

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. FC81/04-05
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/1/2

Finance Committee of the Legislative Council

**Minutes of the 5th meeting
held at the Legislative Council Chamber
on Friday, 25 February 2005, at 2:30 pm**

Members present:

Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP (Chairman)
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, S.B.St.J., JP
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan
Hon Martin LEE Chu-ming, SC, JP
Hon Fred LI Wah-ming, JP
Dr Hon LUI Ming-wah, JP
Hon Margaret NG
Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-ye, GBS, JP
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, JP
Hon Bernard CHAN, JP
Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, SBS, JP
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Hon SIN Chung-kai, JP
Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong, GBS
Hon WONG Yung-kan, JP
Hon Jasper TSANG Yok-sing, GBS, JP
Hon Howard YOUNG, SBS, JP
Dr Hon YEUNG Sum
Hon LAU Chin-shek, JP
Hon LAU Kong-wah, JP
Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBS, JP
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-ye, GBS, JP
Hon CHOY So-yuk
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP

Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
Hon LI Fung-ying, BBS, JP
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, JP
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Hon LI Kwok-ying, MH
Dr Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long
Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, BBS, JP
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, SBS, JP
Hon MA Lik, JP
Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, SBS, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, BBS
Hon TONG Ka-wah, SC
Hon CHIM Pui-chung
Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP
Hon Albert Jinghan CHENG
Hon KWONG Chi-kin
Hon TAM Heung-man

Members absent:

Hon CHAN Kam-lam, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Dr Hon David LI Kwok-po, GBS, JP

Public officers attending:

Mr Frederick MA Si-hang, JP	Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury
Mr Alan LAI Nin, GBS, JP	Permanent Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)
Miss Elizabeth TSE, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) 1
Mr Alfred FOK	Principal Executive Officer (General), Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau (The Treasury Branch)

Miss Susie HO, JP	Deputy Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food (Health)
Dr Anne FUNG	Senior Medical and Health Officer (Research Office), Health, Welfare and Food Bureau
Prof Arthur LI, GBS, JP	Secretary for Education and Manpower
Mr Michael Vernon STONE, JP	Secretary-General, University Grants Committee
Ms Irene YOUNG	Principal Assistant Secretary for Education and Manpower (Higher Education)

Clerk in attendance:

Ms Pauline NG	Assistant Secretary General 1
---------------	-------------------------------

Staff in attendance:

Miss Becky YU	Chief Council Secretary (1)1
Mrs Mary TANG	Senior Council Secretary (1)2
Ms Caris CHAN	Senior Legislative Assistant (1)1
Mr Frankie WOO	Legislative Assistant (1)2

Action

The Chairman reminded members that a special briefing on “Progress Report on the Centre for Youth Development Project” would be held immediately after the meeting. However, if there was insufficient time left for holding the briefing before the cut-off time for holding the House Committee meeting at 4:30 pm, the briefing would be deferred to after the House Committee meeting.

Item No. 1 - FCR(2004-05)40

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ESTABLISHMENT SUBCOMMITTEE
MADE ON 19 JANUARY 2005**

2. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said that Members of the Democratic Party (DP) had no objection to the staffing proposals which already had the support of relevant Panels. He however recalled that when these proposals were examined by the Establishment Subcommittee on 19 January 2005, members noted with concern that previous savings from reorganization/merger of certain departments/bureaux were used to offset the creation of new directorate posts in other departments/bureaux. Although such an arrangement incurred no net additional headcount, it was not envisaged when the consensus was reached by the Seven Party Coalition on the need to contain and reduce the size of the directorate. He considered that this kind of offsetting arrangement for directorate posts across bureaux/departments should be followed up.

3. Mr James TIEN echoed that the Seven Party Coalition's consensus had resulted in the reduction of the number of civil servants from 180 000 to 165 000 and containing the number of directorate posts at 1 500. However, details of the offsetting arrangements on whether the directorate post to be created and deleted should come from the same department/bureau had not been specified. In view of the prevalence of offsetting of posts across departments/bureaux, he concurred that there was a need to follow up the offsetting mechanism in a separate forum.

4. Mr Albert CHENG however took a different view. He considered that the Administration should be accorded the necessary flexibility to redeploy its resources, particularly when there was no net increase in the total headcount.

5. Having regard to members' views, the Chairman agreed to convene an informal meeting to discuss and rationalize the existing offsetting mechanism. In this connection, the Secretariat would prepare a background paper to facilitate members' discussion.

6. The Chairman put the item to vote. The Committee approved the proposal.

Item No. 2 - FCR(2004-05)41

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE MADE ON 26 JANUARY 2005

7. The Chairman put the item to vote. The Committee approved the proposal.

Item No. 3 - FCR(2004-05)42

Head 149 - GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT : HEALTH, WELFARE AND FOOD BUREAU

♦ Subhead 700 General non-recurrent

Item 019 Health and Health Services Research Fund

8. The Chairman informed members that the Panel on Health Services was consulted on the proposal at its meeting on 31 January 2005.

9. Mr Andrew CHENG, Chairman of the Panel on Health Services, said that the proposal had the full support of the Panel.

10. Mr LI Kwok-ying indicated support for the proposal which would provide funding for health services research on Chinese medicine.

11. Dr YEUNG Sum said that DP Members would support the proposal which would allow more funds for health services research.

12. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan opined that instead of providing only the executive summary of research reports, the Administration should make available the full report of research studies to interested parties upon request. The Deputy Secretary for Health, Welfare and Food (Health) affirmed that both the executive summary and the full report of research studies would be made available for public reference. In addition, copies of the research report would be delivered to the 500 relevant health related organizations.

13. The Chairman put the item to vote. The Committee approved the proposal.

Item No. 4 - FCR(2004-05)43

HEAD 190 – UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMITTEE

◆ Subhead 000 Operational expenses

14. The Chairman informed members that the Panel on Education was consulted on the proposal at its meetings on 3 and 11 January as well as 7 February 2005.

15. Dr YEUNG Sum and Mr Fernando CHEUNG declared interest as employees of the University Grants Committee (UGC)-funded institutions while Mr Tommy CHEUNG declared that his spouse was a teaching staff of one of the UGC-funded institutions.

16. Dr YEUNG Sum, Chairman of the Panel on Education, reported that some Panel members were opposed to the proposed recurrent grant for the UGC-funded institutions for the 2005-08 triennium under the 0-0-5 funding model which was based on the planning assumption that the institutions would achieve 5% efficiency savings for the 2007/08 academic year. With the revival in the economy, the percentage of fund cuts for the 2007/08 academic year could be reduced to less than 5%. They urged the Administration to re-examine the 0-0-5 funding arrangement and to resolve with the UGC-funded institutions the financial problems associated with the funding cuts. Panel members were particularly concerned about the 33% funding cut for the Hong Kong Institute of Education (HKIED) as it would not be possible for HKIED to survive and continue operation under such a substantial reduction of funding. Although the Administration was prepared to provide funding for HKIED's two project initiatives, this could not offset the reduction in recurrent provision. The funding cuts, which would give rise to a drastic reduction in the number of certificate programme places for in-service teachers in early childhood education, would be at variance with the objective of enhancing qualification of kindergarten teachers. It was also unfair to require HKIED to bid for non-recurrent funding to run programmes for in-service kindergarten teachers given its proven record in this respect. Panel members were disappointed that the Administration had insisted on submitting the funding proposal to Finance Committee (FC) despite that it was negated by a vote of three to two by the Panel.

Recurrent funding for UGC-funded institutions in the 2005-08 triennium

17. Dr YEUNG Sum said that DP Members were staunchly opposed to the proposed recurrent funding for UGC-funded institutions in the 2005-08 triennium albeit the acceptance of the proposal by the Heads of the Universities Committee (HUCOM). He recalled that the Administration had earlier agreed to consider implementing the 0-0-X model for the 2005-08 triennium where X should be less than five. It was regretted that the Administration had retracted its undertaking and proceeded with the 0-0-5 model. He said that unless the Administration could give a firm undertaking that there would not be any funding cuts for 2007/08 academic year, DP Members would not accept the 0-0-5 model.

18. The Secretary for Education and Manpower (SEM) said that the recurrent funding for UGC-funded institutions was made on a triennium basis to allow early confirmation of funds for forward planning on budgets and academic programmes during the period. As the future economic outlook was uncertain, there was a need to allow for reduction in recurrent expenditure. An undertaking of not implementing any funding cuts for UGC-funded institutions at this stage would not be appropriate as this would mean that any future funding cuts, if to be implemented, would have to fall on the other education sectors. The present 0-0-X model had the support of HUCOM as they were mindful of the need for UGC-funded institutions to have a fair share in achieving savings. There was also an understanding that X would not be greater than five. SEM cautioned that rejection of the present funding proposal would adversely affect the UGC-funded institutions as they would have to use their own funds to finance their plans before re-submission of the funding proposal for approval by FC in six months' time.

19. Dr YEUNG Sum stressed that by rejecting the proposal, the Administration had to re-open discussion with HUCOM to examine the feasibility of the 0-0-0 model. He questioned why the Administration could not re-submit the funding proposal in two weeks' time after a consensus was reached. A special meeting could then be convened without the need to wait for another six months. SEM reiterated that HUCOM had accepted the 0-0-5 model and the Administration was prepared to grant a provision of \$30,762.4 million to UGC-funded institutions. It would be regrettable if the funding proposal was rejected by FC. He added that in view of the recent improvement in the economic outlook, the Administration had agreed to review in mid-2006 the need to achieve the 5% savings in the 2007/08 academic year. As regards Dr YEUNG Sum's enquiry about the criteria for the review, SEM advised that the review would be conducted in consultation with UGC and HUCOM in a consensual manner taking into account public interest.

20. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong clarified that DP Members were not opposed to the funding for UGC-funded institutions but the proposed funding cuts. He was concerned that the UGC-funded institutions would have to plan for budget cuts, including staff retrenchment, in order to make up for the shortfall in funding under the 0-0-5 model, which would be very disruptive to their operations. However, if the

Administration agreed to give a firm undertaking that there would not be funding cuts in the 2007/08 academic year, the UGC-funded institutions would not have to go through this painful process which might later turn out to be unnecessary as the economy improved.

21. SEM said that there was no cause for concern about the feasibility of the proposal. HUCOM would not have accepted the proposal if they were not able to manage the funding cuts. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong however pointed out that HUCOM had failed to take into account concerns of staff and students who had all along been objecting to the funding cuts. In reply, SEM believed that HUCOM represented the management of UGC-funded institutions. He stressed that while no one would welcome funding cuts, there was a need to assume a reduction in public expenditure to prepare for any crisis situations such as resurgence of avian flu or Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome. UGC-funded institutions should not be exempted from funding cuts in those circumstances.

22. Mr Albert CHENG said that he would object to the proposed funding cuts having regard to the adverse impact on the quality of education which was of paramount importance to the community. He also pointed out HUCOM had no choice but to accept the funding cuts. Mr Fernando CHEUNG hoped that members and the Administration could work harmoniously together in ensuring the well-being of institutions within the present constraints. He added that members' concern about staff retrenchment arising from the 0-0-5 model was valid as UGC-funded institutions had to make responsible planning based on the funding model.

23. Mr Jasper TSANG reiterated that Members of the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong (DAB) supported the 0-0-X funding model for the 2005-08 triennium provided that X was less than five. During his discussions with HUCOM as well as staff and students of UGC-funded institutions, including those of HKIEd, there was a suggestion to replace the 0-0-5 model for the 2005-08 triennium with a 10-0-0 model for a triennium starting from 2004/05 since a 10% reduction had already been implemented in 2004/05. This would obviate the need to decide on the extent of funding cuts in 2007/08. However, HUCOM had reservation on the 10-0-0 model lest this might give rise to uncertainty in future planning since they were already planning ahead for the 2008-11 triennium. HUCOM indicated that they would uphold their position as set out in the statement made on 17 January 2005 as follows -

- (a) HUCOM welcomed SEM's indication on 17 January 2005 that if the healthy state of the economy sustained, there would be no cut in the 2007/08 academic year;
- (b) HUCOM also welcomed Government's promise that the funding for the 2007/08 academic year would be subject to a genuine review in mid-2006 and trusted that the final outcome would be subject to the agreement among UGC, Government and HUCOM; and

- (c) HUCOM viewed that the amount to be entered into the funding proposal by the Government for 2007/08 academic year for planning purposes was a matter for SEM.

Mr TSANG said that he was also given to understand that while HUCOM were planning their expenditure under a 0-0-5 model, they were optimistic that no funding cuts would be required for the 2007/08 academic year given the prevailing economic trend. It was on that basis that HUCOM had accepted the funding proposal rather than being forced to do so. Taking into account the views of HUCOM as well as those of staff and students, DAB Members had decided to support the proposal. SEM thanked Mr TSANG for explaining the situation, adding that the Administration was in full agreement with the statement made by HUCOM.

24. Mrs Selina CHOW reminded members that FC's role was to monitor public expenditure to ensure that funding is no more than necessary rather than encouraging more spending. However, some members had confused themselves and placed their sectoral interests above the role of FC. As the funding proposal had the support of HUCOM who were the official representatives of the UGC-funded institutions, it would not be appropriate for FC to allow an amount of funding in excess of the amount sought on grounds that HUCOM did not represent the interests of staff and students. Since the Administration had indicated that the 5% reduction in the 2007/08 academic year was the maximum percentage of reduction, and that the 0-0-5 model would be reviewed in mid-2006 subject to the agreement among UGC, HUCOM and Government, Members of the Liberal Party were prepared to support the funding proposal. Dr YEUNG Sum however pointed out that FC's role was not only confined to approve funding proposals but to oversee the propriety of allocation of public funding.

25. Ms Audrey EU expressed regret that funding for education had to be cut. She noted that the majority of funding for UGC-funded institutions was drawn down from the Central Allocation Vote governed by UGC. Since the UGC Chairman had openly said that funding for individual UGC-funded institutions should be granted in a meritorious manner based on their performance, it was no surprise that HUCOM had to accept the funding proposal as they had no other choice. However, despite HUCOM's acceptance, the concerns of staff and students should not be neglected. As such, Members of the Article 45 Concern Group would not support the funding proposal.

26. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung called upon members to vote against the funding proposal. He said that funding for education should be viewed from a sustainable perspective and any cuts in funding would run contrary to sustainability as they were detrimental to the quality of education. He said that instead of recommending funding cuts for UGC-funded institutions, SEM should have requested the Government to spend more on education, particularly in view of the recent healthy financial situation. He also could not agree that FC should try to reduce public spending nor could he accept that HUCOM were able to represent their staff.

27. Mr Frederick FUNG questioned the rationale behind the 0-0-5 model which seemed to assume that the economic situation would be worsened in 2007/08 with the resurgence of avian flu. If that was the case, there should be funding cuts for each year when avian flu resurged. He emphasized that he was not opposed to the funding for university education but to the funding cuts as these were at variance with the Chief Executive's pledge to invest in education. SEM said that while it was not possible to predict the economic outlook for the coming years, the Administration considered it prudent to provide flexibility in the third year of the triennium to respond to changes in the economy. Mr FUNG remained of the view that the Administration was overly pessimistic and conservative in its predictions on the economy. Besides, the Administration should make efforts to boost the economy through investment in education and other areas to tide over any possible downturn in the economy. He also believed that UGC-funded institutions would be prepared to accept the funding cuts if the economy had changed for the worse with the resurgence of avian flu.

28. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan said that Members of the Hong Kong Confederation of Trade Unions were opposed to the proposed funding cuts since investment in education was one of the primary means to combat poverty. He shared the view that if the 0-0-5 model was adopted, UGC-funded institutions would have to plan their expenditure based on the model and the university management might use this as an excuse to cut staff. This would not only affect the morale of staff and students but also have adverse impact on tertiary education. He also pointed out that the economic projections made by the Administration were too conservative. Instead of adopting the 0-0-5 model and reviewing it in mid-2006, the Administration should consider adopting a 0-0-0 model subject to the same review. He added that as HUCOM were representing the management, there was a need to take into account the concerns of staff and students as well. SEM reiterated that the 0-0-5 model was based on the worst case scenario and would be subject to review.

Reduction for recurrent funding for HKIEd

29. Given that tertiary education would be made easier and incur less resources if improvements were made to early childhood education, Dr YEUNG Sum expressed grave concern about the 33% cut in recurrent funding for HKIEd which would result in 60% reduction in the number of the certificate programme places for in-service kindergarten teachers. This would mean that a lot of kindergarten teachers would not have a chance to take part in certificate programmes. It was apparent that the proposed funding cuts were meant to induce the merging of HKIEd with other institutions. His views were shared by Mr Fernando CHEUNG who also found the drastic cuts on recurrent funding for HKIEd very unacceptable.

30. In reply, SEM stressed that HKIEd had accepted the funding proposal. He said that apart from UGC funding, HKIEd could also apply to the Education and Manpower Bureau (EMB) for additional funding on a non-recurrent basis to finance its proposals on collaborations with other institutions in support of education and

curriculum reforms as well as teacher training programmes under the “3+3+4” academic structure. As regards the provision of professional development programmes for in-service kindergarten teachers, SEM said that the number of training places had in fact been increased with the proposed allocation of places by bidding on a competing basis. This competitive bidding process aimed to introduce diversity to the programmes to meet the different training needs of teachers.

31. Mr Fernando CHEUNG however pointed out that HKIEd was a monotechnic institution focused on the delivery of teacher education programmes. It was therefore unreasonable to only allocate 200 places out of the 1 000 places for certificate programmes for in-service kindergarten teachers to HKIEd. If HKIEd failed to compete for the remaining places which were open to bidding, it might be seen as “mission drift” and not able to fulfil its role in the delivery of teacher education programmes. SEM said that the provision of certificate programmes for in-service kindergarten teachers was not confined to UGC-funded institutions and similar programmes were offered by other institutions. It was only fair that these institutions would be given a chance to compete for the publicly-funded certificate programme places.

32. Ms Audrey EU remained gravely concerned about the drastic reduction in the number of places for certificate programmes for in-service kindergarten teachers offered by HKIEd. Despite the keen competition for certificate programmes for in-service kindergarten teachers offered by HKIEd (some 1 500 in-service teachers competing for 371 places), EMB decided to take out 171 of these places from HKIEd for open bidding, leaving only 200 places for HKIEd. She failed to see why almost half of these programme places had to be taken away from HKIEd when there were still about 6 000 in-service kindergarten teachers who had not been able to benefit from the free certificate programmes offered by HKIEd. She urged the Administration to reinstate the 170 places for HKIEd and to earmark a larger share of the 1 000 places to HKIEd taking into account the good track record of HKIEd in delivering the certificate programmes and the fact that the performance of other institutions competing under the open bidding process had yet to be proven. The Chairman agreed that with their meagre incomes, kindergarten teachers might not be able to afford the tuition fees for the certificate programmes offered by other institutions which were operating on a self-financing basis.

33. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan pointed out that the decision to take out places for certificate programmes for in-service kindergarten teachers from HKIEd and open these places for competitive bidding would have serious impact on HKIEd and would arouse doubt on its professional role in the delivery of teacher education programmes. He questioned the rationale behind such a decision, particularly when the open bidding process had never been tried out before. His concern was shared by Mr Fernando CHEUNG.

34. SEM clarified that all UGC-funded institutions were subject to funding cuts and HKIED was no exception. Notwithstanding, HKIED could also apply to EMB for funding to support its training projects. As regards the certificate programmes for in-service kindergarten teachers, SEM explained that about 150 additional places had been provided under these programmes. Some of the places would be opened for competitive bidding as it was believed that the quality of teaching could be improved through open competition. Although HKIED had performed well in the past, other institutions should also be given a fair chance to prove, through an open competition, that they could perform just as well or even better. In any case, HKIED would have a guaranteed allocation of 200 places and could compete for more through the open bidding process.

35. Mrs Selina CHOW said that on the face of it, the 33% cut in recurrent funding for HKIED seemed very drastic. However, HKIED could apply for additional funding on a non-recurrent basis to develop its training development programmes for teachers. It was also worth to note there was an under-enrolment for HKIED due to various reasons such as locality and demand. Although under-enrolment was tolerated to avoid admitting less qualified candidates just for the purpose of filling places, there was a need to resolve the difficulty which teaching institutions had, particularly in operating part-time post-graduate diploma courses. UGC was looking into the matter together with EMB. While recognizing the performance of HKIED in teacher training, she found the decision to open up places for certificate programmes for in-service kindergarten for open bidding acceptable as this would help create healthy competition among institutions which would in turn improve the quality of education. Mr Albert CHENG however took a different view. He failed to see the rationale for opening up places for certificate programmes for in-service kindergarten teachers for competitive bidding when there was already an under-enrolment.

36. Referring to the Administration's reply to Mr CHEUNG Man kwong's written question at the Council meeting on 23 February 2005, Ms Audrey EU noted that 244 places in the sub-degree (Qualified Kindergarten Teacher) and 219 places in the sub-degree (Certificate in Early Childhood Education) programmes would be deleted in the 2005-08 triennium. She requested that the savings resulting from the reduction, amounting to \$70 million to \$80 million, should be used to finance training programmes for early childhood education. SEM said that part of the savings derived from the deletion of sub-degree places would be ploughed back to the training programmes for early childhood education. The Chairman said that the Panel on Education would need to follow up on the matter and more background information should be made available to members to facilitate discussion.

37. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong requested to put on record DP Members' objection to the 0-0-5 or 0-0-X funding model for the following reasons -

- (a) acceptance of the 0-0-5 or 0-0-X model would mean providing a blanket approval since members had no idea about the criteria to be adopted in assessing the state of economy in the review in mid-2006;

- (b) drastic funding cuts coupled with the opening of its core programme to bidding would have serious impact on the operation and role of HKIED as a monotechnic institution focused in the delivery of teacher education programmes;
- (c) reduction in subsidy for 3 734 sub-degree places in the Hong Kong Polytechnic University and the City University of Hong Kong as a result of the funding cuts would affect the affordability of students, particularly those from low-income families, to enroll in sub-degree courses;
- (d) HUCOM's decision to accept the proposed funding cuts was made at the expense of staff and students which would inevitably undermine the quality of education; and
- (e) UGC's intention to use funding allocation as a means to control UGC-funded institutions would create disharmony among the institutions.

38. Dr YEUNG sum then requested the Administration to withdraw the proposal and to re-submit it in the form of a 0-0-0 model. SEM said that the Administration could not subscribe to a 0-0-0 model as this would mean that university funding could not be reduced in the event of economic downturn. He nevertheless reiterated that if the healthy state of economy could sustain, the 0-0-0 model was feasible upon the review in mid-2006.

39. The Chairman put FCR(2004-05)43 to the vote. 30 members voted for the proposal, 20 members voted against. The individual results were as follows:

For :

Mr James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP	Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-ye, GBS, JP
Mr Bernard CHAN, JP	Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, SBS, JP
Dr Philip WONG Yu-hong, GBS	Mr WONG Yung-kan, JP
Mr Jasper TSANG Yok-sing, GBS, JP	Mr Howard YOUNG, SBS, JP
Mr LAU Kong-wah, JP	Mr LAU Wong-fat, GBS, JP
Ms Miriam LAU Kin-ye, GBS, JP	Miss CHOY So-yuk
Mr TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP	Mr Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
Ms LI Fung-ying, BBS, JP	Mr Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, JP
Mr Vincent FANG Kang, JP	Mr WONG Kwok-hing, MH
Mr LI Kwok-ying, MH	Dr Joseph LEE Kok-long
Mr Daniel LAM Wai-keung, BBS, JP	Mr Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, SBS, JP
Mr MA Lik, JP	Mr Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, SBS, JP
Dr KWOK Ka-ki	Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP
Mr WONG Ting-kwong, BBS	Mr CHIM Pui-chung
Mr KWONG Chi-kin	Miss TAM Heung-man

(30 members)

Against :

Mr Albert HO Chun-yan
Mr LEE Cheuk-yan
Mr Fred LI Wah-ming, JP
Mr James TO Kun-sun
Mr SIN Chung-kai, JP
Mr LAU Chin-shek, JP
Mr Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, JP
Mr LEE Wing-tat
Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung
Mr TONG Ka-wah, SC
(20 members)

Ir Dr Raymond HO Chung-tai, S.B.St.J., JP
Mr Martin LEE Chu-ming, SC, JP
Ms Margaret NG
Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong
Dr YEUNG Sum
Mr Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
Ms Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
Mr Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Dr Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Mr Albert Jinghan CHENG

40. The Committee approved the proposal.
41. Owing to time constraints, the Chairman agreed to defer FCR(2004-05)44 and 45 to the next meeting scheduled for 4 March 2005.
42. The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Legislative Council Secretariat
20 April 2005