

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. FC135/00-01
(The minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/1/2

Finance Committee of the Legislative Council

**Minutes of the 11th meeting
held at the Legislative Council Chamber
on Friday, 30 March 2001, at 2:30 pm**

Members present:

Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong (Chairman)
Hon NG Leung-sing (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Kenneth TING Woo-shou, JP
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, JP
Hon David CHU Yu-lin
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, JP
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan
Hon Martin LEE Chu-ming, SC, JP
Hon Eric LI Ka-cheung, JP
Dr Hon David LI Kwok-po, JP
Hon Fred LI Wah-ming, JP
Prof Hon NG Ching-fai
Hon Margaret NG
Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-ye, JP
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong
Hon HUI Cheung-ching
Hon CHAN Kwok-keung
Hon CHAN Yuen-han
Hon Bernard CHAN
Hon CHAN Kam-lam
Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, SBS, JP
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Hon SIN Chung-kai

Hon Andrew WONG Wang-fat, JP
Hon WONG Yung-kan
Hon Jasper TSANG Yok-sing, JP
Hon Howard YOUNG, JP
Dr Hon YEUNG Sum
Hon YEUNG Yiu-chung
Hon LAU Chin-shek, JP
Hon LAU Kong-wah
Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBS, JP
Hon Mrs Miriam LAU Kin-ye, JP
Hon Ambrose LAU Hon-chuen, JP
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon CHOY So-yuk
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
Hon SZETO Wah
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, SBS, JP
Hon LAW Chi-kwong, JP
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Dr Hon TANG Siu-tong, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
Hon LI Fung-ying, JP
Hon Henry WU King-cheong, BBS
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, JP
Hon Michael MAK Kwok-fung
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon LEUNG Fu-wah, MH, JP
Dr Hon LO Wing-lok
Hon WONG Sing-chi
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee
Hon IP Kwok-him, JP
Hon LAU Ping-cheung
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP

Member absent:

Dr Hon LUI Ming-wah, JP

Public officers attending:

Miss Denise YUE, JP
Mr Stanley YING, JP
Mr K K LAM

Secretary for the Treasury
Deputy Secretary for the Treasury
Principal Executive Officer (General),
Finance Bureau

Mr Gordon SIU, JP
Mr Stephen FISHER, JP

Secretary for Planning and Lands
Deputy Secretary for Planning and Lands

Clerk in attendance:

Ms Pauline NG

Assistant Secretary General 1

Staff in attendance:

Miss Polly YEUNG
Ms Eleanor CHOW

Chief Assistant Secretary (1)3
Senior Assistant Secretary (1)4

The Chairman advised members that the purpose of this special meeting was to consider FCR(2000-01)83 which had not been dealt with at the last meeting on 9 March 2001 due to insufficient time. At the last meeting, the Finance Committee (FC) was invited to consider a total of seven proposals. As the sixth item on the agenda (i.e. FCR(2000-01)82) was of considerable public interest, he had allowed a thorough discussion on the item to enable members' concerns to be fully addressed by the Administration. By the time FC reached the last item on the agenda, i.e. the current paper, it was already 4:30 pm., the usual time to adjourn meetings of FC to give way to meetings of the House Committee. Having consulted the Administration which confirmed that it had no objection to deferring the said item, he had decided to defer the item to this special meeting. The Chairman hoped that the background information would help eliminate any unnecessary speculation by the media on the meeting arrangement.

Item No. 1 - FCR(2000-01)83

CAPITAL WORKS RESERVE FUND

HEAD 701 - LAND ACQUISITION

Home Purchase Allowance and Ex gratia Allowance for Owners and Legal Occupiers of Commercial Properties

2. Members noted that the present proposal had been discussed by the Panel on Planning, Lands and Works on 27 February, 1 and 2 March 2001.

3. Members noted the basis for calculating the Home Purchase Allowance (HPA) for owners of domestic properties and the ex gratia allowance (EGA) for commercial properties in the current proposal would be applied to all land resumption exercises under any relevant ordinances, including the URA Ordinance.

Action

4. Mr James TO referred to the letter from the Planning and Lands Bureau (PLB) dated 8 March 2001 (circulated by the Panel Clerk vide LC Paper No. 788/00-01 on 8 March 2001 and copied to all non-Panel Members) in which the Administration had made certain undertakings. Among these undertakings was the Administration's agreement to recommend to the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) that its acquisition offer should be more favourable than the Government's land resumption offer. He also sought the Administration's confirmation that the present funding proposal should be considered in conjunction with the Administration's undertakings as set out in the aforesaid letter.

5. In response, the Deputy Secretary for Planning and Lands (DS(PL)) confirmed that after careful consideration, the Administration had decided to accept some of the suggestions put forward by Members and residents as set out in the letter. In reply to the Chairman, DS(PL) said that the major point of contention was whether owners affected by urban renewal should be granted a HPA on the basis of a replacement flat of seven years' old as proposed by the Government, or a flat of five years' old as suggested by some Members and residents.

6. Mr James TO urged the Administration to also undertake to recommend to URA that the basis for calculating the HPA for urban renewal projects should be a replacement flat of about five years' old. He pointed out that the basis of a replacement flat of five years' old for calculating HPA had been adopted by the former Land Development Corporation (LDC). He considered that at least the 25 uncompleted projects of the LDC should be entitled to HPA on the basis of a replacement flat of five years' old.

7. In response, the Secretary for Planning and Lands (SPL) reiterated that the Government had studied members' views carefully but considered that a replacement flat of seven years' old to be used as the basis for calculation could not be altered. It was also not appropriate for the Government to recommend to URA a HPA based on a five-year old flat, as distinct from other projects requiring land resumption. Nevertheless, the Administration would spare no effort in providing assistance in other aspects, such as the measures mentioned in its letter dated 8 March 2001. The Administration would continue to adopt a people-oriented approach in dealing with matters relating to urban renewal. DS(PL) added that the Administration would recommend to URA the following measures with a view to rendering practical assistance to affected residents -

- (a) In line with the people-oriented approach taken by LDC, special consideration should be given to granting a higher level of ex-gratia payment to elderly persons who were relying on the rent income of their flat for a living.

Action

- (b) For a flat subdivided into several smaller flats by deed poll, if the owner(s) chose to receive only the statutory compensation for the property interest and not the ex gratia HPA, they would be eligible for rehousing arrangements.
- (c) For owners of unauthorized roof-top dwellings, compensation would be payable in respect of the property interest in the roof-top area concerned. Affected tenants would be eligible for rehousing arrangements if they had a genuine rehousing need.
- (d) Where repair works had been carried out by owners pursuant to repair orders issued by the Building Authority, URA should consider reimbursing the owners the pro-rata amount of the repair costs which corresponded to the remaining period for which such works were expected to last if not for the resumption.

8. On the minimum difference in building age which would yield a meaningful difference in the price of the property, SPL pointed out that this was a matter for professional valuation although generally speaking, the greater the difference in building age, the more significant would be the difference in price.

9. Dr YEUNG Sum noted that according to the Administration's previous estimate, payment of HPA on the basis of a five-year old flat instead of a seven-year-old one would only entail an additional amount of some \$200,000 per household. In view of the small financial implication, he considered that the Administration should accept the residents' request so that the urban renewal programme could be taken forward smoothly.

10. In response, SPL reiterated the Administration's stance that it would not be acceptable to recommend categorically to URA to use a five-year old building as the basis for calculating HPA as the presently proposed compensation package would also apply to other land resumption projects, the number and scope of which were not readily ascertainable at present.

11. Mr TSANG Yok-sing acknowledged that PLB had worked very hard in proposing a number of improvements to address the concerns of the affected parties. He also expressed appreciation for DS(PL) who had spared no effort in meeting with and listening to the views of the residents. However, he stated that Members of the Democratic Alliance for Betterment of Hong Kong could not support the present proposal for the following reasons -

- (a) In its previous acquisition exercises, LDC had also granted HPA on the basis of a five-year old building. The financial implications of using a five-year old building as the basis for HPA would only

Action

account for 1% of the total redevelopment cost and URA, being a non-profit making body, would still be able to maintain a balanced budget. There were no compelling reasons why the Administration could not recommend this option to URA.

- (b) Affected parties had only accepted the presently proposed ex gratia package reluctantly. They had been placed at disadvantaged bargaining position as there was no alternative if the present proposal was rejected.
- (c) Urban renewal was a government responsibility. Even if the present proposal was voted down, the Administration should not abolish the existing set-up for urban renewal. Instead, it should revert to FC with a revised proposal.

12. Miss CHAN Yuen-han further pointed out that the present proposal had in fact been drawn up as a result of concessions made by affected residents in the course of negotiation over the past few months. She urged the Administration to abandon its uncompromising position on the level of HPA.

13. SPL did not subscribe to the view that the Administration's position was uncompromising and stressed that it would be inappropriate for the Administration to make specific recommendations which might have the effect of prejudicing URA's future decision and the level of HPA payable under other land resumption projects. He re-assured members that to provide practical assistance, URA would conduct a detailed assessment of the impact of the urban renewal project on all affected persons. A team of social workers would also be set up in each of the nine districts earmarked for redevelopment.

14. Mr Eric LI said that he was speaking on behalf of Mr NG Leung-sing, Dr Raymond HO, Mr Bernard CHAN, Dr LUI Ming-wah, Mr Abraham SHEK and Dr LO Wing-lok. The members would not like to see further delay to the redevelopment programme due to disputes over the seven-year versus five-year compensation package. They could accept using a replacement flat of seven years' old as the minimum basis for calculating HPA on the understanding that special consideration would be given to deserving cases. Nevertheless, Mr LI sought the Administration's assurance that it would recommend to the future URA to provide practical assistance to needy persons including assisting them in looking for suitable properties, arranging for removal and mortgages etc. He also enquired on the latest progress of the Administration's discussion with the Housing Authority and the Housing Bureau on the eligibility of persons affected by URA redevelopment projects.

15. In response, DS(PL) confirmed that there were plans to reserve some flats of smaller sizes within the vicinity of the redevelopment districts for needy persons, notably elderly persons aged 60 or above living alone. Upon

Action

implementation of the redevelopment project, the nine social work teams would take up cases and assist needy residents in practical aspects such as removal and mortgage arrangements etc.

Admin

16. As regards home ownership, DS(PL) advised that tenants affected by redevelopment projects would be given priority in purchasing Home Ownership Scheme flats. On the eligibility of affected owners, the Administration was still discussing the issue with the Housing Authority and the Housing Bureau and would report progress to the Housing Panel in due course. Members also noted that a paper on the proposed flat-for-flat exchange scheme had been issued to the Panel and copied to all other Members (LC Paper CB(1)723/00-01(03) dated 1 March 2001).

17. Mr Abraham SHEK expressed support for the present proposal. He referred to his involvement in redevelopment work for the past 13 years and expressed the following views -

- (a) In considering whether a seven-year old flat should be used as the basis for calculating HPA, it should be noted that the HPA would apply to all land resumption projects and not solely to URA redevelopment projects. This was an improvement over the existing basis of a ten-year old flat. Affected owners whose flats were in a dilapidated condition would stand to benefit from the proposed package.
- (b) Under the people-oriented approach, LDC had offered ex gratia payment based on a five-year old flat during past acquisitions. The future URA would also be at liberty to make more favourable offers above the minimum level in the light of individual projects.
- (c) The 25 uncompleted projects of LDC should not receive special consideration and should be considered on par with other redevelopment projects.
- (d) Upon acquisition of their properties, every assistance should be provided to existing owners to enable them to purchase their own properties. Apart from domestic property owners, URA would also need to deal with the compensation for owners and tenants of commercial properties and residents in commercial buildings used for domestic purposes.
- (e) In line with past practice of LDC in making acquisition offers, permanent residents of Hong Kong and newly arrived persons who were affected by redevelopment projects should be entitled to equal treatment.

Action

Mr SHEK urged that upon transition to the new organization, the terms and conditions of employment of the existing staff of LDC should not be affected.

18. Mr LAU Ping-cheung expressed support for the present proposal. In view of past losses incurred by LDC in its acquisitions and the current economic climate, Mr LAU said that further delay to the setting up of URA would not be in the interest of the affected residents and the community at large. He was of the view that arguing over a replacement flat of seven or five years' old might not be very meaningful as the value of a property would depend on a number of factors and not solely on age.

19. In reply to Mr LAU, SPL advised that upon approval of the present proposal, the Administration would proceed with the appointment of members to the URA Board. Subject to the completion of all necessary arrangements, the URA could be set up within this year.

20. On behalf of Members of the Liberal Party, Mr Howard YOUNG expressed support for the present proposal in order that the urban renewal programme could be implemented early. Mr YOUNG also enquired whether the practical assistance proposed by the Administration could in effect offset the difference resulting from using a seven years' old or a five years' old flat as the basis for HPA, and whether such assistance would be within the financial capability of the future URA.

21. In response, DS(PL) pointed out that instead of focussing on the difference in the level of HPA, the Administration considered it more important to render practical assistance to affected residents in aspects such as removal and rehousing arrangements so as to minimize the impact of the project on them.

22. Mr Frederick FUNG referred to the request of the Hong Kong Association for Democracy and People's Livelihood that 50% of the value of the redevelopment projects at some \$240 billion should be used on compensating affected residents to enable property owners to purchase a new property while tenants should be rehoused in the same district. However, as a result of intensified pressure by the Government since March 2001, residents found that they had no real choice but to accept the current proposal which was the only option offered. Affected residents from Tai Kok Tsui, Shumshuipo and Kowloon City agreed at a meeting on 5 March 2001 that they would accept HPA calculated on the basis of a seven-year old flat on the Administration's undertaking to provide other forms of practical assistance as subsequently set out in paragraphs(a), (b), (d), (e) and (f) of the letter to Panel members dated 8 March 2001. As a result of raising the removal allowance from \$50,000 to \$100,000 per household and other relief measures, residents of West Kowloon were of the view that the level of HPA was approaching that based on a five-year old flat. Mr FUNG reported that according to a vote taken by over 500

Action

residents, over 400 voted in favour of his supporting the present proposal at FC. As such, he would vote for the present proposal on the understanding that residents affected by urban renewal projects could still pursue with URA for more favourable terms.

23. Mr Frederick FUNG also expressed concerns about owners whose flats were let and sought assurance that concrete assistance would be provided to owners with negative assets. In response, DS(PL) confirmed that the Administration would take steps to ensure that negative assets owners with mortgage loans would not be forced to declare themselves bankrupt and that no one would become homeless as a result of the resumption of their properties. The Administration would arrange for rehousing for needy persons on compassionate grounds. It would also recommend to URA that in the unlikely event that the compensation payable to owners was insufficient for the repayment of bank loans, URA should consider effecting loan repayment to the bank first and to be reimbursed by the owners later. URA might also give special consideration in exceptional cases involving a small amount of money.

24. On whether URA could be persuaded to accept the recommendations on various forms of practical assistance, DS(PL) pointed out that the Administration would put to the URA a series of recommendations which it considered justified. However, it would be for the URA, being an independent statutory body, to make the final decision.

25. Mr Albert CHAN remarked that if the present proposal had not been considered in the context of urban renewal, it would certainly receive greater support. He was concerned that rejection of the present proposal might disadvantage owners/tenants affected by other land resumption projects. Having regard to past practice of LDC, Mr CHAN believed that in future, URA would likely offer more favourable terms for acquisition of properties. In this regard, he urged the Administration to recommend to URA that the acquisition offers for the 25 uncompleted LDC projects should be pitched at a level broadly comparable to using a five-year old flat as the basis for calculation, the reason being that redevelopment in these areas had been delayed pending the establishment of URA.

26. DS(PL) re-affirmed that the Administration had already undertaken to recommend to URA to give special consideration for the 25 uncompleted LDC projects as the residents concerned had waited for redevelopment for quite some time. However, the Administration was not in a position to provide a guarantee on the specific arrangement which was a matter for the URA. In response to Mr CHAN, SPL assured members that while the Administration could not provide any details at present on the extent of special consideration for the uncompleted LDC projects, the affected owners would be given an HPA based on a replacement flat of seven years' old plus some enhanced allowances.

Action

27. Mr Andrew WONG said that in principle, the resumption of properties would amount to a deprivation of private property for which fair and reasonable compensation should be payable. He commented that the existing compensation package for land resumption was most favourable for owners/tenants of domestic properties, but much less favourable for owners/tenants of commercial, industrial properties and owners of agricultural land. He queried the disparity in treatment and called for a comprehensive review, the outcome of which should have retrospective effect. In the absence of the Administration's assurance, he could not support the present proposal.

Admin

28. In response, SPL advised that the Administration would extend the scope of its comprehensive review on land acquisition to also cover agricultural land as suggested by Mr WONG, and report to the Panel in due course. However, pending the outcome of the review and the financial implications involved, SPL said that he was not in a position to make any undertaking on the retrospective effect or otherwise of the future arrangements.

29. Ms Audrey EU urged the Administration to adhere to the people-oriented approach to ensure the payment of fair and reasonable compensation to persons affected by urban renewal projects. She did not consider the request to calculate HPA based on a five-year old flat unreasonable as the persons concerned had in fact been deprived of their private property. She was concerned about the affected owners not being able to purchase a flat of seven years' old in the same district and the specific arrangements for the 25 uncompleted LDC projects.

30. In response, DS(PL) explained that as HPA would be payable as a non-accountable lump sum, there would be sufficient flexibility for individual owners to choose their preferred property. Regarding concerns that the HPA based on a replacement flat of seven years' old would be inadequate for purchasing a seven-year old flat in the same district, DS(PL) advised that this problem should not arise since the amount of HPA would be worked out with reference to the professional valuation by surveyors. In the event of any dispute over property valuation, the matter should be referred to the Appeal Board.

31. In response to Ms Audrey EU's concern about the representativeness of the Appeal Board of the URA, DS(PL) advised that the future Appeal Board would comprise a chairman plus three or four URA Board members to be appointed by the Chairman or Deputy Chairman from the URA Board. Professionals, social workers, District Council/Legislative Council Members and socially renowned persons would be appointed to the URA Board to ensure its representativeness.

32. Miss Margaret NG supported the people-oriented approach in dealing with ex gratia payment for persons affected by redevelopment projects.

Action

However, she recapitulated the Hong Kong Bar Association's objection to the manner of land resumption for urban renewal and shared some members' concerns about equitable compensation for deprivation of property rights. Miss NG pointed out that unlike land resumption for public works projects such as roads and railways which would ultimately benefit the public, acquisition of properties for redevelopment purposes would likely benefit developers while causing blight to persons originally residing in the areas. Therefore, she considered that HPA based on a five-year old flat was a reasonable request and she would not support the present proposal if the Administration would not accede to the request.

33. Miss Margaret NG referred to some old residential-cum-commercial buildings in Central and Sheung Wan and asked whether they would be treated as domestic properties in accordance with their actual use. In reply, DS(PL) confirmed that in the absence of any restriction in the land lease, the nature of the property would be determined with reference to its actual use. However, where the lease had specified that the property was for commercial purpose but it had been used for domestic purpose all along, then, the residents should discuss with URA. The Administration believed that URA would be prepared to treat the property as domestic premises if the facts of the case so justified.

34. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung queried the implementation of the people-oriented approach pledged by the Administration and shared some members' concerns about the blight of affected residents and the need for fair and reasonable compensation for the deprivation of property rights. He stated that he could not support the present proposal and stressed that affected residents' request for compensation based on a five-year old flat was reasonable and they should not be blamed for the delay in setting up URA.

35. Miss Emily LAU expressed appreciation of DS(PL)'s efforts in meeting with affected residents and listening to their views. She concurred with Mr Abraham SHEK's views on the present proposal. On whether the HPA payable for a relatively new property in one district would compare more favourably with that for an older property in another district, DS(PL) clarified that the unit price per square foot of a seven year-old replacement flat varied from street to street. The properties resumed for urban renewal purposes were usually over 30 years of age. The key policy consideration for redevelopment and the payment of HPA was not the conditions of the buildings in question, but the need to improve the living environment of the affected areas.

36. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan expressed support for the present proposal in order that URA could be set up early. He had come to the view that HPA based on a seven-year old flat was the Administration's baseline and urged that the people-oriented approach should be implemented seriously by URA to bring about an enhanced level of compensation broadly equivalent to that based on a five-year old flat as strongly recommended by members at this meeting.

Action

37. Miss Cyd HO expressed support for the present proposal having regard to the views of affected residents. On the future mechanism for determining the rate for calculating HPA, Miss HO requested the Administration to consult not only the industry but also the public at large.

38. In response, DS(PL) advised that the Administration was drafting a set of guidelines for the determination of the rate for calculating HPA for consultation with the industry. The Administration would be prepared to provide the draft guidelines to interested parties and to consider their views as well. The finalized guidelines would be made public.

39. Mr Ambrose LAU declared that he was a member of the LDC Board of Directors. He recapitulated that many difficult issues had been resolved and the residents were looking forward to the early establishment of URA to take the redevelopment programme forward. The remaining issue was the split between a five years' or seven years' old replacement flat. He pointed out that the seven-year benchmark was only the minimum basis and the future URA would have full discretion in making more favourable acquisition offers in the light of the circumstances of individual cases. Having considered the interests of both the affected residents and the community at large, Mr LAU said that Members of the Hong Kong Progressive Alliance would support the present proposal.

40. Before Members of the Democratic Party (DP) took a position on the matter, Mr James TO asked whether the Administration would undertake to recommend to URA to seriously consider Members' strong view for granting HPA on the basis of a five-year old replacement flat. SPL responded that the Administration could not accede to Mr TO's request as it was in fact another way for the Administration to make a specific recommendation to URA to use a five years ' old flat as the basis for HPA.

41. Miss Emily LAU sought the Administration's comments on recent reports on conflict of interests on the part of the LDC Chairman, Mr LAU Wah-sum. While pointing out that the allegation in question should not be discussed at this meeting, SPL advised that issues relating to conflict of interests and complaints would be dealt with in accordance with the relevant legislation governing the LDC or the future URA. He also took the opportunity to thank Mr LAU Wah-sum and his colleagues for their dedicated work amidst all the uncertainties.

42. At the request of Members of DP, the Chairman adjourned the meeting for five minutes. The meeting resumed at 4:40 pm.

43. The Chairman put the proposal to vote. 31 members voted for the proposal, 24 members voted against and none abstained -

For:

Mr Kenneth TING Woo-shou
Mr David CHU Yu-lin
Dr Raymond HO Chung-tai
Mr Eric LI Ka-cheung
Prof NG Ching-fai
Mr HUI Cheung-ching
Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun
Mr LAU Chin-shek
Mrs Miriam LAU Kin-yee
Miss Emily LAU Wai-hing
Mr TAM Yiu-chung
Mr Abraham SHEK Lai-him
Mr Henry WU King-cheong
Mr Michael MAK Kwok-fung
Mr Frederick FUNG Kin-kee
Ms Audrey EU Yuet-mee
(31 members)

Mr James TIEN Pei-chun
Miss Cyd HO Sau-lan
Mr LEE Cheuk-yan
Mr NG Leung-sing
Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-yee
Mr Bernard CHAN
Mr Howard YOUNG
Mr LAU Wong-fat
Mr Ambrose LAU Hon-chuen
Mr Timothy FOK Tsun-ting
Dr TANG Siu-tong
Ms LI Fung-ying
Mr Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan
Dr LO Wing-lok
Mr LAU Ping-cheung

Against:

Mr Albert HO Chun-yan
Mr Fred LI Wah-ming
Mr James TO Kun-sun
Mr CHAN Kwok-keung
Mr CHAN Kam-lam
Mr SIN Chung-kai
Mr WONG Yung-kan
Dr YEUNG Sum
Mr LAU Kong-wah
Mr Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
Mr Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Mr WONG Sing-chi
(24 members)

Mr Martin LEE Chu-ming
Miss Margaret NG
Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong
Miss CHAN Yuen-han
Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung
Mr Andrew WONG Wang-fat
Mr Jasper TSANG Yok-sing
Mr YEUNG Yiu-chung
Miss CHOY So-yuk
Mr SZETO Wah
Mr LEUNG Fu-wah
Mr IP Kwok-him

44. The Committee approved the proposal.
45. The Committee was adjourned at 4:46 pm.