

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(1)1338/07-08
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref: CB1/HS/1/05

**Subcommittee to Study the Transport Needs of and Provision of
Concessionary Public Transport Fares for Persons with Disabilities**

**Minutes of fifteenth meeting on
Tuesday, 11 March 2008, at 2:30 pm
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

- Members present** : Hon LEE Cheuk-yan (Chairman)
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Hon LAU Kong-wah, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
- Member attending** : Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC
- Members absent** : Hon Miriam LAU Kin-ye, GBS, JP
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
- Public Officers attending** : Agenda item II

Mr Matthew CHEUNG Kin-chung, GBS, JP
Secretary for Labour and Welfare

Mr Stephen SUI
Commissioner for Rehabilitation
Labour and Welfare Bureau

Mrs Avia LAI
Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and
Housing (Transport)¹

Miss Nancy LAW, JP
Deputy Director (Administration)
Social Welfare Department

Mrs Cecilia YUEN
Assistant Director (Rehabilitation & Medical Social
Services)
Social Welfare Department

Mr NG Wai-kuen
Chief Social Security Officer (Social Security)²
Social Welfare Department

Mr Don HO
Assistant Commissioner for Transport/
Management and Paratransit
Transport Department

Mr Kenneth MOK
Chief Transport Officer/Planning/Disabled Transport &
Project
Transport Department

Attendance by invitation : Agenda item II
Equal Opportunities Commission

Mr Raymond TANG Yee-bong
Chairperson

Dr Ferrick CHU Chung-man
Head, Policy & Research

Clerk in attendance : Ms Connie SZETO
Chief Council Secretary (1)⁶

Staff in attendance : Ms Sarah YUEN
Senior Council Secretary (1)⁶

Action

Action

I Confirmation of minutes and matters arising

(LC Paper No. CB(1)898/07-08 - Minutes of the meeting held on 15 January 2008)

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 January 2008 were confirmed.

II The provision of concessionary public transport fares for persons with disabilities

Meeting with the Administration

(LC Paper No. CB(1)977/07-08(01) - Administration's paper on transport supplement for a specific group of persons with disabilities

LC Paper No. CB(1)977/07-08(03) - List of follow-up actions prepared by the Secretariat (position as at 5 March 2008))

2. Members noted the submission from Disability Alliance on Concessionary Transport Fare on this agenda item tabled at the meeting.

(*Post-meeting note:* The above submission was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1034/07-08 (01) on 12 March 2008.)

3. At the Chairman's invitation, the Secretary for Labour and Welfare (SLW) briefed members on details of the Administration's proposal (the Proposal) to provide transport supplement to a specific group of persons with disabilities (PwDs). He said that as announced by the Financial Secretary in the 2008-2009 Budget, an additional sum of \$230 million would be allocated annually to provide a monthly transport supplement of \$200 each directly to recipients under the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA) Scheme aged between 12 and 64 with 100% disability and recipients of Disability Allowance (DA) in the same age group. As at September 2007, there were 96 000 PwDs in this identified age group. He explained that the Proposal had the following merits:

- (a) It was the most *practical and flexible* arrangement. As the transport supplement would be paid directly into the recipients' bank accounts, the PwDs concerned were free to decide how to make the best use of the additional supplement to meet their transport needs having regard to individual circumstances. For instance, where necessary, they could choose to take taxi and their carers could also benefit;
- (b) The PwDs concerned might enjoy the benefits *soonest possible*. As the Proposal did not directly involve any other organizations, it could be implemented within a short lead-time after securing funding approval; and

Action

- (c) The additional sum of \$230 million to provide the transport supplement would be *an annual allocation rather than a one-off provision*. The \$200 transport supplement should serve as a good incentive to help encourage PwDs to participate more in activities away from home. As shown by the findings of the survey conducted by the Social Sciences Research Centre of the University of Hong Kong on the travelling characteristics of PwDs (the Survey) in 2006, the weekly expenses on public transport of a PwD would amount to about \$43.8 if half-fare concessions were offered by public transport operators (PTOs). The \$200 transport supplement would more than double the estimated monthly expenses on public transport of a PwD if half-fare concessions were provided to PwDs. The purpose of providing the supplement was to enhance PwDs' contact with and integration into society rather than to subsidize their travelling to work or visiting doctors the expenses of which had already been covered in CSSA or DA. Moreover, in the 2008-2009 financial year the Government would allocate \$22 million to acquire eight new Rehabuses and replace 24 old ones, thereby increasing the number of Rehabuses to 109. Various efforts were also being made to improve Rebus service. In fact, to alleviate PwDs' burden in transport expenses, the Government at present already subsidized up to 80% of the operating costs of the Rebus service, amounting to an annual cost of \$32 million.

4. SLW further said that following consultation with the Subcommittee, the Administration planned to seek the Finance Committee (FC)'s approval for the Proposal at its meeting on 9 May 2008. Subject to FC's approval, the Administration intended to effect payment of the transport supplement with effect from 1 July 2008. He added that alongside with the Proposal, the Administration would continue to encourage PTOs to provide concessionary public transport fare (CPTF) to PwDs in fulfilment of their corporate social responsibilities (CSR).

Meeting with the Equal Opportunities Commission

(LC Paper No. CB(1)977/07-08(02) - Submission on the provision of concessionary public transport fares for persons with disabilities from the Equal Opportunities Commission

LC Paper No. CB(1)977/07-08(04) - Correspondence between Equal Opportunities Commission and the Chief Executive on the provision of concessionary public transport fares for persons with disabilities

Action

- LC Paper No. CB(1)977/07-08(05) - Equal Opportunities Commission's letter dated 20 February 2008 to the Financial Secretary on the provision of concessionary public transport fares for persons with disabilities
- LC Paper No. CB(1)977/07-08(06) - Letter dated 5 March 2008 from the Secretary for Labour and Welfare on behalf of the Financial Secretary to Equal Opportunities Commission)

5. At the Chairman's invitation, Mr Raymond TANG, Chairperson of the Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC), elaborated that while appreciating SLW's efforts in securing the transport supplement to PwDs, EOC was of the view that CPTF for PwDs should be provided under the principle of shared responsibility between the Government and various PTOs in the spirit of CSR, and hoped that the Administration would continue to liaise with PTOs in this regard. In particular, since Government was the majority shareholder of MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL), it should ensure MTRCL would take the lead in providing CPTF to PwDs. The reasons for EOC's stance above were threefold. Firstly, according to the International Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in relation to the human rights of PwDs, measures to address the needs of PwDs, such as the provision of CPTF to PwDs, should be viewed from a human right rather than a welfare service perspective. Secondly, by paying the transport supplement directly into the recipients' bank accounts instead of implementing a CPTF scheme through modification of the Octopus System, PwDs were more likely to use the supplement to meet their other daily living expenses instead of setting it aside for transport needs. The transport supplement might thus not help enhance their integration into the society. Thirdly, as demonstrated from experience of many commercial corporations locally and internationally making substantial investment in CSR, fulfilment of CSR had not conflicted with the requirement to operate according to "prudent commercial principles" nor affected their credit ratings. Moreover, according to section 13 of the Mass Transit Railway Ordinance (Cap. 556), the Chief Executive in Council could give direction to MTRCL in relation to any matter concerning public interests although the Government was liable to pay compensation to MTRCL for loss or damage sustained by MTRCL arising from its compliance with the direction. Thus, the Government should actively consider exercising its ownership rights in MTRCL to provide CPTF to PwDs.

Discussion

6. While showing appreciation for SLW's efforts in effecting the provision of the transport supplement and welcoming the Proposal, members opined that provision of CPTF to PwDs by PTOs should continue to be pursued, so that PTOs could fulfill their CSR. They were also concerned that under the Proposal, PwDs would tend to use the transport supplement for purposes other than travelling. The

Action

objective of introducing the supplement to incentivize PwDs to go out more for social integration might thus be defeated. Moreover, the transport supplement could only make up for the 11% reduction in DA introduced in 2003 and the cumulative inflation rate since then. On the operation of the CPTF scheme, the shared responsibility approach could be easily implemented by modifying the fare collection system currently available in the Octopus System, such as concessionary fares for school children and the elderly. The Survey had already indicated that the provision of CPTF by PTOs could enhance PwDs' social integration without causing financial burden on many PTOs and might even generate additional revenue for some PTOs. Members therefore urged the Administration to continue to actively pursue the provision of CPTF by PTOs, particularly MTRCL, of which Government was the majority shareholder. By doing so, the Government would take the lead in providing CPTF to PwDs and set a good example for other PTOs to follow.

7. In this regard, members also urged the Administration to take parallel action to introduce legislative amendments to the Disability Discrimination Ordinance (Cap. 487) to address the concern of PTOs on possible legal challenge for them to offer CPTF to a selective group of PwDs.

8. SLW clarified that DA as well as CSSA were adjusted in accordance with the movement of the Social Security Assistance Index of Prices and the reduction in 2003 was largely due to deflation at that time. The transport supplement was an additional supplement specially provided to PwDs to encourage their participation in activities away from home and facilitate their integration into the community. It was never meant for making up for the reduction of DA and CSSA in 2003. Subject to members' support, he would take forward the Proposal as soon as possible. Meanwhile, he would defer to the Transport and Housing Bureau on action to follow up with MTRCL in providing CPTF to PwDs in fulfilment of its CSR.

Motion

9. To ensure the Administration would continue discussion with PTOs, particularly MTRCL, on the provision of CPTF to PwDs in the spirit of CSR, Dr Fernando CHEUNG moved the following motion:

"鑒於政府建議以每月增加\$200傷殘津貼為提供予傷殘人士交通優惠之措施未臻完善；本委員會認為政府有責任繼續與公共交通營辦商商討以企業社會責任之精神，向傷殘人士提供半費優惠；本會促請政府立即展開與港鐵公司商量有關安排，並於兩個月內向本委員會匯報有關進展。"

Action

(Translation)

"That since the Government's proposal to provide an extra monthly \$200 disability allowance to persons with disabilities (PwDs) as transport supplement still leaves room for improvement, this Subcommittee considers that the Government has the responsibility to continue discussion with public transport operators on the provision of half-fare concession for PwDs in the spirit of corporate social responsibility; this Subcommittee urges the Government to immediately start discussion with MTR Corporation Limited on the relevant arrangements and report the progress to this Subcommittee in two months."

10. The Subcommittee agreed to proceed with the motion and put it to vote. Of the members present, three voted for the motion. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

(Post-meeting note: The wording of the motion was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(1)1042/07-08(01) on 12 March 2008.)

Admin 11. The Administration was requested to follow up on the above passed motion and provide concrete response when the Subcommittee re-visited the subject.

Meeting arrangements

12. The Subcommittee noted that a meeting to re-visit the subject of introducing a new mode of accessible public transport service for PwDs had already been scheduled for Tuesday, 29 April 2008, at 4:30 pm. Deputations which had attended the Subcommittee meeting when this subject was last discussed on 24 July 2007 would be invited to attend the 29 April meeting.

13. As to the meeting to re-visit the subject of the provision of CPTF for PwDs, members agreed that the relevant meeting date, preferably in late May 2008, should be worked out in consultation with the Administration. They also agreed that the Secretary for Transport and Housing and representatives from MTRCL be invited to attend the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: The meeting was subsequently scheduled for Thursday, 22 May 2008, at 8:30 am.)

III Any other business

14. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:15 pm.

**Proceedings of the fifteenth meeting of
the Subcommittee to Study the Transport Needs of and Provision of
Concessionary Public Transport Fares for Persons with Disabilities
on Tuesday, 11 March 2008, at 2:30 pm
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
Agenda Item I – Confirmation of minutes and matters arising			
000000 – 000101	Chairman	(a) Opening remarks by the Chairman (b) Confirmation of minutes of the meeting held on 15 January 2008 (LC Paper No. CB(1)898/07-08)	
Agenda Item II – The provision of concessionary public transport fares for persons with disabilities			
<i>Meeting with the Administration and the Equal Opportunities Commission</i>			
000102 – 001207	Chairman Administration	Briefing by the Administration on the proposal (the Proposal) to provide transport supplement to a specific group of persons with disabilities (PwDs) (LC Paper No. CB(1)977/07-08(01))	
001208 – 001856	Chairman Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC)	Presentation of views by EOC (LC Paper No. CB(1)977/07-08(02))	
<i>Discussion</i>			
001857 – 002806	Chairman Mr WONG Kwok-hing Administration	(a) Mr WONG Kwok-hing's concerns and views as follows: (i) The Administration should clarify whether the \$200 transport supplement was to serve as an additional supplement or, as claimed by the Disability Alliance on Concessionary Transport Fare (the Alliance) in its submission tabled at the meeting, to only make up for the 11% reduction in the Disability Allowance (DA) introduced in 2003 (the 2003 reduction) and the cumulative inflation rate since then (ii) The Government should ensure MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) would take the lead in providing concessionary public transport fare (CPTF) to PwDs in fulfillment of its corporate social responsibility (CSR) (b) The Administration's responses as follows: (i) DA as well as the Comprehensive	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>Social Security Assistance (CSSA) were adjusted in accordance with the movement of the Social Security Assistance Index of Prices (the Index), and the reduction in 2003 was largely due to deflation at that time. The transport supplement was an "additional" supplement specially provided to PwDs to encourage their participation in activities away from home and facilitate their integration into the community. It was never meant for making up for the reduction of DA and CSSA in 2003. The transport supplement would be recurrent in nature and provided on top of the current rate of DA and CSSA, and would be adjusted according to the movement of the Index. The provision of transport supplement was the most flexible arrangement as PwDs were free to decide how to make the best use of the money to meet their different transport needs</p> <p>(ii) The Government would continue to encourage public transport operators (PTOs) to provide CPTF to PwDs taking into account their operating conditions. The Administration had in the past year liaised closely with the PTOs to encourage them to consider the provision of CPTF to PwDs and reported their stances to the Subcommittee at its meeting held on 9 October 2007, at which representatives of PTOs also attended</p> <p>(iii) Since MTRCL had to operate according to prudent commercial principles, the Administration could only encourage it to provide CPTF to PwDs and the decision had to be made by its Managing Board</p>	
002807 – 003817	Chairman Dr Fernando CHEUNG Administration	<p>(a) Dr Fernando CHEUNG's concerns and views as follows:</p> <p>(i) While the transport supplement was a welcome breakthrough, PTOs should be involved in the provision of CPTF to PwDs in the fulfillment of their CSR. The CPTF scheme should be implemented through modification of the Octopus System (the Octopus</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>option) instead of providing the supplement from the welfare policy perspective, which might affect Government funding for other welfare services. Moreover, PTOs were willing to provide administrative support for the Octopus option. The Survey had also indicated that CPTF could enhance PwDs' social integration and would bring additional revenue to certain PTOs, particularly MTRCL</p> <p>(ii) The transport supplement could only make up for the shortfall in DA resulting from the 2003 reduction</p> <p>(b) The Administration's responses as follows:</p> <p>(i) Provision of the transport supplement was a big step forward towards enhancing PwDs' integration into society and was achieved after a lot of hard work</p> <p>(ii) The transport supplement was an additional supplement and was never meant for making up for the reduction of DA in 2003. It would be funded by new resources allocated to the Labour and Welfare Bureau, and hence its provision would not affect Government funding for other welfare services</p> <p>(iii) Under the Octopus option, the transport expenses incurred by carers of PwDs would not be covered. On the other hand, the transport supplement could provide flexibility to PwDs who could use the money to take taxi together with their carers as necessary. Moreover, while most PTOs had indicated willingness to bear the basic administrative cost of the Octopus option, none of them had agreed to bear the daily operating costs and capital expenses involved. Implementation of the Octopus option might therefore incur higher cost, and take up a significant portion of the additional allocation, thus reducing the additional allocations directly used to benefit PwDs. On the other hand, as payments of the transport supplement were to be effected through the existing CSSA and Social Security Allowance payment</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		system, the daily administrative costs could be reduced to the minimum	
003818 – 004934	Chairman Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung Administration	<p>(a) Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung's concerns and views as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The transport supplement could only make up for the shortfall in DA resulting from the 2003 reduction (ii) The amount of the transport supplement should not be worked out on the basis of the findings of the Survey because the PwDs surveyed were only responding to hypothetical questions relating to travelling behaviour and expenditure under possible fare concessions. Should there be real concessions, the increase in PwDs' travelling expenditure might be much greater than estimated (iii) The purpose of many PwDs' trips was to help other PwDs adapt to disability. Since these PwDs were in fact helping the Government in providing rehabilitation services, more travelling subsidies should be provided to them (iv) The Administration should devise better strategies and tactics to urge PTOs to provide CPTF to PwDs in fulfilment of their CSR <p>(b) The Chairman's view that as MTRCL's majority shareholder, the Government could ensure MTRCL would take the lead in providing CPTF to PwDs through exercising its ownership rights in the company</p> <p>(c) The Administration's responses as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The transport supplement was an additional supplement and was in no way provided to make up for the 2003 reduction. The two should never be mixed up (ii) PwDs would be subsidized in taking part in voluntary work either under the Octopus or the transport supplement option (iii) The Administration would continue to pursue a two-pronged approach in 	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>meeting the aspiration of PwDs on the provision of CPTF. The transport supplement was a hard-achieved breakthrough and should be taken forward first to provide timely and practical assistance to PwDs without further delay. Meanwhile, the Administration would in parallel continue to encourage PTOs to provide CPTF to PwDs having regard to their operating conditions</p>	
<p>004935 – 010129</p>	<p>Chairman Mr Ronny TONG Administration</p>	<p>(a) Mr Ronny TONG's concerns and views as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The Administration's talk of further delaying the transport supplement was undesirable and would not help in working out the best option for providing transport subsidy to PwDs in meeting their aspiration as reflected in the submission from the Alliance tabled at the meeting (ii) It was only natural that most PwDs would use the transport supplement for purposes other than travelling if the present DA level was inadequate. The objective of introducing the supplement to incentivize PwDs to go out more for social integration might thus be defeated (iii) Since according to the Survey, provision of CPTF to PwDs would bring additional revenue to certain PTOs and, even if Government had to fund deficits that might be so incurred, the resources required would not be substantial, the Administration should actively pursue the Octopus option which the Subcommittee and PwDs had long requested, and provide specific details on the implementation plan concerned. If not, the Administration should explain why it was so hesitant in pursuing the Octopus option (iv) The Administration had to devise appropriate strategies and timetable in pursuing the provision of CPTF to PwDs by PTOs <p>(b) The Administration's responses as follows:</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>(i) The Administration had all along been closely liaising with the PwD groups in the Alliance. While the Administration agreed with these groups and EOC on the need to involve PTOs in providing CPTF to PwDs, the transport supplement was a major breakthrough and was a more practical option to meet the transport needs of PwDs. The Proposal should be taken forward first so that PwDs might enjoy the benefits soonest possible.</p> <p>(ii) The Government had been liaising closely with MTRCL to encourage it to consider the provision of fare concessions to PwDs, and MTRCL had indicated clearly its stance on this issue</p>	
010130 – 011137	Chairman Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung Administration	<p>(a) Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung's concerns and views as follows:</p> <p>(i) The provision of \$230 million for providing the transport supplement as a make-shift arrangement should instead be allocated for implementing MTRCL's option, so that PTOs could fulfill their CSR and PwDs could enjoy early and effective transport benefits</p> <p>(ii) Apart from taking the lead in providing CPTF to PwDs through exercising its ownership rights in MTRCL, the Government should also include specific provisions in the relevant franchise agreements requiring PTOs to provide CPTF to PwDs. This was because many PTOs were in fact enjoying subsidy from the Government in terms of either land resources or direct funding</p> <p>(iii) The Administration's talk of further delaying the transport supplement was undesirable because provision of CPTF to PwDs should be regarded as a right of PwDs according to the relevant international covenant</p> <p>(iv) The transport supplement could only make up for the shortfall in DA resulting from the 2003 reduction. If downward adjustment had to be made when there was deflation as the</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>Administration had explained, DA should also be adjusted upwards when there was inflation</p> <p>(b) The Administration's view that the transport supplement option could be taken forward early if supported by members. Meanwhile, the Administration would continue to appeal to PTOs to provide CPTF to PwDs</p>	
<p>011138 – 011852</p>	<p>Chairman Mr Ronny TONG Administration</p>	<p>(a) Chairman's concerns and views as follows:</p> <p>(i) It was illogical to confine the recipients of the transport supplement to those aged between 12 and 64 on the reason that key PTOs were already offering fare concessions to children aged 11 or below and senior citizens aged 65 or above. Under the Proposal, PwDs not within the above age group could not enjoy fare concessions when taking other modes of transport which did not offer fare concessions to the above group of persons. The confinement would only complicate the operation of the transport supplement option</p> <p>(ii) As the Subcommittee would need to report its work to the House Committee before the current LegCo term ended in July 2008, the Administration should report on the result of discussion with PTOs on the provision of CPTF to PwDs within two months</p> <p>(b) The Administration's responses as follows:</p> <p>(i) As PTOs were offering fare concessions to the two categories of PwDs not covered in the Proposal, they should already have sufficient incentive to go out more</p> <p>(ii) While the Administration would continue to make active efforts to encourage and discuss with PTOs in pursuing the provision of CPTF to PwDs by PTOs, more time would be needed for making any real progress in this regard</p> <p>(c) Mr Ronny TONG's view that there was a need to pursue the provision of CPTF to PwDs by PTOs. He and the Chairman also agreed that the Government should</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>concentrate its efforts on pursuing the matter with MTRCL through exercising its influence in MTRCL's Board to ensure the company would take the lead in providing CPTF to PwDs. MTRCL and the Administration should also be invited to a meeting of the Subcommittee to be scheduled for late May 2008 to discuss progress in this regard</p>	
<p>011853 – 012437</p>	<p>Chairman Dr Fernando CHEUNG Administration</p>	<p>(a) Dr Fernando CHEUNG's indication of intention to move a motion and expression of concerns and views as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The Administration's great efforts made in securing the provision of the transport supplement should be recognized and appreciated. The transport supplement was a breakthrough in consideration of Government's earlier negative stance (ii) In the light of the findings of the Survey, there was a strong case for PTOs, particularly MTRCL, to offer CPTF to PwDs as this would bring additional revenue to PTOs. The Administration should work out concrete plans and timetable in pursuing the matter (iii) It was regretful that no progress had been made in amending the Disability Discrimination Ordinance (Cap. 487) (DDO) as previously proposed by EOC in order to address PTOs' concern about possible legal challenge they could face if CPTF was offered to a selective group of PwDs, despite the Administration's undertaking to do so two years before <p>(b) The Administration's response that as transport supplement would be provided by Government under the existing CSSA and DA mechanism, there was no need to amend DDO for implementation of the Proposal. The Administration would consider amendment to DDO when there was a need to do so</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
012438 – 012854	Chairman Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung Administration Mr WONG Kwok-hing	<p>(a) Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung's concerns and views as follows:</p> <p>(i) While members appreciated the Administration's efforts in securing the transport supplement, the Proposal was not a fare concession scheme which PwD groups and the Subcommittee had been pursuing. As such, the Administration should keep up the momentum to urge PTOs to provide CPTF to PwDs, and proceed with the amendment of DDO</p> <p>(ii) Since according to the Survey, implementation of a CPTF scheme would bring MTRCL additional revenue, the Administration should focus on ensuring MTRCL would take the lead in providing concessionary fares to PwDs through exercising its ownership rights in the company, and work out with MTRCL the relevant implementation details</p> <p>(b) The Chairman and Mr WONG Kwok-hing echoed Mr LEUNG's views above, and called upon the Administration to report back on the progress in two months</p> <p>(c) The Administration's undertaking to carefully examine members' views above</p>	The Administration to take follow-up actions as requested in paragraphs 7 and 11 of the minutes
012855 – 013615	Chairman Mr WONG Kwok-hing Administration EOC	<p>(a) The Administration and the Chairman's explanation in response to Mr WONG Kwok-hing that the Subcommittee had agreed at its meeting on 16 February 2006 with the disabled community on the approach of offering CPTF to recipients of DA or CSSA with 100% loss of earning capacity in the first instance in consideration of a number of factors including the need to address PTOs' concern about the significant financial implications</p> <p>(b) The Chairman's and Mr WONG's view that since the transport supplement would be provided by the Government and not by PTOs, consideration should be given to expanding the scope to all PwDs regardless of their degree of disability</p>	

Time marker	Speaker	Subject(s)	Action required
		<p>(c) The Administration's explanation that priority should be given to helping those PwDs most in need in order to ensure the effective use of public resources</p> <p>(d) EOC's view that if the scope of the transport supplement was to be limited to selected groups of PwDs, the legal issues involved would need to be examined and amendment to DDO might be necessary</p>	
013616 – 014132	Chairman Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung	Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung's view that members should not be contented with the provision of the transport supplement, and that as a world city Hong Kong should not procrastinate the provision of CPTF to PwDs by PTOs	
014133 – 014509	Chairman Dr Fernando CHEUNG Mr WONG Kwok-hing	Voting on the motion moved by Dr Fernando CHEUNG	
Agenda Item III – Any other business			
014510 – 014615	Chairman	Meeting arrangements	