, Wong Ki Kwok, Duffy Wong, Philip Wong, Nelson Wan, Albert Wong, Jimmy Wong, Kenneth Wong, Ivy Wong, Raymond Wu, Pius Wu, Wong Chack Kie, Yumi Wong, Sonia Woo, Wang Kiung Yee, Simon Wong, Anita Wong, Wong Kwok Yeung, Ronald Wong, Yu She Nien, Yuen Pui To, Nicol Yau, Simon Yuen, Yim Kwan Hoi, Kejohn Yiu, Freddy Yip, Paul Yu, Josephine Yeung, Charles Yip, Ronald Yam, Yip Kin Wah, Rowina Wong, Eddie Yeung, Yu Bit Ming and Yue Wah Chee

Corporate Nominees: Messrs. Chris Li, Shum Wai Cheong, Amy Wong, Seit Kin Fun, Paul Yuen, Anthony Loo, Andrew Chan, Douglas Yu, Lam Tat Wing, Leo Cheng, Alan Chui, Horace Chui, Yeung Kwok Keung and Michael Lam

1. Special Resolution

The Chairman informed those present that: 38 Members had requested the calling of an Extraordinary General Meeting (EGM) for passing the resolution to reduce the total number of votes held by a Special Voting Member (SVM) from 50 to 2. As the resolution had been approved by the Company Registrar, the EGM would be conducted as scheduled. The President opened the meeting by requesting the Honorary Secretary to read out the notice convening the meeting. The Honorary Secretary read the notice convening the meeting as follows:

“NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that an Extraordinary General Meeting of Members of the Craigengower Cricket Club (the “Club”) will be held at 188 Wong Nai Chung Road, Happy Valley, Hong Kong on Friday 29th April, 2022 at 5:00 pm for the purposes of considering and, if thought fit, passing the following resolution as a Special Resolution of the Club:

Votes: Article 83

That Article 83 of Part B of the Articles of Association of the Club be amended by deleting the word “fifty” and substituting in its place the word “two”.

Explanatory Notes:

1. The resolution has been proposed by a requisition (the “Requisition”) made by thirty-eight Members pursuant to Article 71 of the Articles of Association of the Club (the “Articles”) and Sections 566 to 568 of the Companies Ordinance. It is to reduce the votes of a Special Voting Member from 50 to 2.
2. Fifth Clause of Part A of the Articles provides, inter alia, that no addition, alteration or amendment shall be made to the Articles unless it has previously been submitted to and approved by the Registrar of Companies.
3. Special Condition No. (7) of the Conditions of Lease Extension No. 20199 in respect of Inland Lot No. 9031 on which the Club is situated provides that the consent of the Director of Lands is required before any amendment to the Articles can be made.
4. This notice is issued to comply with the Requisition mentioned in Note 1 above. In the event that the approval and consent from the Registrar of Companies and the Director of Lands are obtained before the commencement of the meeting and approved by the members, the amendment will take immediate effect and will start to apply at the Annual General Meeting which follows this meeting. In the event that the approval and consent from the Registrar of Companies and the Director of Lands cannot be obtained before the commencement of the meeting, the resolution cannot be validly passed and the meeting will be adjourned accordingly.
5. Under Section 596 of the Companies Ordinance, a member who intends to appoint a proxy to exercise all or any of the member’s rights to attend and to speak and vote (whether by show of hands or by poll) at the meeting on his behalf shall complete, sign and return a proxy form to the Club’s office for verification and registration 48 hours before the meeting is scheduled to

commence. A proxy will not be able to use a proxy form which arrives late for verification and registration. A proxy form is enclosed for such purpose.”

The Chairman said, “According to the meeting agenda, I hereby request all Members here to cast their votes, because the General Committee (GC) has received a signed application from 38 Members, requesting calling for an EGM tonight. The conduct of EGM tonight being approved by the Company Registrar and HAB, our next step will be ‘voting’. Before the calling for an EGM, we also received a co-signed request from 13 Members for the implementation of ‘Secret Ballot’. The request from the 13 Members is: I strongly object to the ‘by a show of hands’ in the EGM for each and every decision made. I propose the Secret Ballot approach for making every decision.’ It was submitted by the 13 Members for the GC to make a decision.

The GC has a resolution namely, ‘Resolution of the GC made on 22 April 2022’. We have 3 reasons to sign it:

1. Legal advice was given by counsel that voting made by ‘Secret Ballot’ for conforms with the determination of the sense of the meeting and natural justice.
2. Written request has been made by thirteen Members that voting for passing the resolutions for amendments of the Articles of Association should be made by ‘Secret Ballot’.
3. It was the usual practice of the Club in the past years that voting was made by “Secret Ballot” enable the identity of a voter not be revealed, the privacy of a voter be protected & his position and views not be unnecessarily made known to others.

We have received the consent of most GC members to pass this resolution. As the Chairman, I hereby announce the resolution today be voted by Secret Ballot. This is my decision.

Mr. Ko Sai Hong said, “I propose by a show of hands approach first. After the voting, if anyone request for a poll according to the Articles of Association (AoA), we should demand a poll. Whether the poll is ‘secret’ or not will be subject to everyone’s opinion. However, I think we should stick to by a show of hands first.”

Ms. Ivy Wong said, “May I ask what’s the point for a change since the Chairman has already announced the conduction of a poll? It should be conclusive.”

The Chairman said, “Since Mr. Ko has made his proposal and someone has agreed, my personal opinion is...please show your hands if you vote for it, show your hands if you vote against it, and show your hands if you abstain. We respect Members’ opinions. Do you agree, Mr. Ko?”

Mr. Ko Sai Hong said, “You mean by a show of hands for the resolution or...”

The Chairman said, “I declared the voting approach.”

Mr. Ko Sai Hong said, “Is it voting by a show of hands?”

The Chairman said, “No, it is ballot, demand poll.”

Mr. Ko Sai Hong said, “It means you don’t want to...”

The Chairman said, “Mr. Ko, I can see your meaning. You want by a show of hands approach, right?”

Mr. Ko Sai Hong said, “Yes.”

The Chairman said, “No problem. We are democratic. We do support democracy. If you propose the show of hands approach and it is agreed by everyone, then we should follow this approach. Why I propose the demand poll is because someone wrote us a letter, okay?”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “Sorry, Mr. President...”

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, “It is not your turn yet...”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “But is it your turn? On what basis are you holding the microphone now?”

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, "Please don't point at people by your stick, can you?"

Mr. Philip Chok said, "On what basis are you holding the microphone now? Is it your turn?"

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, "So is it your turn?"

Mr. Philip Chok said, "Then is it your turn?"

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, "Okay."

Mr. Philip Chok said, "Are you the host?"

The Chairman said, "Sorry, I would now pass the microphone to Mr. Chin."

Mr. Philip Chok said, "So be it."

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, "Thank you. The President has made the decision based on two evidences. First, please look at Section 75. The manner of these meetings should be decided by the President. Second, according to Company Law 591, Section 2, once the decision is made by the President, it cannot be overthrown. I have finished."

Mr. Philip Chok said, "Chairman, can I make a speech?"

The Chairman said, "Sure, Philip, please go ahead."

Mr. Philip Chok said, "Thank you. Section 75 of our AoA has pointed out, 'A declaration by the Chairman at any General Meeting that a resolution has been carried thereat upon the show of hands shall be conclusive, and an entry to that effect in the Minute Book of the Club shall be sufficient evidence of that fact, unless immediately on such declaration a poll shall be demanded by not less than 5 Members present in person or by proxy having the right to vote at the meeting...' The Chairman must first call a show of hands, then vote for any resolution. After that, if there are 5 Members challenging the result, it should be voted again by poll. When doing so, the voting may be conducted by secret or non-secret ballot. The first round

‘show of hands’ has already been specified in the Article 75.”

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, “Please look at the last 7 words of Section 75, ‘or by the Chairman of the meeting’, why don’t you read out the last sentence?”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “Where?”

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, “The last sentence of Section 75, why don’t you read it out? ‘Or by the Chairman of the meeting’, don’t you mean to amend the Article?”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “I don’t mean to amend the Article...Duffy Wong, please clarify the meaning.”

Mr. Duffy Wong said, “I can speak only if the Chairman allows me.”

The Chairman said, “Regarding the last sentence of Section 75, ‘or by the Chairman of the meeting’, I hereby request our Legal Adviser, Mr. Duffy Wong to give his advice.”

Mr. Duffy Wong said, “In fact, I 100% agree with the comments just given by the member regarding the first paragraph of Article 75. It means according to that member, in terms of flow, we should first conduct voting by a show of hands. If someone says ‘I don’t like it, start it over,’ then we have to start it over. The flow should be like that. Of course, Mr. Chin has got his point, too. However, ‘5 Members present in person at the meeting’, meaning if 5 Members stand up and request by poll vote...I have explained clearly the meaning of ‘by poll vote’ in the Forum last time. It means the calculation based on everyone has different number of votes. It is not secret ballot. Don’t mix up poll vote with secret ballot. So if we need to trigger what Mr. Chin said, we need to have 5 Members stand up and ask for the poll vote. But nobody has shown up to now. I am not sure if the 13 Members asking for secret ballot are present or not. Secret ballot is not poll vote. Do not be confused. Poll vote means the calculation of share right or vote right. Secret ballot means to do the calculation secretly. The 13 Members wanted to do it secretly, however, according to Article 75, the right procedure should be voting by show of hands first. If there is any objection, then go for the poll vote. As I said just now, whether the poll vote is

secret or not is another issue which can be discussed openly. As it is again another issue, it should be voted by a show of hands before a decision can be made. Of course, when doing show of hands to make a decision on the issue, if there are 5 Members proposing a poll vote, then a poll vote should be conducted. That is what it means. So it is clearly stated in Article 75 and that is the flow.”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “Thank you, Duffy. I totally agree with what you said. That is, the flow should be done by a show of hands first. Then vote by poll or the Chairman decides to vote by poll if 5 Members request. But the flow should be by a show of hands first. Mr. Chin, please look into such a law. It seems you are not aware of what it means.”

The Chairman invited Mr. Leo Lee to express his views.

Mr. Leo Lee said, “No matter by poll or by a show of hands, we still have other Members outside. Please ask them all to join us. It is because the Members outside should be counted if we do the voting by a show of hands. Not just showing hands here, but let them in together, am I right? It makes no sense to do the counting there.”

The Chairman said, “As some of our Members may be in the Western dining room or Chinese dining room, if show of hands has to be conducted, I hope they can clearly show their stand. Is it like this? Ludwig, can you do it? I mean not at the Badminton Court...”

Mr. Leo Lee said, “Ludwig, I suggest asking two colleagues to go there and stay. When we do the poll, they will jot down all results and bring them back here.”

The Chairman said, “Yes, it can be done. Leo, dear members, I have heard you. As the Chairman, I will first of all follow Article 75 by conducting show of hands first. But during show of hands, I cannot record their names. Sorry about it. This is my principle. If you challenge my principle in the future, I will tell you here first. Show of hands can be done, but don’t tell me names should be recorded so that people can discriminate or attack them. This is human right! The very basic human right! As the Chairman, it is impossible for me to let our Members get hurt. Leo, what do you want to say?”

Mr. Leo Lee said, "I want to say about what you've just mentioned, because this meeting is called according to the AoA..."

The Chairman said, "Who called the meeting? Who said so? Leo, who are you representing?"

Mr. Leo Lee said, "I don't need to represent anyone. I represent myself. I do disagree with what you said."

The Chairman said, "Please say what you want to say. No problem. Hong Kong is a society based on rule of law. It is fair and open with the highest freedom in the world. Why should we discriminate Members and blame them?"

Mr. Leo Lee said, "What Hong Kong? What happened? Nobody discriminates anyone."

The Chairman said, "You tell me! Why is there no discrimination?"

Mr. Leo Lee said, " 'Show of hands' is stated in the AoA. If you don't want to be the Members here, you may leave. The AoA is here and it is what it is. Mr. President, if you don't like the Article, you may leave."

The Chairman said, "Show of hands...Leo, do you know the law? Show of hands, everyone please show your hands. I, Frederick Keung, has shown my hands. Did you jot down 'Frederick Keung showed his hand'? I am asking you. Did you jot down 'Frederick Keung showed his hand'?"

Mr. Leo Lee said, "Nobody in this Club wants to jot down anything. If anyone wants to record anything, it is his own business."

The Chairman said, "I have already told you, Leo. There is no need to record. I am simply telling you this. If Frederick Keung shows his hand, do not jot down 'Frederick Keung showed his hand.'"

Mr. Leo Lee said, “Who wanted to record? Who said so?”

The Chairman said, “All you wanted to say is this?”

Mr. Leo Lee said, “That will be fine.”

The Chairman said, “You are objecting to what I said.”

Mr. Leo Lee said, “Because you did not say so just now.”

The Chairman said, “What are human rights, freedom, equal opportunities? I am asking you now. What are equal opportunities, discrimination?”

Mr. Leo Lee said, “By show of hands is the real equalness. Everyone has one vote.”

Mr. David Ho said, “I am David Ho. May I respond to one issue? If I show my hand...I mean myself only...I admit that I showed my hand. If you ask me if I have ever shown my hand, I will reply yes. If you ask myself, David Ho, ‘did I show my hand?’ I did. The reason is simple. I am willing to be 100% responsible for what I have done. You don’t have to tell me whether you will sue me or not. Do I need you to protect my human rights? No! I showed my hand in an open and aboveboard way and in broad day light. There is no room for you to worry about everything and telling me about the great truth. What have you got to do with it? I don’t even have my own rights? I am 100% responsible for myself. What you said sounded like I am 0% responsible and you are the one who is 100% responsible for myself. It is none of your business!”

Mr. Fok Pui Kwong said, “Sorry, can I say something? I suppose the discussion just now is unrelated to the meeting today. We don’t need to extend our discussion topic to human rights and freedom. We are simply showing our hands. No one will discuss freedom and human rights with you. We are just saying...To my understanding, what Leo said and what you said are nothing to do with each other. Why you are so excited that you stroke the table? Anyone challenging your human right and freedom? I don’t think so. Why you need to waste everyone’s time by dragging the topic to these areas? What is your hidden agenda?”

The Chairman invited Mr. Chin Pak Hing to express his views.

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, "Sir, your points taken, thank you."

Mr. Fok Pui Kwong said, "My point of view is, what is your hidden agenda? Why you mentioned about the freedom and democracy?"

The Chairman said, "The issue was raised by you."

Mr. Fok Pui Kwong said, "It's nothing related to it!"

The Chairman said, "Sorry Patrick, we are now responding to what you said. Now I am asking Mr. Chin to express his views."

Mr. Fok Pui Kwong said, "Who says that? Who raises this issue? Who raises the issue of freedom and democracy?"

The Chairman said, "I didn't raise the issue."

Mr. Fok Pui Kwong said, "Do you want me to define what is freedom?"

The Chairman said, "Patrick, you shut up! I will have Mr. Chin to speak."

Mr. Fok Pui Kwong said, "Why I have to shut up? Why?"

The Chairman said, "That's alright. You may go on if you like."

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, "I have a question to ask Mr. Leo Lee. If we now have 5 Members standing up for the demand poll, then will this discussion come to a stop?"

Mr. Philip Chok said, "No. Because first we need to conduct the show of hands. After the show of hands is finished, we can then let the 5 Members stand up. We cannot skip the show of hands. Moreover, the show of hands is secret ballot. Mr. Chairman, there is no need to worry about it. Every one of us understands that the show of hands

is secret ballot.”

The Chairman said, “My apologies, Philip & dear Members. What you said is exactly what I want to say. I don’t mean to do anything. All I want to do is to protect the rights of a person. The show of hands is okay. I simply want it to be secret ballot. Philip, you are right. You have the clearest mind.”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “Thank you, Chairman. Now the show of hands should be secret ballot. By the time when there are 5 Members asking for a poll in round 2, then we need to discuss whether it should be secret ballot or not.”

The Chairman said, “Exactly, Philip. What you said is exactly what I think. Thank you. Okay, I hereby request to vote by a show of hands for passing the resolution tonight. Any objection?”

Mr. Leo Lee raised his hand and said, “I hope everyone understands what was mentioned by Mr. Duffy Wong that Article 75 states that we need to follow certain procedures. We cannot jump the queue without a proper reason. That is what I want to say.”

The Chairman said, “Leo and dear Members, I read Article 75 out now, ‘A declaration by the Chairman at any General Meeting that a resolution has been carried thereat upon the show of hands shall be conclusive, and an entry to that effect in the Minute Book of the Club shall be sufficient evidence of that fact, unless immediately on such declaration a poll shall be demanded by not less than 5 Members present in person or by proxy having the right to vote at the meeting; or by Members present in person or by proxy and representing at least 5% of the total voting rights of all the Members having the right to vote at the meeting; or by the Chairman of the meeting.’ I hereby do not execute the power of ‘or by the Chairman of the meeting’. I hereby request to vote by show of hands to pass the resolution.”

The Chairman invited those present to vote by show of hands. The Club staff then counted the votes.

Mr. Albert Wong said, “I would like to ask why Members on the stage are not

showing their hands. Does it mean nobody on stage vote for the resolution. Can I see it this way?"

The Chairman said, "First, I ask the Club staff, have you finished counting?"

Mr. Albert Wong said, "No. The Chairman just requested the show of hands but I didn't see anyone on the stage showing their hands...It is not a must to show your hands but I just want to confirm anybody shows their hands."

The Chairman said, "Sorry, my next question will be is there anyone demanding poll?"

Mr. Albert Wong said, "The Chairman just said by a show of hands. I simply want to confirm anybody on stage shows their hands. I am afraid Members on stage have forgot to show their hands. You have heard and remember what the Chairman said, right?"

The Chairman asked the GC members on stage to show their hands, and reminded the Club staff to count the votes.

Mr. Philip Chok said, "Mr. Chairman, first you should declare result - the outcome of show of hands of this round. Then call for whether 5 Members demanding poll. That means declare the result of this round first."

The Chairman said, "Which sentence of Article 75 states 'declare result'?"

Mr. Philip Chok said, "It states 'conclusive', which means we have to get the results first."

The Chairman said, "According to Article 75, do I have the right to declare results?"

Mr. Philip Chok said, "You have. The Article states clearly that you need to declare results."

The Chairman said, "Do I have the right? Where is it stated?"

Mr. Ko Sai Hong said, “Mr. President, after the show of hands, if you think the resolution is carried, then you need to declare the result. If 5 Members do not stand up or show their hands for demand poll, that will be carried.”

The Chairman said, “Yes, you are right. Okay, vote counting finished. Oh yes, Ludwig, please check whether vote counting is done at the other meeting venues...”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “Mr. President, I don’t know anything though I have been to many CCC EGMs...It seems you have caused a mess. However, that’s alright. I just want to tell you all. By common sense, I saw many Members showed their hands to vote for the resolution. Not even one against it. So why poll?”

The Chairman said, “Yes, thanks for your comments. Anyone demand poll?”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “You should first declare whether the resolution is carried or not. As far as demand poll is concerned, it is their own demand. It is not necessary for you to call for it.”

The Chairman said, “Ludwig told me there are 172 Members voted for the resolution.”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “So is this resolution carried? Because we need to have 3/4 ...”

The Chairman said, “Now following the Article 75, I am asking any demand poll?”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “No, not yet. You should first declare result of the resolution.”

The Chairman said, “Already declared, 172 Members voted for it.”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “It is not passed yet, as 3/4 members’ votes are required to pass it. Now we are not sure whether it is over 3/4 members. Please have a look at the Article. It requires 3/4 votes to carry resolution in an EGM.”

The Chairman said, "You are discussing Article 75 with me now, right?"

Mr. Anthony Chok said, "I am telling you now, please listen carefully. It is 172 Members voting for the resolution. 172 to 0. It is already passed."

The Chairman said, "172 voting for it. Now I am asking for any objection."

Mr. Anthony Chok said, "Right, I actually want to know how many Members voted against it."

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, "This is your opinion. Anyone demand poll? Please stand up now. Are there 5 Members?"

Mr. Anthony Chok said, "What has it got to do with demand poll? Now it is 172 to 0!"

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, "This is your interpretation. Anyone demand poll?"

The Chairman said, "Anyone did not show your hand among all present Members?"

Mr. Philip Chok said, "Mr. President, you need to declare result and announce whether the resolution is passed or not."

The Chairman said, "Anyone did not show your hand or objection?"

Mr. Philip Chok said, "You have not asked whether there is any objection. Mr. President, you need to ask if there is any objection before you can do the calculation for the resolution to be passed."

The Chairman asked if Mr. Andrew Liu wants to speak. Mr. Andrew Liu and Mr. Chu Kwok Lau showed their hands to vote against the resolution.

Mr. Philip Chok said, "That means 172 to 2. Have you included other meeting venues in your counting? They should be included. Mr. Chairman, according to Article 75, you have to declare whether resolution is passed or not. After that, someone can

demand poll. Now you have not declared yet.”

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, “No, not declare pass.”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “Can you please take a look at the Article. It is required to ‘upon declaration of the resolution’.”

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, “Are you the only one who can interpret the Article?”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “But every time what you say is wrong.”

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, “You are the one who always tell the wrong things.”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “Sorry but there was an example just now. Duffy’s explanation has pointed out your mistakes.”

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, “There are not examples. I don’t agree.”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “You may not agree but you are stupid.”

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, “I don’t agree with you, okay? Now how many Members demanding poll? Please stand up.”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “What authority do you have for asking? Are you the Chairman?”

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, “So are you the Chairman now?”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “So you don’t have the authority to ask who wants to demand poll.”

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, “Shut up!”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “Shut up!”

Mr. Tang Pok Yan said, “What’s up!”

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, “Why you speak so loudly?”

Mr. Tang Wai Ho said, “What kind of authority do you have when you ask someone to ‘shut up’ when he is speaking? I want to know what kind of authority do you have to do so?”

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, “Okay.”

The Chairman said, “Okay, now according to the information from the Manager, we have 223 Members present in the EGM today. We’ve just had 172 Members showing their hands to vote for the resolution. Now I am requesting for any demand poll. If anyone is demanding poll, we will be moving on to the next step.”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “My apologies, Mr. President, I know you have tried hard to be a good chair, but I am worried you will make mistakes because you still haven’t declared whether the resolution is passed or not.”

The Chairman said, “I see. I am following Article 75 to pass this resolution. Philip, you were right. Following Article 75, I declare this resolution is passed. If there is no objection, this resolution is passed.”

Since there was no objection from the Members, the Chairman continued to say, “According to Article 75, my next step is to ask if anyone demanding for poll?”

There are 6 Members showing their hands for demand poll. The Chairman said, “As we now have more than 5 Members demanding for poll, I would like to request every member to conduct a ballot, following Article 75.”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “Mr. Chairman, the following issue is whether the voting should be open or secret ballot. I heard that you have just mentioned that the GC has a resolution requesting for voting by secret ballot. In this respect, we have already seen the GC resolution. However, there are a number of issues about the resolution which I would like to raise:

Firstly, regarding the resolution, the advice by the legal advisor and the written request from 13 Members are not evidenced. If these are key to the GC resolution, then should they openly disclose the name of the legal advisor and details of his advice, as well as the names of the 13 Members and details of their suggestion?"

Secondly, our Club's legal advisor Mr. Duffy Wong spoke to us publicly in a forum that he has looked into the AoA and confirmed that it does not mention about secret or non-secret ballot in voting. So it is possible even if the voting is done by open (non-secret) ballot. What I want to know now is why the GC did not follow the advice from our legal advisor. Why you ignored his opinions?"

Thirdly, your resolution has mentioned about the written request from 13 Members and that is why you suggested to vote by secret ballot. However, everyone knows there were 38 Members submitting their petition in which a request for open ballot was clearly stated. Why you ignored the request from 38 Members but listened to that of 13 Members? What is the reason behind? Can you explain?

Lastly, point #4, our Club has never faced such a serious problem like today. If it is not handled properly, our Club will go bankrupted. Don't think this will never happen. If it is not handled properly, I promise it will happen. Therefore, we have a very good reason to vote by open ballot this time. Voting by open ballot will ensure the best interest of the Club. If our land lease cannot be renewed, many Members will suffer from big losses. Because of this, for natural justice, we have to disclose the names of voter who vote against the resolution."

Mr. President, I know the GC is not going to change their mind. To protect myself from being claimed in the future by those Members who suffer a loss in this event, I am going to take a photo of my voting intention by my mobile phone for record, and send it to xxxx xxxx (a telephone number), in order to generate a list of voluntary ballot voters. I am calling on all Members who support the resolution to follow what I am doing in order to protect yourselves. If you don't do so, you may be misinterpreted as voting against the resolution. Thank you."

The Chairman invited Mr. Albert Wong to express his views.

Mr. Albert Wong said, “That gentleman has explained clearly. In fact, everyone understands the meaning behind the voting today is whether the land lease of the Club can be renewed, i.e. whether the Club will still exist by 2026. In other words, the meaning behind the voting is no longer 1 to 2 or other issues. In fact, I wrote a letter to the Club on 19 January this year listing out three reasons to explain that if our voting system is not changed, the Government will not renew our lease in 2026. Now I will explain what the three reasons are: First, according to Article 25 of the Basic Law, ‘All Hong Kong residents shall be equal before the law’. Second, the Bill of Rights Ordinance Cap. 383 Article 22 states that ‘All persons are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to the equal protection of the law’. The third reason is, it is the core value of the Hong Kong society. Equality is our core value. Our Club is incorporated under the Company Ordinance, so it is ruled by the Hong Kong Law. I have just quoted two Laws. In fact they are quite new. I mean by the time the Club was founded, there was no Basic Law nor Bill of Rights Ordinance. Therefore, we have never breached Hong Kong Law before, but are we breaching the law today? I have no idea. We have a lot of legal experts sitting here...but all these are not the point.

How would the Government see the issue? The core value of the Hong Kong society is the most important to the Government. The HKSAR Government will never do things opposing to the core value of Hong Kong society. This is what I say. You may call my name. My name is Albert Wong. The HKSAR Government will not do anything against the core value of the society. So the meaning behind the voting today is not a matter of one person one vote. It is the survival of the Club. So I was quite hurt. There were only 2 or 3 Members supporting this matter. For other members, I am not saying you were not supportive, however, you will actually wind up the Club directly or indirectly. Please don’t have any speculation about the Government of giving you any leniency or whatever, showing some respect for you. Don’t believe it. The HKSAR Government don’t do this. They care about justice. That is all I want to say. Thank you.”

The Chairman invited Mr. David Ho express his views.

Mr. David Ho said, “Just to say a word, may I? Regarding the meaning of what I

mentioned about to be responsible for myself, I didn't expect Philip to say so. I mean I am willing to register my name on Whatsapp. After my name is registered, then I don't need you to say you will protect me. That is what I mean. As I am willing to be 100% responsible for myself, I believe there are a lot of Members willing to tell what they have done and don't mind if other Members know about it."

The Chairman invited Mr. Kenneth Wong to express his views.

Mr. Kenneth Wong said, "I would like to say something. In fact, the most important thing is, so many GC members sitting here, their prime responsibility is to protect the interests of all Members. But in this respect, though you are crystal clear about what the Members' interests are, your attitude is indifferent and unclear. I will clearly tell all Members that I am a supporter of the resolution. The best option is one person one vote, but we have no choice. We have to opt for the 2nd choice which is changing 50 votes to 2 votes. That's our only choice. However, the GC is not giving us a message that they are supportive to this event, causing a lot of Members feeling that they are not enthusiastic in promoting the change, which also disappointed me. As this is the basic responsibility of the GC, I believe if the Club is sure to go bankrupted in the future, they may have to be legally responsible. That is what I believe."

The Chairman said, "Thank you Kenneth. You have made a long speech and I think you have got something wrong. I am telling you that the one person one vote system you are fighting for is not something new. Sorry, you were not the first one who raised this matter. It was first raised by myself 20 years ago. It was that year when Mr. Paul Tam was the President. Mr. Paul Tam claimed to call an annual EGM for the voting. I was soliciting each and every vote everywhere. Please don't criticize anything about GC. We at GC are positive towards the resolution. I am telling you, I am not objecting to one person one vote. What matters is that you don't point a gun against my head. Do not point...with a threatening, discriminating and blaming attitude. Sorry but I think you are pointing at those 50-voters with such attitude - A discriminating attitude. You are like that deep inside. Because you want an open ballot and even want to sue them. Didn't you say you wanted to sue them? Did you say so? Mr. Philip Chok, did you say so? When you speak in the public, you have to be legally responsible...no problem."

Mr. Philip Chok said, “The one who points a gun against your head is not a Member of the Club, but the Hong Kong Government...”

The Chairman said, “Sorry, it is the Hong Kong Government because someone let them know...”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “So even we point at... it is useless...”

The Chairman said, “Everyone knows what has happened!”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “How amazing you are! They listened to you simply because you told them to?”

The Chairman said, “Somebody is so amazing.”

Mr. Philip Chok said, “Anyone so amazing? What do you think the Government is? Don’t you know that the Government policies first have to be passed and determined at the Executive Council before it can be implemented by various Government departments? I have worked in different Government departments for over 30 years. Now the problem is - I just want to tell you – please don’t blame the Members here because the Hong Kong Government is the one pointing a gun against our Club.”

The Chairman said, “I am not blaming you. However, if you run an open ballot then you are discriminating those 50-vote members.”

Ms. Amy Wong said, “I would like to ask the President and all Members to calm down and keep cool. We are not here to fight. We are here to solve a problem. I totally respect the so called SVM before. Your 50 votes are worth it. However, we have to amend it now, which doesn’t mean we don’t respect you. We just hope to keeping going by 2026. Please focus on this point and do not argue any more. I hope the meeting today can be run smoothly. No one is pointing a gun against you. No one is pointing a gun against me either, asking me to vote. I am here to vote because I am a Member. I hope after 2026, you SVMs’ sons, daughters and grandchildren and Ordinary Voting Members (OVMs) like us can continue to use the facilities. I hope I can stay here every day after I am 65. 2 votes is not the most ideal. You can ask for 10

votes. Even 10 to 1 will work. However, we must satisfy our needs... Please tell me what to do. I am a rational Member. I have a brain. I know if you don't amend, the Government will not pass it. If you tell me, it will be passed, then please send me a notice to tell us what to do. We are not here to debate. We don't need 1 to 1. We just need it to be passed. I hope everyone here will be thinking the way I think. Thank you."

The Chairman said, "This lady is telling my innermost thoughts."

Ms. Amy Wong continued to say, "That's okay. Thank you. I hope everyone can act towards this objective. I also hope SVMs can be aware that 2 to 1 doesn't mean we don't respect you, but we need it to be passed. I thank you very much for your contribution. I hope your children and grandchildren can continue to play here. Thank you."

The Chairman asked Mr. David Lam to express his views.

Mr. David Lam said, "I have not come for many years. I really want to come today. I also hope everyone of our next generation can keep coming here to play because our family have 3 votes, including my son and my daughter. I have not been here for many years. I really hope to see one person one vote today. You said you suggested amending 50 votes to 1 vote 20 years ago. However, you did not show your hand. I was watching you. What did you mean? You were self-contradictory. I was watching your action closely, so I voiced out. If we do not amend, people have the right to imposing an encumbrance on our Club's title deed. It will be a total loss by then.

The Chairman said, "Mr. Lam, if we the GC had disagreed, we would not have called this meeting."

Mr. David Lam said, "Then why you did not show your hand? I saw two Members showed their hands, but not you. You said you suggested 20 years ago, but you did not show your stand.

The Chairman said, "Mr. Lam, please don't be personal. If we do not agree, we would

not have called the meeting. That is what I say.”

Ms. Amy Wong said, “Can everyone stop arguing here please? I hope you can stay calm. I hope no matter it is passed or not today, we have made our stand known. I have the feeling there is nothing we can do, because SVMs have made all decisions for us. However, we still need to come her. We have to do something, because I would like to tell you, I hope the Lease can be renewed. If we don’t have plan B today, and the resolution is not passed, what should we do? Those Members who guaranteed the renewal, please tell me what to do. We need help. We don’t want to create trouble. Please do not argue any more, because today we vote for one single item only. Don’t argue about other issues. If it can be passed, very good. If it cannot be passed, we still have to think of other solutions. Please tell us what can be done. Please do not argue any more. Don’t waste time.”

The Chairman said, “Thank you. What you said is what we wanted to say.”

The Chairman invited Mr. Lucas Tsung to express his views.

Mr. Lucas Tsung said, “Dear Members, the issue we are arguing today is indeed the one concerned by the Club for over 10 years. Certainly, the 50:1 or 1:50 ratio appeared before was a tax problem, but it has nothing to do with it now. So it is time to amend and this is a fact. However, the President has made it clear just now that this issue we have already...I was a GC member before. I had worked hard but was not successful. It is simply because there are so many problems existing. We cannot suggest 2 to 1 or something...as it is not necessary. Our title deed will expire by 2026. It is just 2022 now, so we have 4 years left. You may give a chance to the GC and let them do their work within these 4 years. They have their way. Many Members sitting here has got one vote on their hand. I can understand and I want a reform too. The problem is we cannot finish the job overnight. Please give some time to the GC and let them work during these years in order to make you satisfied. Is that okay?”

Dr. Sharon Chu said, “I think after such keen discussion I would like to say something more emotional. I think after the Forum in in January, we can draw a conclusion based on the points of view of different fellow Members. Regarding the resolution today, are you voting for or against it? It’s the difference between ‘yes and

no', i.e. which side are you on. Before my uncle Mr. Patrick Chu died...he passed away two years ago, he was a Special Voting Member. Once he told me that in terms of Club affairs, the most annoying was the 1 to 50 system – it was such an unfair system. He said he hoped to reform this system. He wanted to see progress in the Club but regretfully, he can never see it anymore. He passed away two years ago. If we can fight for a fair result about this issue, then at Ching Ming Festival next year, I will be able to tell him in front of his grave, “Dear uncle, it is finally done! You can celebrate it with your friends up above in heaven!” I hope to say this to him badly. This may be a bit personal and emotional, but this is what I wanted to say since the January Forum. One more thing which I hope the Committee will not mind, especially the letter...I know you also...I truly believe you are all for the Club's benefit and you all want to do something for the Club. However, sometimes the way you do things...for example the letter to notify us the meeting, I received it only 2 days ago and there is no agenda attached. So I am not so clear about what is happening. Moreover, the Work Report before has mentioned about 38 Members submitting the petition, that means they have submitted application for the 2 to 1 vote proposal. I think the way you wrote the letter is somehow misleading. It sounds like you have already resolved this issue, it is already passed and you have already raised your application. So I think you should avoid doing things which may mislead people. Why did you inform Members about the meeting only 2 days ago? And you were not stating clearly the purpose of the meeting. I truly hope we can avoid such situation. When the election become fairer and the Committee become more representative, I hope such situation will happen less often. That is what I want to say.”

(Remark by the meeting: The notice and agenda to notify all Members to attend the EGM on 29 April 2022 was sent to all Members by Local Surface Mail and email on 5 April 2022, and the purpose of the meeting was fully explained in the notice of meeting.)

The Chairman invited Mr. Paul Lee to express his views.

Mr. Paul Lee said, “I came from the other side because people from that side wanted me to raise the point of order, hopefully the Legal Advisor can provide some advice. First let me introduce myself. I am Paul Lee. F-0x0x. As I have four family members becoming a Member of the Club, we spent over \$1 million on this. Secondly, point of

order. Your notice states that the meeting venue is at CCC, but we have found that the facilities are unfair. My point is, you have to afford...if you divide the venue into three locations, the same facilities should be available in all three locations. As the other side does not have any microphones, if a member wants to say something, he has to walk all the way down here, like myself. He will then let me speak. I have to thank him because if he didn't allow me to speak, I will have to queue up for a long time. Point #1, you have to offer the same facilities to...if here is site A, many Members are sitting at sites B & C without a microphone there and you are not greeting them. Point#2, when a Member was speaking here, you were not regulating the speakers. As a result, some Members spoke continuously for 3 or 4 times but many Members want to say something. Can you please regulate them? After they have spoken once, it is counted once. You cannot...I am not debating with you now, it is not a court here. I have finished the two points of order. Our Legal Advisor can provide some advice so that unclear messages can be avoided. Another point is about program. If we are proceeding to another program, if what I hear is right, we were talking about whether the ballot should be open or secret. I have just one point – to offer us freedom. Of course we can vote for this, but please leave it to us. If I like, I will write my name. Otherwise, I will not. I have a clear stand, but I hope it can be open and fair. I don't want to see any critics, attitude or action causing unreasonable pressure to anyone. My position is to win or lose in a fair game, and hopefully without hearing any words on impulse. I am finished and I am going back to the other side now. I hope we can have a microphone on that side, can we?"

The Chairman said, "Actually, what Mr. Lee said are my innermost thoughts. We probably all have different stands; however, my point is if we go for open ballot, it may lead to some legal responsibilities. I mean some problems like discrimination. Frankly, I am personally not against anything, but I think Hong Kong is a free, fair and democratic society. Why we have to find a way to revenge people whose views are different from you? In this respect, I think it is totally unacceptable. For the goodness of the Club, I am okay no matter you vote for or against the resolution. I believe most Members are voting for the good of the Club. However, if such means is used against our Members, it is so unfair. This is my personal opinion only."

Mr. David Ho said, "Simply speaking, the lady just told us the important point. In fact, we respect everyone here. We eagerly hope to be renewed. Therefore I think 'It

doesn't matter if you are a black cat or white cat. If you can catch the mice, you are a good cat'. What we are doing now is like leaping in the dark. How many years left? Don't you have any crisis awareness? You can see Ukraine...I don't want to get you side-tracked. There are 7 habits. The first is to 'use your initiative'. The second is 'begin with the end in mind', 'prioritise your tasks'. 'win-win mentality', 'know yourself and your enemy'. You have to understand us being the Members. You always say 'I am representing you' but we don't think so. Afterwards, 'integration' – to achieve through various ways. Finally, 'keep updating'. So at this moment, you have to make a decision in the next second in order to get the Government to renew or not, and not to underestimate the difficulty by thinking 'we still have plenty of time'. I will conclude in one sentence and finish my speech: prevention is always better than cure.”

The Chairman invited Mr. Stephen Leung to express his views.

Mr. Stephen Leung said, “Very simple. Those who voted for the resolution has just told their reason. I hope those who voted against the resolution can tell us their reasons too. Just like that.”

The Chairman invited Mr. David Lam to express his views.

Mr. David Lam said, “In fact, most of you Committee members did not show your stands. I hope you can show your stands – whether you are for or against the resolution. You can then win people by virtue. If you are reasonable, I will surrender. I hope you will tell us your reason, in order to be fair to everyone.”

The Chairman said, “Frankly speaking, as the President, I have also showed my stand. I believe it is the same position of most GC members. We support the resolution and we are voting for it. If not, this meeting will not be called and organized.”

Mr. David Lam said, “Your so-called support – even yourself did not show your hand. Please tell me how can I trust you?”

The Chairman said, “If I don't support it, there will be no meeting.”

Mr. David Lam said, “You did not show your hands. You had the chance to do so, but you chose not to show your hands.”

The Chairman said, “I don’t need you to tell us this way. If I don’t support it, there will be no meeting.”

Dr. James Lau said, “Actually if you ask me, Kenny Leung and I both voted for the resolution. Moreover, I can say that at the time when GC asked me to handle corporate governance, we proposed to open up GC for OVMs and SVMs. We agreed and promised to do it in the future. As SVMs are getting old, what is the point of holding the position? I also think they should step down gradually. In fact, I can stop being an SVM or a GC member. I don’t mind. As everybody can see, I have started to step down gradually. I can say that I have done my best to serve the Club – the buildings, lease renewal, and corporate governance – I was involved in all these. But if you think I am holding the post for too long and you don’t need me to serve the Club any more, I don’t mind either. I can enjoy using the facilities of the Club. Regarding what was said by the Audit Committee, I agree with it in principle. You can see I seldom show objection. For many years I have agreed with the opinions of the Audit Committee. I hope we can find a harmonic approach to tackle the problem.”

Mr. Chow Pak Sum said, “Hello everyone, I am Chow Pak Sum. I am a 50-voter. I also support the cancellation of 50 votes because we already have over 3,000 Members in our Club. We 50-voters did contribute to the Club but don’t forget time has changed. Now we have more than 3,000 Members plus their spouse and children, which becomes 6,000 to 7,000 people using Club facilities. Now all Members have their contribution because if we don’t have so many Members, the Government will surely not allow us to run the Club. We are all contributing to the Club. As a GC member, facing the threat from the Government, you should immediately step up and do something, but every one of you is standing there, not knowing what to do. Your duty is to serve the Club. It is different from before. It was a battlefield before but no longer. Now the Government is threatening us, do you know? If we are still alive after 4 years, should we not play chess in Victoria Park? What’s wrong with you? What on earth have you done? You are working for the Club now, not for personal interest. We are not electing the President now. It is the Club, which is run by you. It is not the time to fight for personal interest. It is the time to deal with the Government, don’t

you know? The Government is threatening us and you are talking about 4 years later? If you don't show our stand to the Government, the Government will see it as if we are giving up our rights. Two years...One year later, the Government will transfer the ownership of this place to others. Will they leave it for you? Don't be so ridiculous. All Members are contributing. If these few thousand people do not exist, the Government will immediately take back the land."

Mr. Marco Wu said, "Mr. Chow, the today's meeting is very important. In fact, everyone should know that the purpose of the meeting today is the Club has received a request from the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) in this respect...they all know that the land lease of the Club will be renewed together with 27 other Clubs in the same year of 2026. During our discussion, they pointed out to us that CCC is special with respect to the issue of SVM and OVM 50 to 1 vote. It is 2022 now and we have 3 to 4 years left before 2026. The Club should do something by itself. If we don't do anything, by the time...the evaluation by the Government does not simply focus on the Club but they will look at all clubs in Hong Kong as a whole when they consider how to renew us and what the conditions are, and most importantly the view of the public on this matter. So I think we should now find out what level we can do and how to amend our AoA, especially the SVM and OVM 50 to 1 issue, etc. We the GC has already started working on it. We have had a few meetings with the Government already. In this respect I think we should do more in the future. In fact, we should all understand that we are in the same boat. If we cannot be renewed when 2026 arrives, that will be the worst case. You should understand this point. Please share your views. Thank you."

Mr. Wong Ki Kwok said, "My surname is Wong, membership number is W-0x06. I strongly agree with what Mr. Chow just said. I will become almost a 30-year Member by next year. I don't treasure those 50 votes anymore. Time has changed. It must be amended. I have a friend who became a Member recently. He is a doctor. He has asked me this question, 'Can we continue after 2026?' I guarantee we can continue. If the Club is cancelled, I will get into trouble. I treat the Club as my second home. I have a colleague who joined the Club at the age of 68. If you tell him everything will be finished after a few years...hurry up! Make it simple! Show the hands! We just need to show our hands to pass it. As simple as that."

Mr. Philip Chok said. “Mr. President, I strongly agree with what the Member just said. I want to say that Mr. Lucas Tsung just mentioned about the title deed of the Club will only expire in 2026 so we don’t need to do anything at the moment. I believe there is something Mr. Tsung doesn’t know. On 14 December last year, we received a letter from the Government clearly stating what they requested our Club to: (1) Reform the 50-vote system; (2) Open the GC to the all Members. The letter was clearly written and they knew that we proposed the 5:1 amendment. They clearly stated that it was ‘not satisfactory’ which means this was not what they wanted us to do. The letter then says, listen carefully, this is the most important part, they requested our GC to formulate a Work Plan which the Club should submit to the Government. The Work Plan should list out what our Club plans to do for the two major amendments, namely the amendment of 50-vote system and the opening of GC to the all Members. Moreover, the letter claimed clearly if the Club is doing nothing about these, the HAB will reserve the right to withdraw the policy support to the Club. If they really withdraw the policy support to the Club, some Members may not be aware, it means not renewing the land lease of the Club. The HAB is the policy bureau for sports affairs. If they don’t provide policy support to the Club, the title deed of the Club will not be renewed. It was clearly written. You can have a look at it. Everyone please pay attention to one point - there are only two bold words in the letter. Mr. Tsung, do you know which two words? It’s ‘Urgent Action’. Are you aware of this, Mr. Tsung? Okay. Have our GC done something about it? Did you submit any Work Plan to the Government? No...so the HAB sent another email to the Club on 13 April, stating they requested the Club to submit a Work Plan within 4 weeks in December last year, and nothing was done, until today. The HAB was aware that if an EGM was called, the voting ratio will be reduced to 2:1. i.e. SVMs have two votes. This time the HAB has no objection to it. They responded with ‘not satisfactory’ for 5:1 last time, but this time they didn’t say so. It means they agreed, i.e. they support our resolution of 2 to 1 votes. We could all see that their intention was so clear. In the letter dated 13 April, they also keep asking what happened to the GC? You still have not answered. I would like to ask the GC, when do you plan to reply to the Government? It has been 4 months now. You didn’t do it since then. When do you think you will reply to them? Do you know the consequence if you do not reply? Do you think we can wait until 2026, like what Mr. Tsung said? Thank you.”

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, “I am not very popular, as I represent one side of voices only.

It is probably like a coin – one side is tail; one side is head. You have told the tail only, so I will talk about the other side. Everyone speaks calmly. What I've just told Philip was emotional. I am sorry about that. Philip just mentioned about the letter on 14 December. Now all stories are centered around this letter. But please we have to take a complete picture (see the whole picture). I mean not to quote out of the context. There are a few words which I need everyone to be tolerant with me, because there is more than one opinion in the world. Even there is one judge, two lawyers will argue in front of him. If there are only one judge and one lawyer, then no trial would be required. They wrote 'expiry date is 2026, still have 4 years left' in the first paragraph, and mentioned about 'submit detailed work plan' i.e. route map in the last paragraph. Why they still allow to submit work plan? Because it is not the end. We still have room for discussion and this is not the final step. The point is 'submit detailed work plan', that is the route map. Why they said so? Because the lease expiry is the end of 2026, not 2022. Now let's come to the key point. I believe many people have missed – the key words or core issue is 'reserve the right to withdraw our policy support'. This sentence is the centre of argument tonight. They said 'reserve the right to withdraw our policy support', it means they will not renew with CCC. Okay, so why 'reserve the right'? If you don't do it now what we asked you, for instance, they can write directly 'definitely support for renewal' or 'definitely not support for renewal'. In the last paragraph, HAB could also write 'If you do this, we will recommend CCC...etc.' But they didn't write the letter this way. Why? The reason is simple. Listen carefully. Because the Director of HAB now cannot preempt or take away the authority of the future Director. This renewal will not be done by the existing Director. It will be decided by the future Director. This is an ever-changing world. Two months ago, could you predict Chief Executive Carrie Lam will step down? Did you predict Mr. John Lee Ka-chiu will become the next Chief Executive? Will the Government policy for recreational clubs change in the future? Even if now is the key moment, we are still not sure who will be the next HAB Director yet. So, it is right for Ms. Dorothy Cheung not to commit herself. That's why she wrote 'reserve the right'. In other words, it is April 2022, the key moment is still yet to come. It is just like horse racing – we have not yet reached the finishing point. You are telling everyone this horse is in the leading place and we should stop the race and present the prizes immediately. This is not only unreasonable, but also impossible. My point is time has not come yet. Thank you. I am finished."

Mr. James Law said, “Dear Members, thanks to Mr. Chin for your explanation to us. We have done the recording, right? I hope you are right. With more than 20 years’ experience working for the Government, I think ‘reserve the right’ is equivalent to a serious warning. It means I have warned you already. If you don’t listen to me, I have the right to cancel – don’t say I (the Government) did not make things clear in advance. ‘Reserve the right’ is a clause we used to use. I hope you are right, but we cannot take such a risk. It is always safer to be conservative. Why don’t we do it earlier? If we get it passed tonight, 50 votes becoming 2 votes, then there must be no problem for the renewal. No doubt at all! Now what you said is doubtful. If every one of us listens to Mr. Chin and decides to do nothing, then when 2026 arrives, all of a sudden, we are told we cannot be renewed. What should we do by then? Every one of us simply trusts Mr. Chin tonight. I hope you can be more rational. Those 50 votes...thought we still can negotiate or bargain a few more rounds with the Government. But I just want to tell you, it will not happen. I read the letter. The wordings sound so tough. Indeed, you are not listening to them. When they say ‘no’, you don’t have the right to object. They have warned you already. ‘Reserve the right’ means they will reserve the right not to renew. These are the wordings the Government used to use. Thank you.”

Mr. Marco Wu said, “I would like to respond to James. I agree with what he said. I have been working for the Government for so many years. It also let me know that we cannot wait until 2026 before we can do something, as said by Mr. Chin. It will be too late. Actually, it is 2022 now, and the issue cannot be resolved within one or two months. We need to consult and talk. I think seriously we should start doing something now. We also need to communicate and discuss with the Government. Government policies need to be passed in the Legislative Council and the Executive Council. Time buffer need to be allowed. Therefore, we need to start now.”

Mr. Wong Tak Wing said, “After listening to what Mr. Chin said, I must defend for the Government. I have worked for the Government for over 30 years. I have left now. I cannot represent the Government today. I can only represent myself. We’ve just talked about ‘reserve the right’...my job during these 30 years was writing documents. I don’t know how many times have I written this sentence...In fact some Members just said that it is a general clause used by the Government. They won’t use ‘definitely terminate’ which I have never seen. I have worked for the Government for

over 30 years and I have written over 10 thousand pages of documents. I can tell you I have never seen such wordings. Maybe law firms will write that but not the Government. Second, you said the Government will change, but I say they won't. I have just highlighted three reasons. Which Government official dare to stand out and say, 'We don't need to follow the Basic Law, the Law of Human Rights and the core value of Hong Kong'? There is no turning point. Please don't have any fantasy with the Government. The Government nowadays...I am not representing the Government. I am a retired civil servant. I can tell you, the Government can never do this. How can they get their policy passed in the Legislative Council? If they get it passed, I will get someone to ask them in the Council, why they approved. The Government would not be able to answer. Finally, I would like to know that if the next program is to have 5 Members demanding for poll, I ask, request and beg these 5 people to stand out and tell us what their reasons behind are. We are fair. Just like what Mr. Chin said, the coin has two sides. It is wrong just listening to one side. I ask, request and beg them to speak out. Thank you."

Ms Ivy Wong said, "Mr. Chin just said everything has two sides. I cannot agree more. Before he spoke, I eagerly hoped that he could have his justification. However, I was a bit disappointed after listening to him because his justification was the current HAB by the time of approval, it will not be them anymore. Therefore, what we do now is useless. I think it should be the other way round. If I want to apply for something in the future, the current Director will be changed by the Chief Executive. So no need to do anything until the successor of the Director is on board. Is this the approach we should adopt? Also the Committee said they are already doing something, but everyone wants to know what exactly their action plan is. If we cannot pass the resolution, is there an alternative plan ensuring our success? Similarly, the Director of HAB is also expecting us to do something reasonable. I will not believe the saying that what is promised by the current Director will be totally overthrown by his successor. It does not make sense and does not comply with the Basic Law and human right. Am I right, Mr. President? Are we supposed to start doing something now and wait until the coming change of personnel, do what they want and plan accordingly? I would like to comprehend what the Committee wants to do, so that our Members can feel safe. If we cannot pass...maybe 90% cannot pass, is there a Plan B? Is passing the resolution the only negotiable plan? If we cannot pass, then what do you want to do and how would you help the Members to enable all of us continue to

enjoy using the Club after 2026? Thank you.”

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, “Miss Wong, I absolutely agree with you. However, today’s point is...there is a song liked by the Dr. Lau. It is called *‘It’s now or never, tomorrow will be too late’*. If we start doing things next week, not we wait until 2026... My point is: must we decide by tonight? We must decide by 5 pm tonight, or it will be too late, isn’t it? Will next week be too late? What about next month? Will it be too late? Now is forever. This argument is right or wrong, everyone knows by heart.”

Ms. Ivy Wong said, “If we start doing tomorrow, shall we call another EGM to pass the resolution?”

Mr. Chin Pak Hing said, “No need. The GC can...”

Ms. Ivy Wong said, “If you do it tomorrow, will you consider today what you want to do tomorrow? I just want to know. It doesn’t matter if you pass it or not. If you really guarantee you have another action plan, we are alright. Now I can see nothing. I’ve just raised this question. Maybe you missed my question. If you don’t pass it, and you say you will not do it today but do it tomorrow. Yes, it is already 6:46 pm. It is late and it is time to get off duty. Then if you start working tomorrow, please tell me what action plan do you have. If it is not passed today, at least you have to wait for a period of time before you can call another meeting. Taking the advantage of EGM or AGM when all Members are present here today, can our Committee members please give us some idea as to what you will do if the resolution is not passed. I think this is fair to us. This is the information our Members deserve to know. Do you agree, Mr. President?”

The Chairman invited Mr. Joseph Tang to express his views.

Mr. Joseph Tang said, “Thank you Mr. President. I am Joseph Tang. T-0x1x. In the January Forum and just now, many Members, including Philip Chok, Albert Wong, have talked about their reasons. I don’t want to repeat what were said, but I hope the Committee can give us some indication. I know you are doing something...What about you, the 12 GC members in favor of the motion? Please show your hands again for us to see, so that we know at least 12 of you are supportive to us. Let’s don’t talk

about the other 89 SVMs. Okay?”

The Chairman said, “Purely personal?”

Mr. Joseph Tang, “Purely personal, do you support the 1:1? Still have another 50 voters...or at least the GC is supporting us.”

There are 6 GC members showed their hands to make their stand known.

Mr. Joseph Tang said, “6 of them on the stage showed their hands. Still have other people. Maybe they have left their seats.”

Dr. C. Y. Cheung said, “Let me say something, can I? I have been joining the SVM election for 13 years and only get elected after 13 years. I know deeply that the SVM system is unfair. It should not exist. So I definitely support the resolution.”

Mr. Joseph Tang said, “Thank you Dr. Cheung. Kenny...Kenny just left his seat. He also voted for the resolution. He already showed his hand but he has come back now to show it again. Those GC members who voted against the resolution, can you tell us any reason behind?”

The Chairman said, “Sorry, I don’t want to...”

Mr. Joseph Tang said, “Because of the meeting today, we should not argue about this matter. We should pass the resolution.”

The Chairman said, “If I vote against it, I will still show my hands. However, I voted for it. I don’t want to alienate...”

Mr. Joseph Tang said, “If there is no objection, let’s move on to follow the agenda, shall we? Now the meeting has been run for 2 hours, but we still have not done anything solid.”

The Chairman said, “I don’t want anyone venting their anger on those Members voting against the resolution.”

Mr. Joseph Tang said, “I know. I just want to get the GC members to encourage our OVMs.”

The Chairman said, “Dear Members, it is time to end our speaking time and start voting. We can actually make a decision by voting now.”

The Chairman invited Mr. Kevin Fung to express his views.

Mr. Kevin Fung said, “Hello everyone. I am Kevin. I have joined the Club for over 10 years. It is not a long time. Let me declare my interest. During my 17 years’ time with the Club, I worked in different Sub-Committees with many 50-voters being my co-workers. I think the resolution today is not used to prove that we don’t respect 50-voters, as we do respect them being the senior Members of the Club, for their valuable contribution to the Club. By the way, I want to thank Mr. Chin...will he be the future President after tonight? It was a nice try that he tried to explain this way. But this has proved one thing, such explanation is necessary. Because when I was working on the resolution project, I felt disappointed, especially when I heard different voices showing objection to the resolution from those who voted against it today, in the bars and different facilities of the Club. They said, ‘These guys are seizing power, trying to rob their votes, causing differentiation or something’. I even personally saw some Audit Committee members working on the resolution project be scolded by some 50-voters. Therefore...we have heard the voices of many supporters. I would also like to hear the voices from those who are against the resolution because personally I have heard a lot of such voices. This afternoon, I heard some 50 voters claiming they didn’t know what was going to happen today. When I was still a Lawn Bowls Sub-Committee member last year, including the current Lawn Bowls Convenor, they said that, even we do nothing, the Government would still renew our lease. I want a clear answer. Is it true?”

The Chairman said, “Thank you Kevin for your comments. In fact, we need more young Members like Kevin to serve the Club. Okay. We have listened to what you all want to say. Now we have overrun for one hour. We still have AGM following this.”

The Chairman then announced voting by secret ballot begins.

Four staff from the Club were responsible for counting the votes and an auditor from “PKF HK” was responsible for supervising the counting of the votes.

After vote counting, the Honorary Secretary declared that the percentage of approval of this special resolution was 48.78%. As a result, the resolution was not carried.

2. CLOSE OF THE MEETING

The Chairman thanked Members for their attendance and declared the meeting be closed at 19:40.

Signed as a correct record

Chairman



紀利華木球會於二零二二年四月二十九日（星期五）下午五時在香港跑馬地黃泥涌道 188 號紀利華木球會舉行特別會員大會的會議紀錄

出席者

姜榮輝先生，會長（大會主席）
鄔滿海先生，副會長
林偉光先生，義務秘書
張振翊博士，義務司庫

理事會理事：陳柏林先生，錢北慶律師，何炳權先生，許琪亨先生，關健暢先生，劉志宏博士、梁健開先生及譚耀波先生。

特別遴選會員：龐述俊醫生，祝建平先生，張榮生先生，張子如先生，陳少雄先生，朱國鑾先生，祝建勳先生，徐振榮先生，陳漢良先生，祝建新先生，張金輝先生，陳國鑣先生，陳家齡先生，周柏森先生，馮紀棠先生，馮源先生，胡曉明博士，甘燦堯先生，姜嘉驊先生，林清寬先生，廖耀禮先生，林榮金先生，李國賢先生，梁鑑宏先生，劉盈燊先生，林鍾鑾先生，黎桂培先生，雷西城先生，麥繼球先生，麥海謙先生，麥湘醫生，吳志剛先生，魏志強先生，蕭蔚雄先生，沈樹釗先生，孫以良先生，蔡大維先生，談葆榮先生，曹廣慶先生，叢茂滋先生，曹大衛先生，黃耀輝醫生，黃松發先生，黃永棟先生，王海康先生，黃守明醫生，黃守正先生，黃民享先生，易蔭華先生，楊德興先生，姚榮琛先生，游柏雄先生及黃信先生。

普通遴選會員：馬志堅先生，區自慧女士，朱漢輝先生，張國旗先生，陳大年先生，姜閻華先生，蔣玲芝女士，張錦洪先生，陳國華先生，鍾乃熾先生，朱思賢先生，陳少棠先生，周家輝先生，鄭勳仁先生，周慶榮女士，周家聰先生，蔡忠衡先生，蔡陳和蓓女士，趙汝珩先生，祝鴻基先生，陳文博先生，趙偉健先生，蔡小平先生，鍾國傑先生，陳玉生先生，陳儉輝先生，陳永生先生，張一梅女士，朱巧盈博士，陳檳林先生，徐明琛先生，陳靜怡女士，朱雪瑩女士，馮家麒先生，霍麗金女士，朱國威先生，李炳棠先生，霍新基先生，霍佩光先生，馮碧恩女士，何智偉先生，何偉明先生，余美玲女士，何德錦先生，何嘉珩女士，許思慧女士，何家舜先生，胡鑑民先生，葉建豐先生，葉紀章先生，高錦燊先生，高錦然先生，簡羽佳先生，關兆年先生，鄺錦強先生，鄺江笑麗女士，

季德燐先生，郭家豪先生，高世康先生，劉達釗先生，陸宗盛先生，梁健棠先生，李家達先生，李文峰先生，李漢基先生，羅兆容先生，梁灼添先生，廖智達先生，廖少豪先生，林鏡泉先生，李國豪先生，陸棠文先生，李文光律師，羅尚平先生，林兆炫先生，羅國岡先生，黎昌海先生，陳秀英女士，李家祥先生，殷玲妹女士，廖沛然先生，劉志明先生，黎美丹女士，李少斌先生，劉達基先生，李嘉安先生，李禮文先生，林炎興先生，李樹祥先生，李錫亮先生，劉幸流先生，林寶銘先生，梁錦明先生，黎孝慈女士，李韻儀女士，林健強先生，梁霍寶珊女士，盧德華女士，林富強先生，盧志超先生，凌澤霖先生，羅梓遠先生，李欣欣女士，劉貴顯先生，莫錦坤先生，馬國良先生，麥鎮南先生，莫兆華先生，文應樑先生，吳子經先生，吳文亮先生，吳家榮先生，吳銑文先生，伍兆偉先生，吳麗薇女士，吳偉豐先生，潘鴻昌先生，龐如英女士，潘司民先生，潘澤生先生，潘志衛先生，潘寶琦先生，沈為國先生，蘇燦煊先生，岑慧平女士，邵寶瓊女士，蕭鉅湛先生，余潤琛先生，丁賢鈞先生，徐興馳先生，謝漢堅先生，鄧緯豪先生，蔡大鈞先生，曾濠生先生，譚耀康先生，譚黃瑪琍女士，梁炳南先生，鄧炳榮先生，杜式喜先生，鄧博仁先生，譚綺薇女士，唐樹燊先生，唐啟立先生，譚伯全先生，唐冠雄先生，曾源威先生，唐關未賢女士，徐鳳英女士，曾卓飛先生，黃憲忻先生，黃國坤先生，黃振亞先生，黃潤華先生，黃毓康先生，黃遠為先生，黃國強先生，黃祺國先生，黃鎮南律師，黃琿先生，尹炫翰先生，黃德榮先生，黃鉅輝先生，王耀枝先生，黃妙婷女士，伍尚義先生，伍步崇先生，王卓祺先生，黃月媚女士，鄔婷碧女士，王均怡女士，黃健輝先生，黃尹姿女士，黃國楊先生，王志才先生，饒斯年先生，袁沛濤先生，邱明先生，袁泰來先生，嚴鈞塏先生，姚金松先生，葉慶寧先生，余汝銳先生，楊小杏女士，葉秋葵先生，任德輝先生，葉建華先生，王維蘭女士，楊瑞強先生，余必明先生及余華志女士。

公司提名會員：李錦慶先生，岑偉昌先生，黃幼幼女士，薛建勳先生，源永康先生，盧劍聰先生，陳家全先生，余劍豪先生，林達榮先生，鄭彥文先生，徐嘉釀先生，徐譽先生，楊國強先生及林聖豪先生。

(一) 特別決議案

大會主席告知會員，由於有 38 位會員要求召開特別會員大會，以通過將特別遴選會員的票數由 50 票減至 2 票的提議，因而召開此會議。而此提議已獲得公司註冊處處長核准，所以會議可如期舉行。大會主席宣佈會議正式開始，並邀請義務秘書宣讀大會議程，義務秘書宣讀議程如下：

「茲通告紀利華木球會謹訂於二零二二年四月二十九日（星期五）下午五時正在香港跑馬地黃泥涌道一八八號紀利華木球會（本會）舉行特別會員

大會，以考慮及酌情通過下列決議案為本會特別決議案：

票數：組織章程第八十三條

『動議修訂本會組織章程乙部第八十三條，刪除「五十」的字眼並以「兩」的字眼取代。』

說明附註：

- 1.) 本決議案由 38 名會員根據本會組織章程（「會章」）第 71 條及《公司條例》第 566 至 568 條提交的請求提出，旨在將特別遴選會員的票數由 50 票減至 2 票。
- 2.) 會章甲部第 5 條細則規定，除非事先已提交公司註冊處處長並獲其核准外，本會不得對會章作出任何增補、更改或修訂。
- 3.) 本會所在的內地地段第 9031 號的第 20199 號契約續期條款第(7)號特別條件規定，本會必須經地政總署署長同意，方可對會章作出修訂。
- 4.) 本會依上文附註 1 所述的要求發出本通知。如在會議開始前獲得公司註冊處處長及地政總署署長的核准及同意，並獲得會員的通過，此項修訂將即時生效，並在隨後的週年會員大會上實行。如未能在會議開始前獲得公司註冊處處長及地政總署署長的核准及同意，本決議案則不能有效通過，會議亦將相應延期。
- 5.) 根據《公司條例》第 596 條，會員如希望委任代表以行使其出席會議並在會議上發言及投票（不論以舉手或投票方式）的全部或任何權利，必須填寫及簽署代表委任書，並在會議預定開始前 48 小時前交回會所辦事處，以便進行驗證及登記。代理人將不可以使用逾時遞交作驗證及登記的代表委任書。為此隨函附上一份代表委任書。」

大會主席說：「根據我們此次會議的議程，我現在要求在座各位會員作出投票，因為理事會收到 38 位會員的聯署申請，要求舉行今晚的 EGM。我們亦得到 Company Registrar 及 HAB 的批准，得以舉行今晚的 EGM。我們下一步將進行這 38 位會員要求的程序，即投票的工作。在召開此次會議前，

我們亦收到 13 位會員聯署簽名，要求我們做『Secret Ballot』。這 13 位會員的要求是：『本人極力反對在特別會員大會上用舉手方式決定每一事項，本人提議用不記名投票方式決定每一事項。』這是由 13 位會員交給我們，讓理事會亦做出決定。

理事會有一個 resolution，名為『Resolution of the General Committee made on 22 April 2022』。我們簽署的原因有 3 點：

1. Legal advice was given by counsel that voting made by “Secret Ballot” for conforms with the determination of the sense of the meeting and natural justice.
2. Written request has been made by thirteen Members that voting for passing the resolutions for amendments of the Articles of Association should be made by “Secret Ballot”.
3. It was the usual practice of the Club in the past years that voting was made by “Secret Ballot” enable the identity of a voter not be revealed, the privacy of a voter be protected & his position and views not be unnecessarily made known to others.

我們亦得到大部份理事簽署通過這議案。我身為此次會議的主席，我現在宣布此次的 resolution 用不記名的方式投票，這是我作出的決定。」

高世康律師說：「我提議先用舉手方式投票，舉手後如有人根據會章要求 poll，那便 demand poll。至於是否 secret，到時候請大家發表意見。但我認為應先舉手。」

黃妙婷女士說：「我想請問，既然主席已宣布要用 poll，已是 conclusive 了，為什麼還要改變？」

大會主席說：「既然高律師提出了，亦有人贊成，我個人的意見是……贊成的請舉手、反對的請舉手、棄權的請舉手。我們也是尊重民意的。高律師，你同意嗎？」

高世康律師說：「你指舉手贊成議案還是……」

大會主席說：「我宣布用投票的方式。」

高世康律師說：「是否舉手投票？」

大會主席說：「不是，是 ballot，demand poll。」

高世康律師說：「即你是不想……」

大會主席說：「高律師，我了解你的意思是想用 show of hands，對嗎？」

高世康律師說：「是的。」

大會主席說：「沒問題的，我們很民主的，我強調我們是很民主的。如果你建議用 show of hands，大家如果覺得應該用 show of hands 的，那便用 show of hands。我建議用投票是因為有人寫信進來，OK？」

祝建勳先生說：「Sorry，會長……」

錢北慶律師說：「Philip，還沒輪到你……」

祝建勳先生說：「輪到你了嗎？你憑什麼現在拿起咪高峰？」

錢北慶律師說：「你不要用手杖指著別人，可以嗎？」

祝建勳先生說：「你憑什麼現在拿起咪高峰？輪到你嗎？」

錢北慶律師說：「那又輪到你嗎？」

祝建勳先生說：「又輪到你嗎？」

錢北慶律師說：「OK。」

祝建勳先生說：「你是主持嗎？」

大會主席說：「對不起，我現在交給錢律師發言。」

祝建勳先生說：「這就可以。」

錢北慶律師說：「Thank you。會長決定了這件事，是有兩個根據。第一，你看看 Section 75，這些 meeting 的 manner 是由會長決定的。第二，Company Law 591 Section 2，會長決定了便不能『返炒』。我說完了。」

祝建勳先生說：「主席，我可以發言嗎？」

大會主席說：「好的，Philip，請你發言。」

祝建勳先生說：「謝謝。我們 Article 的 Section 75，『A declaration by the Chairman at any General Meeting that a resolution has been carried thereat upon the show of hands shall be conclusive, and an entry to that effect in the Minute Book of the Club shall be sufficient evidence of that fact, unless immediately on such declaration a poll shall be demanded by not less than 5 Members present in person or by proxy having the right to vote at the meeting.....』Section 75 指出，主席首先要 call 一個 show of hands 再 vote for any resolution。After that，如果有 5 位會員 challenge，便要 by poll。而在 by poll 的時候，才開始展開記名或不記名的投票。第一 round 的 show of hands，已經在 Article 75 規定了。」

錢北慶律師說：「你看 Section 75 最後 7 個字，『or by the Chairman of the meeting』，為什麼你不把最後一句唸出來？」

祝建勳先生說：「哪裡？」

錢北慶律師說：「Section 75 最後一句，為什麼你不唸出來？『Or by the Chairman of the meeting』，你想修改 Article 嗎？」

祝建勳先生說：「我不是想修改 Article……Duffy Wong，請你澄清這個意思。」

黃鎮南律師說：「我要得到主席的批准才能發言。」

大會主席說：「有關 Article 75 最後一句『or by the Chairman of the meeting』，我現在要求我們的 Legal Adviser，Mr. Duffy Wong 提出他的意見。」

黃鎮南律師說：「其實剛才的會友提出關於 Article 75 首段的意見，我是百分百同意的。即是說流程上正如剛才那位會友所言，應該先 show of hands，之後若有人說『我不喜歡，重新再來』，便要重新再來。流程應該是這樣的。當然，錢律師說的也有道理，但『5 Members present in person at the meeting』，即如果有 5 位會員站起來說要 by poll vote……什麼是 poll vote，我在上次諮詢會上已經說得很清楚，意思是每個人有不同票數的計算方式，不是 secret ballot，不要誤會 poll vote 就是 secret ballot。那麼如果要 trigger 錢律師所說的事，便須 5 位會員站起來，現身說要 poll vote，但到現在都沒有人現身。我不知道那 13 位要求用 secret ballot 的會員有沒有來……secret ballot 不是 poll vote，不要混淆。Poll vote 是指計算股權或票權，secret ballot 則指悄悄地做。那 13 人想要悄悄地做。但參照第 75 條，程序上應先行 show of hands，如果有人反對，再用 poll vote。正如剛剛所說，poll vote 用不用 secret ballot，則是另一議題，又要提出來討論。是另一個議題，又要 by show of hands 決定這個議題。當然 by show of hands 決定這個議題時，亦是當有 5 人提出要用 poll vote 時，便須用 poll vote，是這個意思。所以第 75 條說得很清楚，流程就是這樣。」

祝建勳先生說：「謝謝 Duffy，我完全同意你的說法。即流程上首先須做 show of hands，之後如果有 5 位會員要求便 by poll，或由主席決定 by poll。但流程上首先須做 show of hands，麻煩錢律師先看清楚這條法例，你好像不知道這條例的意思。」

大會主席邀請李文光律師發言。

李文光律師說：「無論 by poll 或 by show of hands，我們外面還有會員，請把他們都叫過來，因為如果是 by show of hands 的話，我們應該把外面的會員都計算在內的。不止是在這裡 show，而是讓他們全部都進來，對吧？沒道理要在那邊 count 的。」

大會主席說：「因為我們可能有些會員在西餐廳或中餐廳，如果要 show of hands，我們希望他們要表態，是這樣嗎？Ludwig，你可以做到這方面嗎？即不在 Badminton Court 的……」

李文光律師說：「Ludwig，我提議找兩位同事到那邊，我們在做這個動作時，讓他們將所有結果記錄下，然後再拿過來。」

大會主席說：「可以。Leo、各位會員，我聽到各位會員的表達。我身為Chairman，我首先將根據 Article 75，先使用 show of hands。但 show of hands 時，我不能記錄他們的名字。……抱歉，這是我做人的原則。如果你將來 challenge 我做人的原則，我先在這裡告訴你們，show of hands 可以，但不要告訴我 show of hands 要記名，so that 有人歧視、攻擊他們，這是一個人的人權！一個人基本的人權！我身為會長，我不可能令我們的會員受到傷害。Leo，你有什麼想說？」

李文光律師說：「想說你剛剛提到的事情。因為我們這個會議是根據會章召開的……」

大會主席說：「誰召開的！誰說的！Leo 你代表誰？」

李文光律師說：「我不用代表誰，我代表我自己。我就是不同意你們的說法。」

大會主席說：「說吧，沒問題。香港是法治社會，公開、公平、公正，全世界最自由的，為什麼要歧視、追究一些會員？」

李文光律師說：「什麼香港？怎麼了？沒有人會歧視的。」

大會主席說：「你說吧，為什麼沒有歧視？」

李文光律師說：「Show of hands 是寫在了會章上的。你們不喜歡做這裡的會員的話，可以離開。會章就在這裡，是這麼說的。會長，如果你不喜歡這本 Article，你可以離開。」

大會主席說：「Show of hands……Leo，你懂法律嗎？Show of hands，請各位舉手，我姜榮輝舉手了，你有沒有記錄下來寫『姜榮輝舉手』？我現在問你有沒有記錄下來『姜榮輝舉手』？」

李文光律師說：「這個會所沒有人要記錄下來。如果有誰要記錄的話，那是他的事。」

大會主席說：「我已經告訴你了，Leo，不需要記錄。我只是跟你說這件事情

而已。假設姜榮輝舉手了，你不要記錄『姜榮輝舉手』。」

李文光律師說：「誰要記錄下來？誰說的？」

大會主席說：「你只想說這句話吧。」

李文光律師說：「那便可以了。」

大會主席說：「你現在是反對我說的話。」

李文光律師說：「因為你剛剛沒有這麼說。」

大會主席說：「什麼是人權、自由、平等機會，我現在問你，什麼是平等機會、歧視？」

李文光律師說：「By show of hands 便是真的平等了，大家都是一票的。」

何德錦先生說：「我是 H-0x8x 何德錦，我回應一件事情吧。如果我舉手……我只說我自己……我承認我舉手，如果你問我是否曾經舉手，我會回答我有的。你問我何德錦是否曾經舉手，我有的。原因很簡單，我願意為自己所做的負百分百的責任。我不需要你說是否控告我，我自己的人權何須你來保護？我舉手是光明磊落、光天化日下，用不著你擔心這樣那樣，說那些大道理，關你什麼事？我連自己的權力都沒有嗎？我對自己負百分百的責任，現在你說得好像我自己負了零責任，你為我則負了百分百的責任，關你屁事！」

霍佩光先生說：「Sorry，可不可以讓我說兩句？剛剛那番討論我覺得是與今天的會議無關的。我們不需要扯到人權、自由，我們只是舉手而已，沒人跟你說自由和人權。我們只是說……Leo 那番說話與你說的話，在我的 understanding 是風馬牛不相及的。為什麼你這麼激動，拍桌拍椅，有人 challenge 你的人權、自由嗎？沒有吧。為什麼你要扯到這些方面，浪費大家的時間？你的 hidden agenda 是什麼？」

大會主席邀請錢北慶律師發言。

錢北慶律師說：「Sir，你的 point taken，thank you。」

霍佩光先生說：「My point of view is, what is your hidden agenda? Why you mention about the freedom and democracy?」

大會主席說：「問題是你們說的。」

霍佩光先生說：「It's nothing related to it!」

大會主席說：「Sorry，Patrick，我現正回應你們所說的話。我現在交給錢律師發言。」

霍佩光先生說：「Who says that? Who raises this issue? Who raises the issue of freedom and democracy?」

大會主席說：「不是我 raise 的。」

霍佩光先生說：「Do you want me to define what is freedom?」

大會主席說：「Patrick，你閉嘴！我現在交給錢律師發言。」

霍佩光先生說：「為什麼要我閉嘴？Why?」

大會主席說：「沒問題，你喜歡的話可以繼續說的。」

錢北慶律師說：「我有一個問題想問 Leo 律師，如果現在有 5 個人站起來 demand poll 的話，那這個 discussion 會不會 come to a stop?」

祝建勳先生說：「不行。因為首先需要 show of hands，show of hands 完成後才能讓 5 個人站起來，不能不 show of hands。而 show of hands 是不需要記名的，主席不需要擔心。我們每個人都明白 show of hands 是不需要記名的。」

大會主席說：「抱歉，Philip、各位會員，你所說的 exactly 是我想說的。我不是想要做什麼，我只想維護一個人應得的權利。Show of hands 是沒問題的，只是我不希望記名。Philip 你說得對，你的頭腦是最清晰的。」

祝建勳先生說：「多謝主席，現在 show of hands 應該是不需要記名的。若然在第二 round 有 5 個人要求 poll，屆時我們才需要討論記名或不記名。」

大會主席說：「Exactly, Philip. 你所說的正是我所想的，謝謝你。好了，我現在要求以 show of hands 通過今晚的議案，有沒有人反對？」

李文光律師舉手發言，他說：「我希望大家知道，剛剛黃律師提到，我們第 75 條是指要有次序的，不可以無緣無故插隊。我要說的就是這些。」

大會主席說：「Leo、各位會員，我將第 75 條唸出來：『A declaration by the Chairman at any General Meeting that a resolution has been carried thereat upon the show of hands shall be conclusive, and an entry to that effect in the Minute Book of the Club shall be sufficient evidence of that fact, unless immediately on such declaration a poll shall be demanded by not less than 5 Members present in person or by proxy having the right to vote at the meeting; or by Members present in person or by proxy and representing at least 5% of the total voting rights of all the Members having the right to vote at the meeting; or by the Chairman of the meeting.』我現在不執行『or by the Chairman of the meeting』的權力，我現在要求以 show of hands 通過。」

大會主席邀請贊成通過是次特別決議案的會員舉手表決，會所職員隨即進行點算。

黃德榮先生說：「我想請問台上的人為什麼沒有舉手？是台上沒有人贊成，可以這樣理解嗎？」

大會主席說：「我首先問職員，你們點算完畢了沒有？」

黃德榮先生說：「不是，剛剛會長說要舉手，我沒看到台上有人舉手……不是一定要舉手，我只是想 confirm 沒有人舉手？」

大會主席說：「抱歉，我下一句便會問有沒有人 demand poll。」

黃德榮先生說：「剛剛會長說要舉手，我只是想 confirm 台上沒有人舉手，

我擔心台上的人忘記了。你們是記得的，聽到會長的話的，對吧？」

大會主席請台上理事會成員舉手，並提醒會所職員進行點算。

祝建勳先生說：「會長，你應該首先 declare result，這個 round show of hands 的 outcome，然後再 call for 有沒有 5 個人 demand poll。即應首先 declare 這個 round 的 result。」

大會主席說：「Article 75 哪句寫了要 declare result？」

祝建勳先生說：「裡面說的是要『conclusive』，我們是要先有了結果。」

大會主席說：「根據 Article 75，我有沒有權 declare result？」

祝建勳先生說：「你有，Article 寫得很清楚，你需要 declare result 的。」

大會主席說：「有嗎？在哪？」

高世康律師說：「會長，舉手後如果認為 resolution carry，你需要 declare 這個 resolution carry 了。如果沒有 5 個人站起來或舉手 demand poll，那便是 carry 了。」

大會主席說：「沒錯，你說得對。好了，點票完畢……對了，Ludwig，請 check 一下其他會議場地有沒有點票……」

祝建平先生說：「會長，我什麼都不懂，雖然我到過 CCC 很多 EGM……你們似乎弄得一塌糊塗，不過沒關係。我只告訴你們，在普通的常識中，我看到很多人舉手贊成，連一個反對的人都沒有，那你說什麼 poll？」

大會主席說：「好，多謝你的意見……有沒有人 demand poll？」

祝建勳先生說：「你應該先 declare 這個 resolution 是否已 carry。有沒有人 demand poll 是他們自己 demand，不需要你 call for。」

大會主席說：「Ludwig 告訴我有 172 人贊成。」

祝建勳先生說：「那麼這個 resolution carry 了嗎？因為要有四分之三……」

大會主席說：「現在我是根據 Article 75 問有沒有人 demand poll？」

祝建勳先生說：「不，還沒到。你應先 declare result of the resolution。」

大會主席說：「已經 declare 了，172 人贊成。」

祝建勳先生說：「這還沒有通過的，因為要有四分之三人贊成才能通過，現在不知道有沒有四分之三的人。你看看 Article，在 EGM 要 carry resolution 的話是要四分之三……」

大會主席說：「你現在是用 Article 75 來跟我說，對吧……」

祝建平先生說：「我現在告訴你，你聽清楚。現在是 172 人贊成，172 對 0，已經 pass 了。」

大會主席說：「是 172 人贊成，我現在問有沒有人反對。」

祝建平先生說：「對了，我就是想知道有多少人不贊成。」

錢北慶律師說：「這是你的意見，有沒有人 demand poll，請現在站起來，有沒有 5 個人？」

祝建平先生說：「跟 demand poll 有什麼關係？現在是 172 對 0！」

錢北慶律師說：「這是你的 interpretation，有沒有人 demand poll？」

大會主席說：「出席的會員中，有沒有人沒舉手？」

祝建勳先生說：「會長，你要 declare result，說 resolution 通過了沒有。」

大會主席說：「是否有人未有舉手，或者反對？」

祝建勳先生說：「你還未有問有沒有人反對。會長，你需要問有沒有人反對，這才能計算出議案是否能通過。」

大會主席問廖耀禮先生是否想發言，廖耀禮先生及朱國鑾先生舉手表示反對。

祝建勳先生說：「也就是說 172 對 2，你有沒有把其他會議場地也計算在內？應該將那些也計算在內。會長，Article 75 指你須 declare whether the resolution is passed or not。After that 便有人可以 demand poll，你現在還未 declare。」

錢北慶律師說：「不是，沒有 declare pass。」

祝建勳先生說：「麻煩你看看 Article，需要 upon declaration of the resolution。」

錢北慶律師說：「只有你可以 interpret Article 嗎？」

祝建勳先生說：「可是你說的每次都是錯的。」

錢北慶律師說：「你說的才都是錯。」

祝建勳先生說：「抱歉，剛才已經有一個例子了，Duffy 的解釋已經指出你的錯處了。」

錢北慶律師說：「沒有例子，I don't agree。」

祝建勳先生說：「You may not agree but you are stupid.」

錢北慶律師說：「I don't agree with you, okay? 現在有多少人 demand poll，請站起來。」

祝建勳先生說：「你有什麼權問？你是主席嗎？」

錢北慶律師說：「那你現在是主席嗎？」

祝建勳先生說：「所以你沒有權問有沒有人 demand poll。」

錢北慶律師說：「Shut up!」

祝建勳先生說：「Shut up!」

鄧博仁先生說：「做什麼！」

錢北慶律師說：「你這麼大聲做什麼？」

鄧緯豪先生說：「別人在說話的時候，你叫他『shut up』，這是什麼權力？我想知道你有什麼權力這樣做？」

錢北慶律師說：「Okay。」

大會主席說：「Okay，現在經理給我的資料顯示，今晚有 223 人出席，剛剛舉手贊成 show of hands 有 172 人。我現在要求的是，有沒有人 demand poll？如果有人 demand poll，我們便會進入下一步驟。」

祝建勳先生說：「抱歉，會長，我知道你想主持得正確，但我很擔心你會做錯，因為你還沒 declare 這個 resolution 有沒有通過。」

大會主席說：「明白。我根據 Article 75，這個 resolution 是通過了。Philip，你說得對，我根據 Article 75，declare 這個 resolution 通過了。如果沒有人反對的話，便通過這個 resolution。」

由於沒有會員表示反對，大會主席繼續說：「根據 Article 75，我下一步問有沒有人 demand poll？」

有六位會員舉手要求以投票方式表決是否通過這項特別決議案，大會主席宣布：「由於現在有超過 5 位會員 demand poll，我根據 Article 75 請大家以選票投票。」

祝建勳先生說：「主席，隨後的問題是用記名或不記名的方式來投票。我聽到主席剛剛已經提到 General Committee 有一個 resolution，指應用不記名投票。在這方面，我們已經看到 General Committee 的 resolution，但在其中有

很多地方令我覺得很有問題。我提出幾點：

第一點，該 resolution 提到有法律顧問的意見，亦有提及 13 位會員的書面要求，但這些都是未經證實的。如果 General Committee 的 resolution 是須依賴這方面的話，他們是否應該公開該法律顧問的名字及他提供的內容？以及 13 位會員的名字及他們提出的內容？

第二點，本會的法律顧問 Duffy Wong 在論壇上公開對我們說，他曾審查會章，確認了我們的會章並沒有提及應該用記名或不記名投票，所以記名投票是可以的。我現在想知道為什麼理事會不跟隨本會法律顧問的意見……為什麼忽視了他的意見？

第三點，你們的 resolution 提出有 13 位會員來函，所以你們現在決定不記名投票。但大家都知道有 38 位會員遞交了呈請，而在呈請中清楚地要求須記名投票。為什麼你們不理會 38 位會員的要求，卻只聽從 13 位會員呢？道理何在，可否解釋一下？

最後，第四點，本會從未遇過今天所面對這麼嚴重的問題，如果我們處理得不好，會令本會倒閉。大家不要以為這並不會發生，如果我們處理得不好，我保證會發生。所以有很好的理由這次使用記名投票，而採用記名投票是符合本會最大的利益。如果本會未能續約，很多會員將蒙受龐大的損失。正因如此，為了自然公正(natural justice)，是應該公開投反對票人士的名字。

會長，我知道理事會是不會改變他們的決定了，為了保障我自己日後不被蒙受損失的會員所追討，我將使用我的手機拍下投票意向存為記錄，及傳送至 xxxx xxxx (某電話號碼)，以便編制一份自願記名投票人士的名單。我呼籲所有支持動議的會員依照我的做法，保障自己。如果你們沒有這樣做，則會被誤會為反對動議。多謝各位。」

大會主席邀請黃德榮先生發言。

黃德榮先生說：「剛才那位先生已經說得很清楚，其實大家都明白今天投票背後的意義是本會能否續約，即本會在 2026 年後能否繼續存在。也就是說整個投票背後的意義不是 1 比 2 或是其他什麼。其實我在今年 1 月 19 日曾致函本會，列出 3 個理由解釋若果我們的選舉制度不作改變的話，政府是

不會在 2026 年續約的。我現在向大家解說那 3 個理由是什麼：第一，根據基本法 Article 25，『All Hong Kong residents shall be equal before the law』。第二是 Bill of Rights Ordinance Cap. 383 Article 22，『All persons are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to the equal protection of the law』。第三個理由是，這是我們香港社會的 core value，是我們的核心价值观，人人平等。本會是 incorporated under Company Ordinance，所以是受香港法律管制的。我剛 quote 的兩個 law，其實是頗新的 law，即本會成立時，基本法、Bill of Rights Ordinance 等還沒有出現。所以從前並沒有抵觸香港法例，但今天會不會抵觸？我不知道。在座有很多法律的專才……不過這些都不重要。

政府怎麼看待事情？政府最重要的是香港社會的核心价值观，特區政府是不會違反社會的核心价值观而做出這種事情。這是我說的，you may call my name，my name is Albert Wong。香港特區政府是不會違反這個社會的 core value，所以今天投票的意義不是一人一票的問題，而是本會的生存。所以我剛才才頗傷心的，在座只有 2、3 個人支持這件事情，其他的人我不敢說你們不支持，但其實你們將間接或直接使本會 wind up。你不要有 any speculation about the Government of giving you any leniency or whatever，說給你面子，不要相信。特區政府不做這種事情，他們是談正義的。我要說的就是這些，謝謝。」

大會主席邀請何德錦先生發言。

何德錦先生說：「一句可以嗎？關於我剛剛提到為自己負責的意思，其實沒有預計到 Philip 會這麼說，即我願意登記到該 whatsapp 上。登記了我的名字後，我便不需要你說為了保護我。我的意思就是這樣，因為我願意為自己負百分百的責任，我相信很多會員都願意說出自己做過些什麼，不介意讓其他人知道自己做過什麼。」

大會主席邀請王耀枝先生發言。

王耀枝先生說：「我想說幾句話。其實最重要的一點是，在座這麼多 General Committee，他們最基本的責任是維護所有會員的利益。但在這件事上，會員的利益在哪裡你們是很清楚的，但你們的取態是模稜兩可、不清晰的。如果我是 General Committee，我會很清晰地告訴大家我是支持的，最好是一

人一票，現在沒有辦法，我們退而求其次，將 50 票改為 2 票，這是無可奈何，唯有這樣做。但 General Committee 未能給我一個信息，說他們很支持這件事，令很多會員認為他們沒有很積極地推動這個改動，亦令我很失望。因為這是 General Committee 最基本的職責，而我相信日後若本會真的倒閉時，有可能是有法律責任的，我自己是這樣相信。」

大會主席說：「多謝 Kenneth。你說了這麼多，我想你有些事情搞錯了。我告訴你們，你們現在爭取的一人一票，不是一件新鮮事，抱歉，不是你們先提出的，是我在 20 年前提出的。當年 Paul Tam 當會長，Paul Tam 已經提出每年都召開 EGM 來進行，我到處拉票、爭取一票。你不要說我們 General Committee 什麼，我們 General Committee 是同意的。我告訴你們，我現在不是反對一人一票，最重要的是你不要用槍指著我的頭，不要用一个脅逼、歧視、追究責任的方向指著……抱歉，我認為你們就是用這個方法指著那些 50 票，用一個歧視的方法，你們根本是這樣。因為你們想要記名，還說要控告他們，你們是不是有說過要控告他們？有沒有說過？Philip Chok 你有沒有說過？你出來說話，要取政治責任……沒問題的。」

祝建勳先生說：「現在用槍指著你的不是這個會所的會員，而是香港政府……」

大會主席說：「Sorry，是香港政府，因為有人告訴了他們……」

祝建勳先生說：「所以我們指著是沒有用的……」

大會主席說：「大家都知道發生了什麼事！」

祝建勳先生說：「你這麼厲害，你告訴他，他就聽從你？」

大會主席說：「有人是這麼厲害的。」

祝建勳先生說：「有人這麼厲害嗎！你把政府當成什麼了？你知不知道政府的政策要先通過行政局，釐定了政策，再交由部門去執行。我在政府部門工作了 30 多年。現在的問題是，我只是想告訴你，你不要怪我們這裡的會員，因為拿槍指著本會的是香港政府！」

大會主席說：「我沒有怪你，只不過你現在記名，即是你歧視那些 50 票的會員。」

黃幼幼女士說：「我想請會長及各位會員都鎮定、冷靜些，我們不是來吵架的，我們現在是要解決問題。我很尊重以前的所謂 SVM，你們那 50 票是值得的。但我們現在要修改，不是因為我們不尊重你們，我們只是希望 2026 年後能繼續。請大家針對這點，不要爭吵這麼多了。我們希望今天的會議能順利進行，我們沒有人拿槍指著你，這裡也沒有人拿槍指著我要求我來投票，我來投票是因為我是 Member。我希望 2026 年後，你們 SVM 的子女、孫子，以及我們這些普通會員都可以繼續使用，我希望在 65 歲以後可以每天待在這裡！2 票不是最理想的，你可以要 10 票，10 對 1 也行，但我們必須滿足需求。告訴我應怎麼辦？我是一個理智的會員，我有腦袋的，我知道若你們不修改，政府便不會通過。你告訴我會通過的，那便出通告告訴我們該怎麼辦。我們並不是爭一口氣，我們不需要 1 對 1，我們需要通過而已。希望大家抱著這個心，謝謝。」

大會主席說：「這位小姐說出了我的心聲。」

黃幼幼女士繼續說：「沒關係，謝謝你，我希望大家都是朝這個目的去做。我亦希望 SVM 留意，2 對 1 不是因為我們不尊重你們，而是因為我們需要通過。我很感謝你們的貢獻，我希望你們的兒孫都可以繼續在這裡玩。多謝各位。」

大會主席邀請林炎興先生發言。

林炎興先生說：「我幾年沒來了，我今天真的很想來。我也希望我們下一代、每一個人將來能繼續玩。因為我一家共有 3 票，即我的兒子和女兒都有。我已很多年沒來了，我真的很希望今天能看見一人一票。你說你自己在 20 年前已提出 50 票改成 1 票，但你剛剛並沒有舉手。我很留意你的，你這是什麼意思？你這是自打嘴巴。我很留意你剛才的行動，所以我才發聲。如果我們不作修改，到了 2026 年本會有權被釘契，到時候真的是 total loss。」

大會主席說：「林先生，如果我們 General Committee 不同意，便不會召開會議了。」

林炎興先生說：「那為什麼你剛才不舉手？我看到有 2 位舉手，你自己卻沒有舉手。你自己說在 20 年前已經提議了，但你剛才卻不表態。」

大會主席說：「林先生，你不要人身攻擊。我們不同意便不會召開會議，我只說這句話。」

黃幼幼女士說：「大家不要再在這裡爭吵了，我希望大家冷靜。我希望無論今天通過與否，我們大家都已經表態了。我覺得我們是無能為力的，因為 SVM 決定了一切，但我們仍然要來這裡，我們都要做，因為我想要告訴你們，我們希望本會能續約。如果大家今天沒有後著，議案不獲通過，那怎麼辦呢？有會員保證一定能續期的，請告訴我們，要怎樣做。我們 need help，我們不是要搞破壞，請大家不要再爭吵了。因為今天唯一要投票的便是這件事，不要再在其他事情上爭論了。能通過很好，如果不能通過，我們也要想辦法。請告訴我們，可以怎樣做。你們不要再爭吵了，不要浪費時間。」

大會主席說：「多謝你，你說的就是我們的心聲。」

大會主席邀請叢茂滋先生發言。

叢茂滋先生說：「各位會員，今天所爭吵的事，根本是本會這 10 多年來都很關注的事情。當然，從前出現 50:1 或 1:50 的比例，是因為稅務的問題，但現在已經跟這些沒有關係了，所以是時候修改了，這是事實。但剛才會長已經說得很清楚，這件事情我們已經……我也曾擔任委員，我也下過很多功夫，但仍然做不到，就是因為有很多問題存在。現在我們不能提議 2 對 1 或是什麼……不需要了。因為我們的契約到 2026 年，現在才是 2022 年，還有 4 年。你便可以給予理事會機會，在這 4 年內做事，他們有辦法的。在座有很多人手持 1 票，我也很明白，我也很希望能改革，但問題是不能一朝一夕便完成。請給理事會時間，讓他們在這幾年內工作，令你們滿意，好嗎？」

朱巧盈博士說：「我認為在經過這麼激烈的討論後，我想說一些可能較為感性的話。我想大家經過一月的會議，聽到了很多不同會友的意見，已經可以得出一個結論。對今天的議題，你到底是投反對或贊成票，是『是與非』的分別，即你到底向哪邊靠攏。我伯父朱國熙律師生前……他前年去世了，他是 Special Voting Member。他曾跟我說，他對於會務心頭的一根刺便是 1 比

50 這麼不公義的制度。他說他很希望能改革這個制度，他很希望能看到本會進步，但很遺憾地他已經看不到了，他前年已經去世了。我很希望在這件事情上，如果我們能夠爭取到公義的結果時，明年清明可以在他的墳前說：『伯父，完成了！你在天家與你的好友慶祝一下吧。』我很希望可以跟他說這句話。可能比較 personal、感性些，但在 1 月的會議後，這也是我一直想說的。還有有一件事，希望 Committee 不要介意，尤其是那封信件，我知道你們也……我亦真心相信大家也是為本會好、都是想為本會做事，但有時候有些做事的方法……例如通知我們開會的信件，我在 2 日前才收到，而且沒有 agenda，沒有會議的議程。所以其實我不是很清楚是在做什麼，而且你們之前的工作報告已經說有 38 位會員提出了呈請，就是指 2 票對 1 票的 proposal 已經提出了申請。我認為這種寫法其實是有些誤導的，好像這件事情已經解決了、已經通過了一樣，好像你們已經提出了這個申請。所以我認為不要在做事上予人一種誤會，為什麼在 2 日前才告訴會員，又不清楚地說明會議的 purpose 是什麼，我真的很希望這些情況可以避免。選舉如果能更公平的話，Committee 可以更有代表性時，我希望發生這類事情的情況可以減少。我想說的就是這些。」

（大會的備註：通知全體會員出席二零二二年四月二十九日舉行特別會員大會的通告及議程於二零二二年四月五日以本地平郵及電郵向會員發出，會議目的亦已在通告上清晰列明。）

大會主席邀請李炳棠先生發言。

李炳棠先生說：「我是從那邊過來的，因為那邊的人讓我提出些事情，point of order，希望 Legal Adviser 給予意見。首先我介紹一下，我是 Paul Lee，F-0x0x，因為我的家庭中有 4 個人已加入本會，放下了百多萬。第二，point of order，因為你們的 notice 指開會的 venue 在 3C，但發現場地的 facilities 不公平。我的 point 是，你要 afford……如果你分開了 3 處，要有 the same privilege 及 facilities 於這 3 個地方。因為那邊沒有咪高峰，如要發言，須像我這樣繞了大圈走過來，他才讓我發言。我要感謝他，不是他讓我說的話，我要排很長時間的隊。第一點，你要 afford the same privilege and facilities to……如果這裡是 A 場，B、C 場有很多人坐在那裡，卻沒有咪高峰，你們又沒有招呼他們。第二點，當會友在這裡發言時你沒有 regulate speaker，有些連續說了 3、4 次……很多人想要發言，麻煩你 regulate，說了是一次便是一次，不能……我現在不是跟你 debate，這裡不是 court。我說完這 2 個

point of order 了，法律顧問可以給一些意見，免得大家糊裡糊塗的。另一點是程序，如果現在已經 proceed 到另一個程序，如果我沒聽錯，剛剛說要決定在 ballot 上記名與否，我只有一個 point，便是給予我們自由。當然，可以表決，但可 leave it to 我們吧。我喜歡寫下名字便寫，不寫便算了。我的立場很清晰的，但我希望很公開、公平，不希望有任何說話、姿勢、action，令人有不 reasonable 的壓力存在。我的立場是要公平地贏或輸，不希望有任何意氣的說話。我說完了，現在回去那邊，我希望可以放一個咪高峰在那邊，好嗎？」

大會主席說：「其實李先生說的都是我心裡的話。大家可能都有立場，只不過我的意思是，如果用記名的方法，可能會引致一些法律責任，即有些秋後算帳或歧視等問題出現。很坦白，我 personally 不是 against 什麼，只不過我覺得香港是一個自由、公平、民主的社會，為什麼要用一個方法來秋後算帳，對付一些反對你意見的人呢？這點我真的無法接受。你們投什麼的票，我完全沒有所謂，我也是為了本會好，我相信大部份會員也是為本會好的。但如果使用這種手段來對付那些 Members，這不是一個公平的方法。這不過是我自己的一個看法。」

何德錦先生說：「很簡單，剛才那位小姐已經說出了重點。我們其實很尊重大家，我們最希望的是能夠續約，所以說『不管黑貓白貓，捉到老鼠就是好貓』。我們現在的做法猶如摸著石頭，還有多少年？沒有危機感的嗎？你看到烏克蘭這樣……我不扯到那裡了。有 7 個習慣，第一個是『積極主動』，第二個是『以終為始』、『要事第一』、『雙贏思維』、『知彼解己』，你要了解我們這些會員，你經常說『我代表你』，但我不覺得是。之後是『綜合綜效』，用各種方法來做到那件事。最後是『不斷更新』，所以現在這一剎那，你下一秒便要做一個決定，令政府續約與否，而不是掉以輕心、『大把時間』。我一句說完，不會再說了，什麼時候都是預防勝於治療。」

大會主席邀請梁健棠先生發言。

梁健棠先生說：「很簡單，剛才贊成的人說出了他們的理由，我希望反對的人亦出來講為什麼他們反對。就是這樣。」

大會主席邀請林炎興先生發言。

林炎興先生說：「其實你們 Committee 很多都沒有表態，我希望你們表態，贊成抑或反對，以德服人。你的理由說得通，我是認輸的。希望你們說出你們的理由，對大家公平一些。」

大會主席說：「坦白說，我身為會長，我亦表達了我的立場，我相信同樣是大部份 General Committee 的立場。我們是贊成通過這個議案，如果我們不贊成，根本不會舉行這個會議。」

林炎興先生說：「但是你所謂的贊成，你們自己都沒有舉手，請問我如何可以相信你？」

大會主席說：「我們不贊成的話，根本就不會舉行。」

林炎興先生說：「你沒有舉手！你有機會的，可是你們也不舉手。」

大會主席說：「我不需要你們跟我們說這些話，我們不贊成的話就不會舉行。」

劉志宏博士說：「其實如果你問我，我和 Kenny Leung 也投下了贊成票的。而且我可以說，當時理事會讓我負責 corporate governance，我們提議將來會 open up General Committee 予 OVM 及 SVM，都是我們同意及將會做的。因為 SVM 已經老了，還擔任些什麼呢？我也認為該慢慢退下來，其實我也可以不當 SVM，也可以不擔任 General Committee，沒所謂的。其實大家也可以看到，我開始慢慢退下來了。我可以說，我盡力服務本會，建築物、續約、corporate governance，我都有份做的。但如果你覺得我做得太久了，不要我再擔任公職了，我亦不介意，我可以很享受會所的。至於 Audit Committee 說的話，原則上我亦大致同意，你看到我很少反對。這麼多年來我也同意 Audit Committee 說的話，大家希望用一個很和洽的方法處理。」

周柏森先生說：「各位好，我是周柏森。我也是 50 票，我也贊成取消 50 票。因為本會已經有 3000 多位會員，我們這些 50 票是有貢獻的，但不要忘記時代已經不同了，現在我們有 3000 多位會員，加上會員配偶及會員子女，有 6000 至 7000 人使用會所設施。現在所有會員都有貢獻的，因為若果沒有這麼多會員的話，政府一定不會將這個會交給我們。我們每一位會員都有貢獻的，你們身為理事，現在政府迫近，你們應該第一時間出來做事，但你們每位理事都站著，不知道在做什麼。你們是為會所服務的，現在會所不

同以往，以往是你爭我奪，現在不是了。現在政府迫近了，你知道嗎？萬一我們 4 年後還未死的話，我們豈不是要到維園下棋？有沒有搞錯？你說你們怎樣做事的？你現在是為了會所，不是為了個人，現在不是選會長。現在是會所，是你們負責運作的。我們現在不是爭權奪利，而是在對付政府，知道嗎？現在政府迫近，你還說 4 年後？你再不向政府表態，政府便當作棄權，2 年……1 年後，政府便將這個地方轉交給其他人了，還留給你們嗎？有沒有搞錯？所有會員都有貢獻的，如果沒有這數千人，政府馬上收地。」

鄔滿海先生說：「周先生，今天這個會議是很重要的，其實大家都應該知道，今天召開這個會議的目的正是因為本會收到民政局在這方面……他們都知道本會在 2026 年與其他 27 個會所在同一年續期，在大家傾談時，他們亦向我們指出，我們 3C 會是很特別的，就是 SVM 及 OVM 50 票對 1 票這件事。現在是 2022 年，距 2026 年尚有 3 至 4 年的時間，會所應先自行做些事了，如果不做的話，到時候……政府檢討的時候不只看本會，亦會整體上視乎所有會所的情況，考慮如何續期、條件為何等事，以及最重要的是民意對這方面的看法。所以我認為我們現在該看看能做到什麼程度，如何修改我們的會章，尤其是 SVM 及 OVM 50:1 等問題。我們 General Committee 已經開始做事了，我們跟政府亦已經見了幾次面，在這方面我認為接下來應該做更多。大家應該了解，其實我們都是同坐一條船，如果說到了 2026 年未能續約，這是最壞的打算。這點大家應該了解，大家多給意見。謝謝。」

黃祺國先生說：「我姓黃，會員號碼 W-0x6x，我很同意周先生剛才所說的。到了明年，我入會將差不多 30 年了，我也不稀罕你那 50 票了。現在的時代根本變了，一定要修改的。我有位朋友最近入會，他是醫生，他也曾問過我這個問題。2026 年可以繼續嗎？我保證可以繼續。如果你取消了，我會被斬的。我把這個會所當成第二個家。我有一位同事，68 歲才入會，如果你告訴他在幾年後不能玩了……快一點，簡單些，舉手吧！只須舉手通過便可以了。」

祝建勳先生說：「會長，我很同意剛才發言的會員。我想說的是剛才叢茂滋先生提出我們的地契到 2026 年才到期，所以現在不需要做任何事。我相信叢先生不知道，去年 12 月 14 日政府來函，信上清楚地要求本會，第一點，作出改革 50 票的問題。第二點，須開放理事會。信上寫得很清晰，而當時他們知道本會提出了 5:1 的修改，但他很明顯地寫明這不符合他們的意思，『not satisfactory』。那封信接著說……這是最重要的，大家留意，要求本會

的理事會做出一份 work plan (工作計劃書)，遞交給政府，列出本會打算如何進行這兩項修改，即『50 票的修改』及『開放理事會』。而且，信上亦指出如果本會不做這些事情，民政局將保留撤回對本會政策上的支持。如果他撤回了政策上的支持，大家或許不知道，即等同不續約。因為民政局是體育事務的政策科，他不提供政策上的支持，本會的地契是不會續約的。這寫得很清楚，大家可以看看那封信。但是有一點亦請大家留意，整封信上只有兩個字是 bold letter 的，叢先生你知道是哪兩個字嗎？是『urgent action』，叢先生有留意到嗎？好了，本會的理事會有沒有做到些什麼？有沒有遞交 work plan 給政府？沒有……因此，民政局在 4 月 13 日再發出一個電郵，民政局問，他們已於 12 月要求提交一份 work plan，當時要求在 4 個星期內提交，卻一直沒有做到，到了現在還沒有做。民政局說留意到若召開 EGM，便會將投票率減至 2:1，即 SVM 有 2 票，而這次民政局並沒有反對。上一次的 5:1 他們說明不滿意，而這次沒有反對，這次同意了，也就是說民政局是支持、接受大家 2:1 的要求。這個方向就很清晰了，大家都看到。他們還在這封 4 月 13 日的信中再追問理事會怎樣了？你們還沒有回答。我想請問理事會，你們什麼時候回答政府呢？已經 4 個月了，一直沒有做到，你們打算什麼時候回覆政府？你知不知道若不回覆，後果是什麼？你以為還可以如叢先生所說，等到 2026 年嗎？多謝。」

錢北慶律師說：「我不是很 popular，因為只有一面的聲音，你們會不會像一個 coin，一面是字，一面是人像。你只說了字，我便說另一面，大家心平氣和。剛剛我跟 Philip 說的話是 emotional，I am sorry about that。Philip 剛才提到 12 月 14 日的信函，現在所有 story 是 centre around 這封信，但千萬要注意須 take a complete picture，即不要斷章取義。其中有幾個字，我希望大家 tolerant with me。因為這個世界上不只有一個意見，有一位法官在也會有兩位律師在爭拗，如果只有一位法官、一位律師的話便不用審訊了。他在第一個 paragraph 便說 expiry 是 2026 年，現在還有 4 年多。而在 last paragraph 便提到『submit detailed work plan』，即路線圖。為什麼還讓你 submit work plan？因為這不是終結，尚有商討的餘地，這不是最後一步。重點是 submit detailed work plan，即路線圖。為什麼要這麼說？因為 lease expiry 是 2026 年底，不是 2022 年。現在 come to the key point，我相信很多人都沒注意到，key words or core issue 是『reserve the right to withdraw our policy support』。而今晚爭吵的便是這句，他『reserve the right to withdraw our policy support』，即不跟你續約。好了，為什麼要『reserve the right』？他可以直接寫，如果你不做，if you don't do what we asked you, for instance 可以寫『definitely

support for renewal』, or 『definitely not support for renewal』。Last paragraph 也可以寫, 『你這樣做的話 we will recommend CCC……』但卻沒有寫。為什麼不寫呢? 理由很簡單, 你聽清楚, 因為現在的 Director of HAB 不能 preempt 或奪去將來 Director 的權力。這個 renewal 不是現在的 Director 做的, 而是將來的 Director 的決定。世界上變化便是永恆, 2 個月前你有沒有預計到林鄭特首會下台? 有沒有預計到李家超先生會上台? 將來政府對 recreational club 的 policy 會不會變? 現在到了關鍵時刻, 還不知道誰是 HAB 的 Director。所以 Dorothy Cheung 女士沒有 commit herself 是對的, 『reserve the right』。換句話說現在是 2022 年 4 月份, 尚沒到關鍵性時刻, 就像賽馬還沒到 finishing point, 你卻說那匹馬領先, 便停止賽事, 立即頒獎, 這個做法不但不合理, 更是不會發生的。我的 point 是時辰未到。Thank you, I am finished.」

羅尚平先生說:「各位, 多謝錢律師對我們這樣的解釋。我們有錄音的, 對吧? 我希望你是對的, 但以我在政府工作 20 多年的經驗, 『reserve the right』等於嚴重警告, 即是說我已經警告你了, 如果你不聽從我的說話, 我則有權取消, 不要說我事前沒明說。『Reserve the right』是我們慣用的詞語。我希望你是對的, 但我們不能 take 這個 risk, 永遠都是保守些為好, 為什麼不快點做? 今晚通過了, 50 票變成 2 票, 續約一定沒有問題了, no doubt 了。現在你的說法是很 doubtful 的, 如果我們今晚每個人都聽從了錢律師的話, 先不做了, 那麼到了 2026 年『呼』地一聲, 告訴我們不予續約, 到時候怎麼辦? 我們今晚每個人都只是相信錢律師而已。我希望各位理性些, 那些 50 票……以為可以和政府再繞幾個圈, 但我告訴你們, 不會的。我看過那封信, 字眼是非常強硬的, 根本是你不聽從他的話, 他說『no』, 你便不能反對。他已經警告你了, 『reserve the right』, 指他會保留權利不續約, 這是政府慣用的詞語。謝謝。」

鄔滿海先生說:「我想回應 James, 我同意他所說的, 我在政府工作了這麼多年, 亦知道我們不可能像錢律師說的那樣, 等到 2026 年才做些什麼, 已經 too late 了。其實現在已經是 2022 年了, 這件事情不是 1、2 個月能辦妥, 大家須諮詢、傾談, 我認為真的須現在開始做功夫, 亦須跟政府溝通、商討。政府又要經立法會、行政會通過, 這裡需要預留時間, 所以我們現在須開始做了。」

黃德榮先生說:「我聽了錢律師的話, 一定要為政府 defend。我在政府工作

了 30 多年，現在已經離開了，今天不能代表政府說話，我只代表自己。剛剛說的『reserve the right』……我在這 30 年間的工作就是寫文件的，我不知道寫了多少次……其實剛剛已經有會友說了，那是政府一般的用語，他不會使用『definitely terminate』，我從來沒有見過。我在政府工作了 30 多年，我寫政府的文件、報告起碼超過 1 萬頁，我告訴你，我從未見過這個字眼。可能律師樓是這樣，但政府不是這樣做的。第二，你說政府會改變，我說不會的，我剛剛說了 3 個道理，哪位政府人員膽敢站出來說我們不用跟從基本法、人權法及香港的 core value？這是無法轉圓的，你不要對政府有任何幻想。今時今日政府……我不是代表政府說話，我是一個退休公務員，我告訴你，政府不可能這樣的，他怎樣在立法會通過？如果他能在立法會通過，我會讓人在立法會問他們，為什麼會批准，政府無法回答的。最後，我知道隨後的程序是有 5 個人可以 demand poll，我請求、要求、跪求那 5 人站出來，說一下他們的道理是什麼。我們是公平的，像錢律師所說，一個 coin 有兩面，只聽一面是不對的。另外，我請求、要求、跪求他們出來說。謝謝。」

黃妙婷女士說：「剛剛錢律師說凡事有兩面，我很同意。當他還沒發言前，我真的很渴求他有他的理據，但聽到之後有些許失望。因為他的理據是現在這個民政局，到審批的時候便不是他們了，所以我們現在做是徒勞的。我認為這是倒轉了，如果我想要將來申請一些事情，現在這個署長、特首會換人的，所以現在不做，待下一個再做，是這樣的 approach 嗎？而且剛剛 Committee 說他們已經在做了，但大家都想知道究竟 Committee 的 action plan 是什麼。如果我們未能通過，有沒有另一個 alternative plan 使我們能成功呢？同樣地，署長也是 expect 你們做些合理的事情。我不會相信今天這個署長說的話，下一個會完全推翻，完全不合基本法、不合常理、不合人權，會長，對嗎？我們是不是應現在開始做，可能待到下一屆換人了，投其所好，再慢慢計劃？我希望理解 Committee 想怎樣做，好令我們會員有底。如果我們未能通過……可能九成未能通過，我們有沒有另一個 plan？是否通過現在這個是唯一可以討論的 plan？不然的話，我們未能通過，你們想怎樣做，怎樣幫會員，使我們在 2026 年後可以繼續享用這個會所？謝謝。」

錢北慶律師說：「黃小姐，我絕對同意你的說法，不過 today's point 是……有一首歌劉博士也很喜歡唱，名為 *It's now or never, tomorrow will be too late*。如果我們下星期開始做，不是等到 2026 年，我的 point：是否今晚一定要決定？今晚 5 時 we must decide, or it will be too late, is it？Next week 會 too late

嗎？What about next month 會 too late 嗎？Now is forever，這個 argument 對不對，各位心中有數。」

黃妙婷女士說：「我們明天才開始做的話，我們是不是又要召開一個 EGM 來通過？」

錢北慶律師說：「不用的，理事會可以……」

黃妙婷女士說：「你明天再做的話，會在今天考慮明天想做什麼？我只是想知道，你不通過不要緊，如果你真的保證你們有其他 action plan，我們大家沒問題的。我現在看到 nothing。我剛剛就是問了這個問題，可能你 miss 了我的問題。你不通過，你說今天不做，明天再做。是的，現在已經 6 時 46 分，很晚了，該下班了，那麼你明天開工，你告訴我到底有什麼 action plan。不通過的話，你至少要等一段時間才能再開會的。趁著 EGM、AGM，大家會員都在這裡，麻煩我們的 Committee 給我們一些 idea，如果不通過的話，你們會怎麼做？我認為這對我們很 fair、很公平，這是我們會員是應得的資料。會長同意嗎？」

大會主席邀請鄧炳榮先生發言。

鄧炳榮先生說：「謝謝會長，我是 Joseph Tang，T-0x1x。在 1 月的會議及剛才，已經有很多會友說出理由，包括 Philip Chok、Albert Wong，我不重覆了。但我希望 Committee 給我們一些 indication……我知道你們已經在做事了……不如你們 12 位 in favour of 這個 motion 的，再 show hands 給我們看看，讓我們知道至少你們 12 位是 support 我們的，不說另外那 89 位 SVM 了，好不好？」

大會主席說：「純粹 personal 的嗎？」

鄧炳榮先生說：「純粹 personal 的，你是贊成 1:1 嗎？還有其他 50 票……或者 at least General Committee 是支持我們的。」

有六位理事會成員舉手表態。

鄧炳榮先生說：「台上有 6 位舉手了，還有其他人，可能離座了。」

張振翊博士說：「讓我說幾句，好嗎？我參選了 SVM 13 年，我在 13 年後才當選。我深知這個 SVM 制度是很不公平、不應存在的，所以我一定支持。」

鄧炳榮先生說：「謝謝張先生。Kenny……Kenny 剛剛離座了，他也是贊成的，剛剛已經舉過手了，不過現在回來再舉手。反對的 General Committee member 可有理由可以告訴大家？」

大會主席說：「抱歉，我不希望……」

鄧炳榮先生說：「因為今天這個會議不應該 argue 這件事了，應該通過的。」

大會主席說：「如果我是反對，我也會舉手，不過我是贊成的。我不希望挑撥……」

鄧炳榮先生說：「如果沒有反對，我們快點跟著議程進行，好嗎？現在已進行了 2 小時，還沒有做到一些很 solid 的事。」

大會主席說：「我不希望有人發洩在那些投反對票的會員身上。」

鄧炳榮先生說：「我知道的，我只是想讓 General Committee 鼓勵一下我們這些 Ordinary Members。」

大會主席說：「各位會員，我們的發言時間已經差不多，該是投票的時候了，我們其實可以作投票決定了。」

大會主席邀請馮家麒先生發言。

馮家麒先生說：「大家好，我是 Kevin，我在這個會所 10 多年，不是很長的時間。我申報一下利益，我自己在會所的 17 年時間，曾在不同的 Sub-committees 工作過，曾跟很多 50 票的人一起工作。我認為今天這個 resolution 不是來證明我們不尊重 50 票的人，因為我也很尊重很多 50 票的年長會友，他們有很多貢獻。By the way，我很多謝錢律師……過了今晚以後是不是未來會長？他剛剛這樣嘗試解釋，nice try。但這證明了一件事，

其實是很需要做這樣的解釋。因為在做這個 resolution 的工程中，我感到很失望，特別因為我在本會酒吧及不同 facilities 上聽到尤其是很多剛剛反對的人，他們的聲音是，這群傢伙在奪權，希望搶走他們的票，在搞分化或者什麼，甚至我親眼看到有些在做這個工程的 Audit Committee 會友被一些 50 票的人罵。因此……今晚已經聽到很多支持人士的聲音，我也很希望聽聽反對人士的聲音。因為我自己已親耳聽到不少，尤其是剛剛下午時還聽到很多 50 票指不是很清楚今天會發生什麼事。我自己去年仍是 Lawn Bowls Sub-committee 時，包括我們現屆的 Lawn Bowls Convenor，都會說其實我們什麼都不做，政府也會續約的。我想問清楚，事情真的是這樣嗎？」

大會主席說：「多謝 Kevin 的意見，其實本會需要更多像 Kevin 這樣的年輕人為本會服務。好了，我們今天都聽了大家的意見，現在已經超時 1 小時了，接下來還有 AGM。」

大會主席隨即宣布投票開始，以不記名的方式進行。

四位會所職員負責點票，大信梁學濂(香港)會計師事務所的核數師負責監察點票的工作。

於點票後，義務秘書宣佈是項決議案取得贊成票數的百分率為百分之四十八點七八，因此，決議未獲得通過。

(二) 會議結束

大會主席多謝各會員出席會議及宣佈會議於晚上七時四十分正式結束。

簽署確認

大會主席