

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. FC18/08-09
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/1/2

Finance Committee of the Legislative Council

**Minutes of the 28th meeting
held at the Legislative Council Chamber
on Friday, 18 July 2008, at 1:15 pm**

Members present:

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

Hon LI Fung-ying, BBS, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Dr Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, JP
Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, SBS, JP
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, SBS, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, BBS
Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC
Hon CHIM Pui-chung
Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP
Hon KWONG Chi-kin
Hon TAM Heung-man
Hon Mrs Anson CHAN, GBM, JP

Members absent:

Dr Hon David LI Kwok-po, GBM, GBS, JP
Dr Hon LUI Ming-wah, SBS, JP
Hon Margaret NG
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Hon WONG Yung-kan, SBS, JP
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, SBS, JP
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP
Hon LI Kwok-ying, MH, JP
Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, SBS, JP
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon Albert Jinghan CHENG, JP

Public officers attending:

Professor K C CHAN, SBS, JP

Mr Stanley YING, JP

Miss Amy TSE, JP

Secretary for Financial Services and the
Treasury

Permanent Secretary for Financial
Services and the Treasury (Treasury)

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)
Mr Henry TANG Ying-yen GBS, JP	Chief Secretary for Administration
Mr Michael SUEN Ming-yeung, GBS, JP	Secretary for Education
Mr Matthew CHEUNG Kin-chung, GBS, JP	Secretary for Labour and Welfare
Miss Mary CHOW Shuk-ching, JP	Acting Permanent Secretary for Transport and Housing (Housing)
Ms Carol YIP, JP	Deputy Secretary for Labour and Welfare (Welfare) ²
Mr LI Wing	Controller, Student Financial Assistance Agency

Clerk in attendance:

Mrs Constance LI Assistant Secretary General 1

Staff in attendance:

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

Action

Item No. 2 - FCR(2008-09)41

HEAD 170 – SOCIAL WELFARE DEPARTMENT

- ♦ Subhead 179 Comprehensive social security assistance scheme
- ♦ Subhead 180 Social security allowance scheme

HEAD 62 – HOUSING DEPARTMENT

- ♦ Subhead 700 General non-recurrent
- Item 883 Rent payment for public housing tenants**

**HEAD 147 – GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT : FINANCIAL SERVICES AND
THE TREASURY BUREAU (THE TREASURY BRANCH)**

- ♦ Subhead 700 General non-recurrent
- Item 881 Electricity charges subsidy for eligible residential accounts**

HEAD 173 – STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AGENCY

- ♦ Subhead 700 General non-recurrent
- New item “One-off support grant for needy students”**

Members continued the discussion on FCR(2008-09)41 regarding the package of relief measures proposed by the Administration to reduce the burden on domestic households under the increasing inflationary pressure.

Suspension of the Employee Retraining Levy

2. Ms Emily LAU noted that employers of foreign domestic helpers (FDHs) were unclear about the proposed suspension of the Employee Retraining Levy (the levy). Some of them were considering terminating the contracts of their existing FDHs and rehiring another one when the suspension came into force. She considered it necessary for the Administration to clearly explain the proposal, and to provide a hotline to answer public enquiries on the suspension. The Secretary for Labour and Welfare (SLW) said that the proposed suspension would be implemented from 1 September 2008. For all employment contracts with visas for the FDHs concerned granted by the Immigration Department between 1 September 2008 and 31 August 2010, employers would be eligible for the proposed suspension and would not be required to pay the levy for the entire two-year contract period. The implementation details of the proposed suspension would be publicized once these were worked out. He called upon employers not to terminate the contracts of their existing FDHs as this would incur additional cost, such as air tickets and one month's salary in lieu of notice for their FDHs as well as administrative cost for hiring a new helper, let alone the waiting time of at least one month for the new helper to arrive.

3. Noting that the proposed suspension of the levy would only apply to contracts with visas granted on or after 1 September 2008, Mr LEE Wing-tat expressed concern that employers who had just entered into contracts with their FDHs could not benefit from the suspension until the expiry of the existing two-year contracts. Given that most FDH contracts were usually signed during the summer months when FDHs took their annual leave, he considered it most desirable to advance the effective date for the suspension to 1 August 2008. In this way, more employers would be able to benefit immediately from the suspension. The Immigration Department should also assist employers who wished to advance the renewal of contracts with their existing FDHs for optimizing their benefit under the scheme. As the suspension of levy was part of the measures to provide immediate relief to ease inflationary pressure, Mr Ronnie TONG said that he could not see why some employers had to wait for two years in order to benefit from the suspension of levy. He supported that the suspension should apply to all FDH contracts as from 1 September 2008.

4. The Chief Secretary for Administration (CS) said that there were legislative constraints in suspending the levy across the board for all FDH contracts. SLW advised that for FDH contracts expiring after 1 September 2008, the employers concerned would be able to benefit from the suspension upon renewal of the FDH contracts. Given that there were about 250 000 FDHs and 230 000 FDH employers in Hong Kong, a lot of work, including amendment to Schedule 3 to the Employees Retraining Ordinance (Cap. 423) (ERO), would have to be done to effect the suspension of the levy for a period of two years. The Chief Executive-in-Council (CE-in-Council) would also need to give approval for the suspension before gazettal

of the proposed legislation. Sufficient time for processing was required and hence, the effective date for the suspension was set on 1 September 2008. Nevertheless, he would look into the feasibility of advancing the effective date for the suspension taking into account the fact that changes in FDH employment usually took place during the summer months. Mr Albert CHAN commented that the Government was trying to avoid amending ERO on grounds of administrative difficulties. The belated suspension would cause much inconvenience to employers, some of whom might defer the arrival of their FDHs in order to benefit from the suspension.

5. Mr CHAN Kam-lam held the view that FDH employers should be allowed to immediately benefit from the suspension, since the objective was to reduce the burden of domestic households. To this end, the Administration should exercise flexibility in applying the suspension, so that FDH employers would not need to wait for the renewal of contract in order to benefit from the suspension. Consideration should also be given to refunding the levy to those employers who had already paid the levy. Mr James TIEN shared similar views.

6. CS explained that ERO did not provide for any refund of levy. Moreover, there would be complications in the proposed refund arrangements as some employers had paid the levy of \$9,600 in full for the entire two-year contract period while others by four instalments of \$2,400 each. SLW added that refund of levy was not possible at the present stage as this was not allowed under ERO. He pointed out that section 15(1) of ERO required FDH employers to pay the levy to the Director of Immigration, while section 15(2) clearly stipulated that the levy should not be repaid or refunded to the employer. The said arrangement had been in force for years. Legislative amendments to ERO would be required if refund was to be introduced, and there would also be administrative difficulties in arranging for the refund. Even if refund were allowed, it would take a much longer lead time for implementation and would unlikely have retrospective effect. Notwithstanding this, the Administration took note of member's views on the proposal. Mr CHAN Kam-lam supported a more proactive approach in this respect and that legislative amendments for the refund of the levy should be considered if necessary. Mr James TIEN said that members would support amendments to ERO to allow for refund of the levy. While agreeing that there was need to expedite amendments to ERO, Ms Emily LAU cautioned that such amendments should be carefully scrutinized.

7. Given the need for timely provision of relief measures, Ms Miriam LAU urged the Administration to expedite the necessary legislative process for the introduction of the suspension of levy. She however pointed out that the suspension would not serve the purpose of easing the inflationary pressure currently faced by some FDH employers if this could only be made available in two years' time, because their need for hiring FDHs might no longer exist by then. In line with the spirit for suspension of levy for FDH contracts with visas granted on or after 1 September 2008, consideration should be given to waiving the next instalment(s) of levy for employers of existing FDH contracts. For employers who had already paid the \$9,600 levy in full, they would enjoy the waiver upon renewal of the contract. CS responded that Ms LAU's suggestion would still be unfair to those employers who had paid the levy

in full but would not hire FDHs upon completion of the current contracts.

8. While acknowledging that the Government would need time to fine-tune the arrangements for the suspension, Mr LAU Kong-wah hoped that efforts would be made to expedite the legislative process such that the effective date for the suspension could be advanced to 1 August 2008. To allow equal treatment for employers who had signed FDH contracts before 1 September 2008 and those who had paid the full levy of \$9,600 for their new contracts, he urged the Administration to consider extending the suspension to all FDH employers, including those whose FDH contracts were not due for renewal. He stated that the proposed arrangement would have the full support of members in the legislative process. SLW said that he would liaise with the Immigration Department on the feasibility of advancing the effective date for the suspension as far as practicable. The Administration would disseminate information on any further developments on the suspension of levy for the benefit of the public.

9. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan commented that the proposed package of relief measures was short term in nature without longer term planning or commitment for the benefit of the community. He considered that the levy should be ceased rather than suspended, particularly when the Government had sufficient resources to provide employees retraining without income from the levy. Mr LAU Chin-shek shared similar concerns. CS pointed out that the levy was meant to provide a stable source of funding for employees retraining, which was essential in maintaining the competitiveness of Hong Kong. Given that sufficient funding had been accumulated for the purpose, a temporary suspension of the levy as proposed was considered feasible.

10. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung said that the legislative provisions relating to the levy should be repealed. He did not support that the levy collected from FDH employers should be used for retraining local workers. He agreed with other members that funding for retraining employees should come from government resources and not from the levy. He also considered that the minimum salary for FDHs should also be increased. Expressing similar concern, Mr Ronnie TONG recalled that the levy was first introduced by way of an executive order not subject to the scrutiny of the Legislative Council (LegCo). He considered that the CE-in-Council could by order repeal the levy without requiring LegCo's comment. He therefore failed to see the difficulties involved in repealing the levy. CS clarified that the Employees Retraining Levy applied to employers of all imported workers and not only to those who hired FDHs. SLW added that whether the levy should be repealed would remain a policy consideration.

Two rent-free months for eligible Hong Kong Housing Authority and Hong Kong Housing Society tenants/licensees

11. Ms Emily LAU considered that apart from low-income families living in rental units of the Housing Authority (HA) and Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS), the two rent-free months should also apply to HA tenants paying additional rent and

tenants of HKHS Group B estates. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr LEE Cheuk-yan, Miss CHOY So-yuk, Mr LEE Wing-tat and Miss CHAN Yuen-han shared similar views. The Acting Permanent Secretary for Transport and Housing (Housing) (PSTH(H)) said that the rent payment proposal was meant for lower income families living in HA/HKHS rental units. Hence, it would not apply to HA tenants paying additional rent (whose income levels exceeded at least two times the HA Waiting List Income Limits), and tenants of HKHS Group B estates (whose income level was higher than the other HKHS estates and HA estates). Tenants paying additional rent would benefit from other relief measures, such as electricity charges subsidy and rent reduction arising from the rates concession. Given that the income limits for Elderly Persons' Flats were lower than those for rental flats of HKHS Group B estates, it was considered appropriate to apply the rent payment proposal to some 300 Elderly Persons' Flats located in the HKHS Group B estates.

12. Mr CHAN Kam-lam was disappointed that the two rent-free months would not apply to tenants paying additional rent. He pointed out that these tenants were in fact not well-off as their incomes were only two times more than the income limits which were rather low. He opined that there should be greater flexibility in implementing the rent payment proposal which should also apply to those tenants whose incomes had just exceeded the income limits because of recent salary increase or their children had just entered the job market. He suggested that those tenants who were paying additional rent should also be eligible for the two rent-free months based on the regular monthly rental. Mr LAU Kong-wah pointed out that these tenants had been excluded from the rent payment proposals introduced earlier. Although the Administration had previously agreed to review the situation, no further action had been taken so far. He requested that on this occasion, special consideration should be given to this group of tenants. CS thanked members for their views.

One-off grant for needy students

13. While supporting the proposed provision of a one-off grant of \$1,000 for needy students to meet education-related expenses in the coming school year, Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong expressed concern about the high price of school textbooks, which had increased by 10% over the last year, and the long list of textbooks to be procured, which amounted to a few thousand dollars. As the increase in textbook cost was usually attributed to unnecessary addition of pages and pictures, he considered it necessary to put in place a mechanism for price control on textbooks. Schools should also be encouraged to re-use some textbooks, in particular atlases. The Secretary for Education explained that the one-off grant was meant to alleviate the financial burden of needy students to meet their education-related expenses in the coming school year, and not only for the purchase of textbooks. The Administration was aware of the concern about high textbook cost, and would set up a working group whose membership would include LegCo Members to explore the feasibility of using electronic textbooks. Ms Miriam LAU emphasized the need for the timely provision of the one-off grant to tie in with the commencement of school year.

14. Ms Audrey EU said that students studying overseas did not have to procure textbooks because the schools would provide them with used textbooks. She could not understand why such practice could not be applied in Hong Kong. CS said that some schools in Hong Kong also provided used textbooks for their students.

Electricity charges subsidy

15. Ms Audrey EU expressed reservation on the proposed electricity charges subsidy, which would be provided to all residential electricity account holders irrespective of their affordability. She pointed that needy families living in bedspace apartments and cubicles might not be able to benefit from the subsidy if they did not have their own individual electricity accounts. The proposal also ran contrary to energy conservation as this would encourage consumption of more electricity. She therefore did not consider that the subsidy, which was applicable to both the rich and the poor alike, was an effective relief measure for needy families. CS said that the electricity charges subsidy would not encourage electricity consumption as any unused amount could be carried forward to cover electricity charges under the same account until 31 August 2014. The Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury added that the electricity charges subsidy scheme would be able to cover a substantial number of households in Hong Kong.

Transport subsidy for the physically disabled and medical subsidy for the elderly

16. Ms Emily LAU said that there was a need to provide transport subsidy for the physically disabled and the elderly. SLW advised that as set out in the 2008-2009 Budget, an additional supplement of \$200 a month had been provided to Disability Allowance recipients aged between 12 and 64 and Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA) recipients in the same age group with 100% disability, in an attempt to encourage persons with disabilities (PWDs) to participate more in activities away from home. He added that members' request for provision of concessionary public transport fares for PWDs had been reflected to the bus and rail companies.

17. Mr LAU Chin-shek opined that the transport subsidies should not be confined to low-income earners in the four districts, but should be extended to cover all low-income earners. CS said that the Pilot Transport Support Scheme was meant to encourage the unemployed and low-income employees living in remote areas, i.e. Tuen Mun, Yuen Long, the North District and outlying islands to seek employment across districts.

Old Age Allowance

18. Miss CHOY So-yuk reiterated her request for relaxing the permissible absence limit related to the Old Age Allowance (OAA). SLW said that the feasibility of relaxing the permissible absence limit would be covered in the review of OAA, which was expected to be completed by the end of the year.

Freeze on Government fees and charges

19. Miss CHOY So-yuk enquired whether consideration could be given to freezing the rental for wholesale markets as a measure to reduce inflationary pressure. CS said that the Government would freeze the level of fees and charges affecting people's livelihood. The fee increases that had already been approved would continue to apply.

20. Ms Miriam LAU said that the Government should provide a list of fees and charges which would affect peoples' livelihood. She agreed that rentals of market stalls should be frozen as any rental increase would have impact on costs, which would invariably be transferred to consumers. She considered that fees and charges of certain services provided by the Government not affecting people's livelihood should also be frozen, as any increase in such charges would also add to the inflation. The Permanent Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) said that it was not possible to provide a list of fees and charges that would be considered to be affecting people's livelihood, because individual fees and charges had different timetables for review. What would happen was that when reviewing each fee or charge, the Administration would take into account factors such as the cost of providing the service. Under the new initiative, the review would also examine if an increase in the fee or charge would affect people's livelihood. An increase in fee or charge that which would affect general prices would be regarded as having inflationary pressure.

Other relief measures

21. Ms Emily LAU enquired if the Consumer Council would be tasked with the responsibility of assessing the prices of food and household items. She also enquired if the Mass Transit Railway Corporation (MTRC) was prepared to provide half-fares for students, and whether a food bank would be set up. The Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) 1 said that an additional funding of \$5 million per year would be provided to the Consumer Council for conducting price surveillance, the implementation details of which were being worked out. As regards the proposed half-fares for students, CS said that this was being considered by MTRC and was expected to be introduced by October 2008. SLW advised that the provision of food assistance was being considered, and funding approval would be sought from the Finance Committee in the next legislative session after consultation with the Panel on Welfare Services. In response to Miss CHAN Yuen-han's enquiry, SLW said that the Administration had been working closely with the Hong Kong Council of Social Services on the provision of food assistance, and the means to identify the needy families. Meanwhile, the Social Welfare Department had established partnership with St. James Settlement in expanding the network of the latter's food bank to those in need.

Measures to assist those who could not benefit from any of the relief measures

22. While welcoming the package of relief measures, Miss CHOY So-yuk shared the concern that there would be certain people, such as fishermen, who could not benefit from these measures. Mr LAU Kong-wah echoed that fishermen were not able to enjoy the electricity subsidies, rental payments or rates reduction. He enquired whether consideration could be given to providing more assistance to the fishermen during the annual two-month fishing moratorium. CS responded that the Administration was well aware of the financial difficulties faced by fishermen amid rising fuel costs. Therefore, in assessing their eligibility for CSSA, the value of their fishing vessels was disregarded under the asset test during the two-month fishing moratorium in 2008.

23. Mr LAU Chin-shek pointed out that low-income earners who did not fall within the safety net provided by the Administration could not benefit from the package of relief measures. Sharing similar concern, Mr Albert CHAN said that the working poor who were not living in public rental housing or employing FDHs would not be able to benefit from the relief measures, except for the electricity charges subsidy. Mr Ronnie TONG was disappointed that the Government did not have any idea about how to identify and provide the working poor with the necessary assistance. He requested the Administration to undertake that assistance would be provided to low-income earners. CS responded that efforts would be made to identify and assist those people who did not fall within the safety net but required assistance.

24. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan said that despite the package of relief measures, there would still be resentment from the community because all the measures were on a short-term basis without any commitment in the longer term. He also expressed concern that some people could not benefit from any of the proposed relief measures. While the Pilot Transport Support Scheme was one step in the right direction, it was confined to only four districts. He suggested that a safety net or a subsidy should be provided for low-income workers who could not benefit from the package of relief measures. For example, those unemployed or earning less than \$6,500 per month but were not receiving CSSA would be offered a subsidy of \$600 per month. CS said that he could not agree to Mr LEE's suggestion of providing a subsidy for low-income earners as it should be the responsibility of employers rather than the Government to provide reasonable pay to their employees.

25. Ms Audrey EU shared the concern that the package of relief measures was only short-term and longer-term measures were necessary to assist the needy families. She supported the re-establishment of the Commission on Poverty to review the recommendations of the LegCo Subcommittee to Study the Subject of Combating Poverty. CS responded that the Administration attached great importance to measures to combat poverty, and SLW was assigned the responsibility to address the problems relating to poverty. Many government policies were formulated to assist the disadvantaged groups and needy families. SLW advised that following the conclusion of work of the former Commission on Poverty (CoP), the Task Force on Poverty (Task Force) had been set up to study problems relating to poverty and

monitor the progress of implementing the CoP recommendations. Some of the CoP recommendations had already been implemented, for example the Child Development Fund was established to provide children from a disadvantaged background with more personal development opportunities. The progress report on the implementation of the former CoP recommendations would be made available in due course for public information.

26. Dr Fernando CHEUNG agreed that more long-term measures should be worked out to assist the disadvantaged groups. He hoped that before the next Policy Address, the Administration would set up fora to invite views from welfare organizations and concerned groups on the formulation of policies to assist the needy. These would include, among others, improvements to the CSSA Scheme, retirement schemes for the elderly, financial assistance to needy students, and creation of employment opportunities for the unemployed.

27. Mr Alan LEONG noted that there were many queries on the package of relief measures, which revealed that these measures were not well thought out. Nevertheless, he said that he had no choice but to support these measures which would provide some relief to the needy under the increasing inflationary pressure.

28. Mr WONG Kwok-hing stressed the need for more long-term relief measures to ease inflationary pressure faced by needy families. He hoped that more comprehensive measures would be introduced in the forthcoming Policy Address. CS said that the Chief Executive would consult all sectors of the community when formulating the next Policy Address.

29. Ir Dr Raymond HO said that Members belonging to the Alliance supported the funding proposal to implement the package of relief measures.

30. The Chairman put FCR(2008-09)41 to the vote. 39 members voted for the proposal. The individual results were as follows:

For :

Mr James TIEN Pei-chun	Mr Albert HO Chun-yan
Ir Dr Raymond HO Chung-tai	Mr LEE Cheuk-yan
Mr Martin LEE Chu-ming	Mr Fred LI Wah-ming
Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong	Miss CHAN Yuen-han
Mr Bernard CHAN	Mr CHAN Kam-lam
Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun	Mr SIN Chung-kai
Dr Philip WONG Yu-hong	Mr Jasper TSANG Yok-sing
Mr Howard YOUNG	Dr YEUNG Sum
Mr LAU Kong-wah	Mr LAU Wong-fat
Ms Miriam LAU Kin-ye	Ms Emily LAU Wai-hing
Miss CHOY So-yuk	Mr Timothy FOK Tsun-ting
Ms LI Fung-ying	Mr Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Ms Audrey EU Yuet-mee	Mr Vincent FANG Kang
Mr WONG Kwok-hing	Mr LEE Wing-tat

Dr Joseph LEE Kok-long
Mr Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung
Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung
Mr WONG Ting-kwong
Prof Patrick LAU Sau-shing
Miss TAM Heung-man
(39 members)

Mr Daniel LAM Wai-keung
Mr Alan LEONG Kah-kit
Dr Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Mr Ronny TONG Ka-wah
Mr KWONG Chi-kin

31. The Committee approved the proposal.
32. As this was the last Finance Committee meeting in the current legislative session, the Chairman thanked members, the Administration and the LegCo Secretariat for their cooperation and support in the past year.
33. The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 pm.

Legislative Council Secretariat
28 October 2008