

**立法會**  
***Legislative Council***

LC Paper No. CB(1)458/00-01  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/PL/TP/1

**Legislative Council**  
**Panel on Transport**

**Minutes of Meeting held on**  
**Friday, 15 December 2000, at 10:45 am**  
**in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

- Members present** : Hon Mrs Miriam LAU Kin-yee, JP (Chairman)  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon David CHU Yu-lin  
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan  
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, JP  
Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-yee, JP  
Hon CHAN Kwok-keung  
Hon LAU Kong-wah  
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo  
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP  
Dr Hon TANG Siu-tong, JP  
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, JP  
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip  
Hon WONG Sing-chi  
Hon LAU Ping-cheung
- Members absent** : Hon Andrew WONG Wang-fat, JP  
Hon LAU Chin-shek, JP

**Public officers attending : Agenda Item IV**

Transport Bureau

Mr Kevin HO  
Secretary for Transport (Atg.)

Mr Patrick HO  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport (1)

Transport Department

Mr Robert FOOTMAN  
Commissioner for Transport

Mr Daniel AU  
Assistant Commissioner for Transport/NT

**Agenda Item V**

Transport Bureau

Mr Kevin HO  
Secretary for Transport (Atg.)

Ms Doris CHEUNG  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport (6)

Transport Department

Mr Robert FOOTMAN  
Commissioner for Transport

Mr LI Shu-ming  
Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban

Mr SIN Kwok-leung  
Chief Traffic Engineer/NT(East)

**Clerk in attendance :** Mr Andy LAU  
Chief Assistant Secretary (1)2

**Staff in attendance** : Ms Alice AU  
Senior Assistant Secretary (1)5

---

Action

**I Confirmation of minutes and matters arising**

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)308/00-01 - Minutes of joint meeting held with the Environmental Affairs Panel on 7 November 2000; and
- LC Paper No. CB(1)309/00-01 - Minutes of meeting held on 24 November 2000)

The above minutes of meetings were confirmed.

**II Information papers issued since last meeting**

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)277/00-01 - Complaint against noise impact of existing roads;
- LC Paper No. CB(1)287/00-01 - Kam Tin Bypass;
- LC Paper No. CB(1)304/00-01 - Ma On Shan to Tai Wai Rail Link and KCR Extension from Hung Hom to Tsim Sha Tsui - Essential Public Infrastructure Works;
- LC Paper No. CB(1)305/00-01 - Staffing proposal for Highways Department and Transport Department to take forward the new railway projects recommended by Railway Development Strategy 2000;
- LC Paper No. CB(1)306/00-01 - Staffing proposal for Transport Bureau to take forward the new railway projects recommended by Railway Development Strategy 2000; and
- LC Paper No. CB(1)314/00-01 - Report on Parking Demand and Supply and Progress of Improvement Measures)

2. As regards the preparation of information papers by the Administration, the Chairman informed members that the Secretary for Transport had conveyed to her that the Administration would give priority to discussion papers for agenda items of Panel meetings. However, it might mean that information papers, either those requested by members or for items originally proposed by the Administration for discussion but were left out of the agenda, might have to be deferred.

Action

3. Members noted the above information papers issued since the last meeting and did not raise any questions on LC Paper Nos. CB(1)277/00-01, CB(1)287/00-01 and CB(1)314/00-01.

4. Referring to paragraph 17 of the Administration's paper on "Ma On Shan to Tai Wai Rail Link and KCR Extension from Hung Hom to Tsim Sha Tsui - Essential Public Infrastructure Works" (LC Paper No. CB(1)304/00-01), Mr LAU Kong-wah pointed out that it was untrue to say that members of the Sha Tin District Council (STDC) had no adverse comments on these railway projects. He suggested that before the item was put to the Public Works Subcommittee for consideration on 10 January 2001, it should be discussed by the Panel so that the Administration could account for the views and suggestions put forward by STDC, the mitigation measures to be proposed, as well as the progress of implementation.

5. In this connection, Mr CHENG Kar-foo opined that given the importance of railway development projects on the society as a whole, there might be a case for the establishment of a dedicated subcommittee to examine matters relating to the implementation of railway development projects in Hong Kong. Both Mr LAU Ping-cheung and Mr Albert CHAN shared his view. Members agreed that a subcommittee be formed under the Panel for the purpose.

*(Post-meeting note: The first meeting of the Subcommittee on matters relating to the implementation of railway development projects was scheduled to be held on 4 January 2001 at 10:45 am. The item on "Ma On Shan to Tai Wai Rail Link and KCR Extension from Hung Hom to Tsim Sha Tsui - Essential Public Infrastructure Works" would be discussed at the meeting.)*

6. As regards the staffing proposals for the Transport Bureau (TB), Transport Department (TD) and Highways Department (HyD) to take forward the new railway projects recommended by Railway Development Strategy 2000 as set out in LC Paper Nos. CB(1)305/00-01 and CB(1)306/00-01, Mr Albert CHAN opined that the Panel should examine these proposals in detail before they were submitted to the Establishment Subcommittee (ESC) for consideration on 20 December 2000. He suggested that the Administration should be requested to defer putting the items to ESC pending the Panel's discussion. His views were shared by Mr Tommy CHEUNG.

7. In response, the Secretary for Transport (Atg.) (S for T(Atg.)) explained that as some of the supernumerary posts in relation to the staffing proposals would lapse in January 2001, the Administration had planned to submit the items to ESC for consideration on 20 December 2000. Subject to ESC's endorsement, relevant funding requests would then be made to the Finance Committee (FC) in January 2001. Mr Albert CHAN was however dissatisfied that these items were put to the Panel at the very last minute. The Administration's action had clearly showed its disrespect for the consultation mechanism currently in place for LegCo Panels to discuss major financial proposals before they were formally put to FC. He considered that as the Panel had

## Action

made its best efforts to deal with these items, any consequences arising from their late submission to FC would have to be borne by the Administration. Mr TAM Yiu-chung also remarked that in future, sufficient time should be allowed for members to discuss major funding proposals from the Administration.

8. While apologizing to members for the inconvenience so caused, S for T(Atg.) advised that the staffing proposals could only be finalized taking into consideration the views collected through consultation on the Railway Development Strategy 2000. In view of the tight timeframe, members agreed that a special meeting would be held on 20 December 2000 at 7:30 am to discuss these two staffing proposals.

### **III Items for discussion at the next meeting scheduled for 19 January 2001**

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)307/00-01(01) - List of outstanding items for discussion; and  
LC Paper No. CB(1)307/00-01(02) - List of follow-up actions)

9. Members agreed to discuss the following items as proposed by the Administration at the next meeting scheduled for 19 January 2001:

- (a) Lantau North-South Road Link; and
- (b) Measures to enhance passenger safety on public light bus.

10. Members also agreed to include the item on “Development of Intelligent Transport System in Hong Kong” as proposed by Mr LAU Kong-wah in the list of outstanding items for discussion.

### **IV Policy on public light buses**

- (LC Paper No. CB(1)307/00-01(03) - Information paper provided by the Administration)

11. At the invitation of the Chairman, the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) presented an overview of the Government’s current policy on public light buses (PLBs) and highlighted the following points for members’ information:

- (a) Since PLBs played a supplementary role in the provision of public transport services in Hong Kong, and given that they were less efficient road users when compared to other mass carriers, the Government’s policy on PLBs was one of containment by limiting their numbers as well as their activities. For red minibuses (RMBs), it meant that their operation was confined to existing service areas and they were not allowed to have access to new towns and new housing developments. There were also restrictions on RMBs using new expressways.

Action

- (b) Within this framework, the Government's established policy was to encourage red minibuses (RMBs) to convert to green minibuses (GMBs) which were subject to TD's regulatory control. This policy had the general acceptance of the public as well as the PLB trade.
- (c) The Administration would continue to work closely with the PLB trade through different channels to discuss various operational matters and to seek their views on all issues affecting the trade.

12. In this connection, the Chairman drew members' attention to the submission from one trade association, the HK Public Light Bus Owner & Driver Association, stating its views on the operation of RMBs. The submission (in Chinese version only) was tabled at the meeting and was subsequently circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)338/00-01.

Financial viability of PLB operation

13. Given that franchised bus services had been greatly improved in recent years, Mr TAM Yiu-chung expressed concern about the financial viability of PLB operation. In response, the Assistant Commissioner for Transport/NT (AC for T/NT) said that TD had been closely monitoring the situation. According to the findings of a consultant study on GMB operation conducted two years ago, GMB operation was on the whole financially viable. For individual routes which were suffering a loss due to changing circumstances, measures had been identified and implemented to improve their viability, such as by re-routeings. In respect of RMB operation, the Administration had learnt from the trade that despite competition from other public transport modes, RMB operation was still viable given their flexibility to adjust to market forces quickly. One case in point was the new routes operating via the Western Harbour Crossing (WHC).

Admin. 14. Mr TAM however queried about the validity of such findings nowadays and asked whether there had been cases where GMB operators had surrendered their operating right for loss-making routes to the Government. AC for T/NT replied that such occurrences were rare and recently, there had only been one case where the operator of a Kwai Chung GMB route had given such indication. He further explained that TD would have updated information on GMB operation through the financial data provided by the operators every month. In order to facilitate members' understanding on the current situation of PLB operation, the Chairman requested for information on the monthly patronage of GMBs and RMBs over the past two years. AC for T/NT agreed to provide such information after the meeting.

15. Responding to Mr LAU Ping-cheung's questions, AC for T/NT explained that under the Government's overall PLB containment policy, the size of the PLB fleet had been frozen at 4 350 since 1976 and RMBs were encouraged to convert to GMBs. If there was a need to introduce new PLB routes to serve new towns and new housing

## Action

developments, TD would issue passenger service licences to GMBs to provide the service. For financially unviable routes, GMB operators could choose to surrender their operating right and convert the GMB fleet back to RMBs although such cases rarely happened.

### Seating capacity of PLBs

16. Referring to a long-standing request of the PLB trade, Mr LAU Kong-wah asked whether it was an appropriate time for the Administration to re-visit its decision not to increase the seating capacity of PLBs from 16 to 18. AC for T/NT explained that the main consideration was that given the supplementary role played by PLBs in the existing public transport hierarchy, there should be sufficient distinction between the roles of PLBs and franchised buses. This distinction would however be blurred if PLBs were allowed to increase their seating capacity. Furthermore, there was no consensus view among the trade on this issue as concerns had been raised about the operational problems which might arise, such as the longer time taken to fill up the seats.

### Role of PLBs

17. Some members had grave concerns about the supplementary role assigned to PLBs under the Government's containment policy which dated back to 1970s. While supporting the conversion of RMBs to GMBs, they pointed out that the overall policy might be out-dated as it had failed to take into account the changes of Hong Kong's public transport system brought about by the development of extensive railway networks and the improvements of franchised bus services. Some members were particularly concerned that by restricting the service areas of RMBs, the Government had stifled the livelihood of RMB operators.

18. The Chairman considered that from a policy perspective, it was high time for the Government to critically review the role and functions of PLBs in the public transport hierarchy and decide whether the historical factors for its containment policy were still applicable given the substantial development and improvement in the public transport system. She pointed out that it was unfair for the Government to restrict PLB operation to existing service areas which were set more than 20 years ago. If the Government still regarded PLBs as a supplementary form of public transport to franchised buses, the PLB trade simply could not survive. Thus, a comprehensive review was urgently required to tackle the problem at root. By identifying a proper role for PLBs, they would be able to compete with other public transport modes in a level playing field and perform more efficiently and effectively to the benefit of the society as a whole. Moreover, as the total number of PLBs had been capped at 4 350, the Government should not worry about the adverse impact their service expansion might have on other public transport modes. Both Ir Dr Raymond HO and Mr Abraham SHEK agreed with her views.

19. In response, AC for T/NT elaborated on the Administration's stance regarding the supplementary role of PLBs. He said that under the public transport hierarchy, PLBs

Action

should mainly serve in areas which were physically inaccessible to buses or where demand did not warrant franchised bus services. They also had an important role to play as feeders to the mass carriers. While RMBs were confined to existing service areas, they were encouraged to convert to GMBs. With the gradual conversion of RMBs to GMBs, the role of PLBs had become more well-defined in that GMBs would mainly operate short-haul routes linking up new towns and villages in the New Territories with railway stations and bus terminals. In order to ensure a balanced system comprising different transport modes, the Administration considered it appropriate to maintain the supplementary role of PLBs and restrict their use of major trunk roads. However, Ir Dr Raymond HO pointed out that if electric light buses were adopted, PLBs would be a more environmentally-friendly form of transport than buses.

20. Mr Albert CHAN did not agree with the Administration's views. As he saw it, the primary function of PLBs was to supplement the mass carriers such as railway and franchised buses in the public transport system and it was the supplementary role PLBs were to perform. However, according to the explanation given by the Administration, PLBs had clearly been marginalized and were treated as a secondary class of public transport services. By pursuing its restrictive policies, the Administration had not given PLBs any room for development. Hence, he supported the Chairman's suggestion that the Administration should review its policy on the matter.

21. Referring to the updated information on market share of PLBs which stood at 14% as compared with 38% for franchised buses, 30% for rail and 14% for taxis, Ir Dr Raymond HO pointed out that when pitched against the 11 million public transport boardings per day, a market share of 14% was by no means "supplementary" and PLBs did perform a significant role in the public transport system. He was not convinced that the concerns raised by members would be addressed if the Administration still clung to its out-dated PLB policy.

22. Members unanimously agreed to request the Administration to conduct a comprehensive review on the role and functions of PLB. In particular, the review should examine whether the supplementary role of PLBs as defined by the Administration was still valid under the present situation. Responding to the Chairman's enquiry about the time required to complete the review, C for T advised that

Admin.

it would probably take about three to six months.



Action

Restrictions on RMB operation

23. Expressing strong disagreement with the restrictions imposed on PLB operation, Mr Albert CHAN opined that the Government's policy was discriminating against RMBs and had deprived the public of their right to choices. Dissatisfied with the Administration's refusal to relax the restrictions, he pointed out that even if the service areas of RMBs were extended after the restrictions had been relaxed, it still did not mean that the supplementary role played by PLBs had been changed. On the contrary, this role could be enhanced if RMBs were allowed to use new expressways because a more efficient service would be provided. With access to new towns and new housing developments, RMBs would be diverted off busy thoroughfares in urban areas and they could also serve those areas which had been monopolized by franchised buses. Citing the Tai Lam Tunnel (TLT) and Shing Mun Tunnels (SMT) as examples, Mr CHAN remarked that if RMBs were allowed access, precious social resources could be put to better use. Both the passengers and RMB operators would benefit from a much faster trip while the congestion at Castle Peak Road and the Lion Rock Tunnel (LRT) could be relieved. He further pointed out that with increased patronage, pressures for toll increase of TLT could also be relieved.

24. In reply, AC for T/NT clarified that the supplementary role of PLBs applied to RMBs and GMBs alike and there was no discrimination against RMBs under the Government's policy. He reiterated that under the existing policy, RMBs would be confined to their existing service areas and whenever passenger demand was identified in new towns or new housing developments, consideration would be given to providing the required service by GMBs which were under TD's direct monitoring, in accordance with the generally accepted policy of encouraging conversion of RMBs into GMBs. Nevertheless, in implementing this policy, suitable flexibility had been allowed. Taking into account the traffic and transport situation, RMBs were permitted to use specified sections of expressways such as WHC, where relaxation would not enlarge their existing service area, and where their operations were not envisaged to have significant impact on other public transport modes. Regarding the suggestion to open up SMT to PLBs, AC for T/NT informed members that as there were currently four GMB routes operating via the tunnel, TD would have to carefully consider the impact of further PLB operation via this tunnel on other public transport providers. If considered justified, demand for new PLB service would be met by GMB operation. As for TLT, he explained that adequate public transport services had already been provided in the form of franchised buses and residents' services. However, TD would closely monitor the transport demand of the area and introduce new GMB routes to operate via TLT where appropriate. In fact, one possible GMB route from San Tin had already been identified which would be included in the route selection exercise to be conducted by TD.

25. Mr Albert CHAN was however unconvinced that the same set of criteria as stated by AC for T/NT for allowing RMBs to use WHC had been consistently applied to TLT. He said that it was clearly not true to say that adequate public transport services had been provided as there was still a strong demand for RMB service from residents in Yuen

## Action

Long area even though RMBs had to travel along Castle Peak Road. As he saw it, the Government's policy was unreasonable and absurd from a transport planning point of view, and it only served to safeguard the interests of franchised bus companies. Given the potential benefits of relaxation, he urged the Government to conduct a comprehensive review on the existing restrictions imposed on RMB operation and to allow RMBs to use new expressways subject to road safety considerations. In this connection, Mr CHAN proposed that the Administration should be requested to relax the restriction on RMBs to use TLT immediately. The Chairman then invited members present to indicate their positions on Mr CHAN's proposal. The proposal was supported by the majority of members present.

26. In view of the forthcoming review on the role and functions of PLBs and the GMB route planned for TLT, Ir Dr Raymond HO expressed reservation on Mr CHAN's proposal and opined that it might not be the right time to change the situation of a particular expressway. He took the view that a decision on the matter should be taken pending the completion of the review.

27. The Chairman concluded that the Administration should take note of members' views and conduct a review on the role and functions of PLBs with a view to reporting back to the Panel in three to six months' time. Meanwhile, the Administration should address members' request to relax the restriction on RMBs to use TLT.

## **V Toll differential amongst different tunnels and the resulting traffic implications**

(LC Paper No. CB(1)307/00-01(04) - Information paper provided by the Administration)

28. The Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban introduced the Administration's paper on the subject (LC Paper No. CB(1)307/00-01(04)) which gave an account of the traffic implications of the recent toll increases of the Tate Cairn's Tunnel (TCT), TLT and WHC, as well as the measures taken to promote access and utilization of the tunnels.

29. Members expressed grave dissatisfaction on the Administration's paper which failed to address their concerns about the adverse impact caused by the toll differential amongst different tunnels. They pointed out that without a conscious and determined effort from the Administration to promote a more equitable use of tunnels, such as between TCT and LRT, and among the three cross-harbour tunnels, precious social resources were wasted and congestion was created unnecessarily. As could be seen in recent years, whenever a tunnel increased its toll, vehicles would be diverted to other tunnels causing or aggravating the congestion there. This would then be used by the other tunnel companies as a pretext to increase their tolls. If nothing was done by the Administration to stop this vicious cycle, members of the public would ultimately be the ones to suffer.

## Action

30. Referring to paragraph 9 of the paper, Mr CHENG Kar-foo deplored the irresponsible stance taken by the Administration in concluding that “the throughput (of the tunnels) would gradually recover when users’ resistance to the toll increase becomes diluted”. He opined that the reality was that the general public was forced to accept the toll increases because the measures proposed by the Administration to maximize utilization of tunnels could do nothing to alleviate the problem.

### Problem with WHC

31. Referring to the low patronage of WHC, Mr CHENG Kar-foo opined that it would be most important to ensure a more even distribution of traffic utilizing the three cross-harbour tunnels. Given the automatic toll increase mechanism of WHC, he asked whether the Administration would consider subsidizing the operating costs of WHC so as to minimize pressure for further toll increases and promote utilization. While acknowledging the boldness of his suggestion, Mr CHENG opined that it might be justified given the savings in social costs and the increase in productivity that could be achieved by less traffic congestion. In response, S for T(Atg.) said that while the Administration would carefully consider the views put forward by members, it would not be in line with existing policy to directly subsidize public transport companies.

32. Following-up on Mr CHENG’s point, the Chairman suggested that cross-subsidy among different tunnels might also be considered. S for T(Atg.) replied that if there was general agreement among members and the public, the Administration would be prepared to examine the matter further. However, he cautioned that toll was but one of the many factors which affected tunnel utilization. For WHC which was a relatively new tunnel, its patronage would have to be built up gradually. In fact, the patronage of WHC had been increasing since its commissioning at about the same rate as the initial operation of the Eastern Harbour Crossing. The Administration took the view that the traffic management measures outlined in its paper would help to promote access to and utilization of WHC. In considering further measures that could be taken, it should be recognized that the tunnels were operated by different companies with different costing structures and management strategies. Although the tunnels were essentially public resources, the Administration could not interfere with their operation.

### Problem with TCT

33. In view of the substantial accumulative loss of the Tate’s Cairn Tunnel Co. Ltd. (TCTC), Mr LAU Kong-wah remarked that the problem with TCT was even more serious than WHC. Given the terms of the operating franchise and the financial position of TCTC, the Administration would have to approve the company’s applications for toll increase. However, according to his calculations, TCTC’s financial problems would not be solved even if it was allowed to increase tunnel toll for the next ten years. Thus, it was clear that toll increase was not a solution to TCT’s problems, not to mention the fact that by charging an even higher toll, TCT would fail to divert traffic from the already

Action

congested LRT. He was particularly worried that much discontent would be aroused among the public who were forced to accept toll increase year after year.

34. In reply, S for T(Atg.) explained that one of the problems faced by TCT was the low patronage of goods vehicles which were charged a higher toll as compared with the flat toll structure of LRT. One way to improve the throughput of goods vehicles at TCT would be by increasing the toll for such vehicles at LRT. But given its impact on the livelihood of the general public, the Administration would have to consider the suggestion carefully. He further advised that as toll adjustments in the previous two years had not brought about any significant reduction in the daily traffic of TCT, an increase in tunnel toll should be able to help improve the financial position of TCTC.

35. While stressing that it was never his intention to suggest any increase in the tunnel toll of LRT, Mr LAU Kong-wah said that he was gravely dissatisfied with the Administration's procrastination in the matter. Instead of acknowledging and tackling the real problems faced by TCT, the Administration was simply relying on toll increases to make up for the company's deficit. In order to increase transparency and facilitate members' assessment on the validity of the present 50% toll increase application from TCTC, he requested the Administration to provide members with all the relevant data and analysis on TCTC's financial position which had been supplied to Sha Tin District Council previously. Moreover, such information should be supplied to members before a decision on the approved level of toll increase was made by the Administration. S for T (Atg.) noted the member's request and replied that information passed to Sha Tin District Council, if any, would also be made available to members. He also emphasized that in considering the toll increase application, due regard would be given to the financial status of the company and a decision had yet to be made by the Administration. He assured members that in line with existing practice, the tunnel company would account for its toll increase application to the Panel.

36. In this connection, the Chairman recalled that when the Eastern Harbour Crossing failed to reach an agreement with the Administration on its toll increase application a few years ago, the tunnel company had taken the matter to arbitration. At that time, the arbitrator had decided that a return of about 15% was reasonable for the tunnel company. Worrying that the ultimate rate of increase might turn out to be much higher than that negotiated between the Administration and TCTC if the present toll increase application was to be resolved through arbitration, she asked whether TCTC could indeed take the matter to arbitration. S for T(Atg.) replied by confirming that the Tate's Cairn Tunnel Ordinance (Cap. 393) had provided a channel for TCTC to take the matter to arbitration under such circumstances.

Alternative solutions

37. Both Mr WONG Shing-chi and Mr CHAN Kwok-keung were concerned about the lack of alternative solutions proposed by the Administration to ensure a more equitable use of the tunnels. In response, S for T(Atg.) said that one of the ways to

## Action

reduce congestion at tunnels would be to encourage the use of public transport as most of the congestion was caused by private cars which were the main users of tunnels. It was especially true for TCT and LRT which were both already very congested. Of course, another alternative would be to build more tunnels. However, given the spare capacity of other public transport modes to take up more passengers, the Administration did not consider this option justified.

38. Members expressed utmost disappointment with the irresponsible reply given by the Administration and they were dissatisfied that their legitimate concerns had been deliberately ignored by the Administration. The Chairman opined that while the problems might not seem significant at the moment, the Administration should nevertheless adopt a more forward-looking attitude to review its policy so as to ensure a more equitable use of transport infrastructure.

## Motion

39. Concurring with the Chairman's view, Mr CHENG Kar-foo proposed a motion urging the Administration to examine and formulate a long-term policy on tunnel utilization, and to propose new measures for resolving the congestion problem of tunnels as well as promoting the optimum use of tunnel resources. The wording of the motion with amendments proposed by Mr LAU Kong-wah and accepted by Mr CHENG Kar-foo were as follows:

“本會要求政府盡快研究長遠隧道政策及提出新方案，以解決隧道擠塞及充分善用公共資源之問題。”

40. The above motion was put to vote and was endorsed unanimously by members present.

41. At the request of Mr CHAN Kwok-keung, the Chairman asked the Administration to provide information on all alternative solutions it had previously considered, in the context of the study to be undertaken in response to the Panel's motion.

Admin. 42. As regards the expected completion date of the study, members suggested and S for T(Atg.) agreed that the study would be completed as early as possible within six months.

## **VI Any other business**

43. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:45 pm.

Action

Legislative Council Secretariat  
17 January 2001