

**立法會**  
***Legislative Council***

LC Paper No. FC248/16-17

(These minutes have been  
seen by the Administration)

Ref : FC/1/1(7)

**Finance Committee of the Legislative Council**

**Minutes of the 12<sup>th</sup> meeting  
held at Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex  
on Saturday, 11 February 2017, at 11:10 am**

**Members present:**

Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP (Chairman)  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP  
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP  
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP  
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, SBS, JP  
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP  
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP  
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung  
Hon Claudia MO  
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, JP  
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS  
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP  
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP  
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP  
Hon Kenneth LEUNG  
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki  
Hon KWOK Wai-keung  
Hon Dennis KWOK Wing-hang  
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung

Hon IP Kin-yuen  
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, SBS, JP  
Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH  
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP  
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan  
Hon Alvin YEUNG  
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin  
Hon CHU Hoi-dick  
Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, JP  
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP  
Hon HO Kai-ming  
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting  
Hon SHIU Ka-fai  
Hon SHIU Ka-chun  
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH  
Hon YUNG Hoi-yan  
Dr Hon Pierre CHAN  
Hon CHAN Chun-ying  
Hon Tanya CHAN  
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP  
Hon LUK Chung-hung  
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai  
Hon KWONG Chun-yu  
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho  
Dr Hon YIU Chung-yim  
Dr Hon LAU Siu-lai

**Members absent:**

Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung  
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP  
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP  
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee, GBS, JP  
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP  
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS  
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP  
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP  
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding  
Hon HUI Chi-fung  
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH

Hon Kenneth LAU Ip-keung, MH, JP  
Hon Nathan LAW Kwun-chung

[According to the Judgment of the Court of First Instance of the High Court on 14 July 2017, LEUNG Kwok-hung, Nathan LAW Kwun-chung, YIU Chung-yim and LAU Siu-lai have been disqualified from assuming the office of a member of the Legislative Council, and have vacated the same since 12 October 2016, and are not entitled to act as a member of the Legislative Council.]

**Public officers attending:**

Ms Elizabeth TSE Man-yee, JP	Permanent Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)
Ms Carol YUEN, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) <sup>1</sup>
Mr Alfred ZHI Jian-hong	Principal Executive Officer (General), Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau (The Treasury Branch)
Mrs Vicki KWOK WONG Wing-ki	Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (2)
Mr Elvis AU Wai-kwong, JP	Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Nature Conservation and Infrastructure Planning)
Ms Kitty CHOI, JP	Director of Administration
Ms Christine WAI	Assistant Director of Administration

**Clerk in attendance:**

Ms Anita SIT	Assistant Secretary General 1
--------------	-------------------------------

**Staff in attendance:**

Mr Derek LO	Chief Council Secretary (1) <sup>5</sup>
Ms Ada LAU	Senior Council Secretary (1) <sup>7</sup>
Mr Raymond SZETO	Council Secretary (1) <sup>5</sup>
Mr Frankie WOO	Senior Legislative Assistant (1) <sup>3</sup>
Miss Yannes HO	Legislative Assistant (1) <sup>6</sup>

---

Action

**Item No. 2—FCR(2016-17)79  
RECOMMENDATION OF THE ESTABLISHMENT  
SUBCOMMITTEE MADE ON 30 NOVEMBER 2016**

**EC(2016-17)19**

**HEAD 44—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DEPARTMENT  
Subhead 000—Operational Expenses**

The Finance Committee ("FC") continued with the deliberation on the item FCR(2016-17)79.

2. Dr KWOK Ka-ki urged that, upon expiry of the tenure of the proposed post in 2019, the Administration should finish formulating its specific policies on food donation and recovery to cover issues such as determining the types of food suitable for donation and collection of relevant data. Noting Dr KWOK's concern, Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (2) ("DDEP(2)") said that the Administration would try its best to collect relevant data for timely release.

3. Mr CHU Hoi-dick said that he did not agree with the Administration's policy direction in food waste treatment as it only focused on the provision of large-scale infrastructure and cooperation with the business sector without paying much regard for community participation. He said that at present, the quantity of food waste recovered by private food waste treatment facilities was about 100 tonnes per day. In the absence of mandatory source separation and food waste recovery policies, he questioned whether the proposed large-scale Organic Waste Treatment Facilities ("OWTFs") would be able to collect a sufficient amount of food waste to sustain their operation. These large-scale OWTFs would also throttle the room for survival of private food waste treatment facilities. Mr CHU enquired how the Administration would collaborate with private food waste treatment facilities. Mr CHU asked the Administration to respond to his request for information in his letter dated 10 February 2017 to the FC Chairman and the Secretary for the Environment.

[*Post-meeting note:* The Chinese and English versions of the supplementary information provided by the Administration were issued to members vide LC Paper Nos. FC120/16-17 and FC148/16-17 on 2 May 2017 and 25 May 2017 respectively.]

Action

4. DDEP(2) responded that the Administration encouraged the participation and collaboration of private food waste treatment facilities in the implementation of policies. In the view of the Administration, as the first phase of OWTF, which was currently under construction, situated at Siu Ho Wan, it might not be able to meet the service demand in remote areas. The support of private treatment facilities was therefore necessary to keep up with the demand in different districts and promote the efficiency of food waste treatment by commercial and industrial businesses. She reiterated that the Administration would consider introducing mandatory source separation in a timely manner with a view to giving a greater incentive to the private sector to operate food waste treatment facilities and businesses to deal with food waste in a positive manner.

Motions proposed by members under paragraph 37A of the Finance Committee Procedure

5. At 11:20 am, FC started to consider whether the motions proposed by members under paragraph 37A of the Finance Committee Procedure ("FCP") ("37A motions") would be proceeded forthwith.

*Motions proposed by Mr CHU Hoi-dick*

6. The Chairman put to vote the question that the motion proposed by Mr CHU Hoi-dick numbered [0001](#) be proceeded forthwith. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. The division bell was rung for five minutes. With the agreement of the Chairman, Mr CHU Hoi-dick read out his proposed motion during the ringing of the division bell. The Chairman declared that 11 members voted for and 23 voted against the question. The question was negatived.

*Motion moved by a member under FCP 47*

7. Mr CHAN Hak-kan moved without notice a motion under FCP 47 that in the event of further divisions being claimed in respect of any motions or questions under the same agenda item, FC should proceed to each of such divisions immediately after the division bell had been rung for one minute. The Chairman proposed the question on Mr CHAN Hak-kan's motion.

Action

8. There being no request to speak, the Chairman put the motion to vote. The Chairman declared that the majority of the members present and voting were in favour of the motion. The motion was carried.

9. FC continued to deal with the remaining proposed 37A motions.

*Motions proposed by Mr CHU Hoi-dick*

10. The Chairman put to vote the questions, one by one, that the motions proposed by Mr CHU Hoi-dick numbered 0002 and 0003 be proceeded forthwith. With the agreement of the Chairman, Mr CHU Hoi-dick read out his proposed motions one by one. The Chairman declared that the majority of the members present and voting were against the questions. Those two questions were negated.

*Motion proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen*

11. The Chairman put to vote the question that the motion proposed by Mr CHAN Chi-chuen numbered [0004](#) be proceeded forthwith. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. The division bell was rung for one minute. With the agreement of the Chairman, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen read out his proposed motion during the ringing of the division bell. The Chairman declared that 11 members voted for and 19 voted against the question. The question was negated.

Voting on FCR(2016-17)79

12. There being no further questions from members, the Chairman put the item FCR(2016-17)79 to vote. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division and the division bell was rung for one minute. The Chairman declared that 25 members voted in favour of and one member voted against the item. Three members abstained from voting. The votes of individual members were as follows —

*For:*

Mr WONG Ting-kwong  
Mr WONG Kwok-kin  
Mr Michael TIEN Puk-sun  
Mr YIU Si-wing  
Dr KWOK Ka-ki  
Dr Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Mr POON Siu-ping  
Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan  
Mr Jimmy NG Wing-ka

Mr CHAN Hak-kan  
Ms Claudia MO  
Mr Frankie YICK Chi-ming  
Mr LEUNG Che-cheung  
Mr Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung  
Mr Martin LIAO Cheung-kong  
Dr CHIANG Lai-wan  
Mr Andrew WAN Siu-kin  
Dr Junius HO Kwan-yiu

Action

Mr LAM Cheuk-ting  
Ms YUNG Hoi-yan  
Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan  
Dr LAU Siu-lai  
(25 members)

Mr SHIU Ka-fai  
Mr CHAN Chun-ying  
Mr KWONG Chun-yu

*Against:*

Ms Alice MAK Mei-kuen  
(1 member)

*Abstain:*

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung  
Dr CHENG Chung-tai  
(3 members)

Mr CHU Hoi-dick

13. The Chairman declared that the item was approved.

**Item No. 3—FCR(2016-17)81  
JUDICIAL SERVICE PAY ADJUSTMENTS**

14. The Chairman said that this item invited FC to approve an increase in pay by 4.85% for Judges and Judicial Officers ("JJOs") with effect from 1 April 2016; and an increase in pay by 4% for JJOs below the Court of First Instance of the High Court ("CFI") level and 6% for Judges at the CFI level and above with effect from 1 September 2016. The Administration Wing ("AW") consulted the Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services on the relevant proposals on 23 January 2017.

Magnitude of pay increase

15. Dr KWOK Ka-ki, Mr SHIU Ka-fai and Mr Jeffrey LAM supported the judicial service pay adjustment proposal. Dr KWOK asked to what extent could the differentials between judicial pay and earnings of legal practitioners be reduced after the proposed pay adjustments, as well as some other allowance adjustments, took effect.

16. Noting that there would be an across-the-board increment of 4.85% for all JJOs, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr Jeremy TAM enquired whether a further pay rise of 6% allowed for Judges at the CFI level and above was set at an appropriate level. Mr TAM asked when would the next review of judicial pay be conducted.

Action

17. Director of Administration ("D of Admin") said that the Administration could not at this stage make an accurate projection of the impact of the current pay adjustments. However, she confirmed that there would still be pay differentials between JJOs and legal practitioners after the aforesaid pay adjustments and the enhancement of other conditions of services. Generally speaking, a CFI Judge aged over 50 would receive an annual remuneration of about \$5 million after pay adjustments if he/she was not provided with Judiciary Quarters ("JQs"), whereas a Senior Counsel earned an approximate of \$13.5 million in a year as shown in the findings of a benchmark study. D of Admin cited the views of the Standing Committee on Judicial Salaries and Conditions of Service ("the Judicial Committee"), emphasizing that the job nature of JJOs was not exactly the same as that of private legal practitioners, and JJOs, who might value their security of tenure, social prestige and status, were also entitled to other fringe benefits. Therefore, the Administration had no intention to adjust judicial pay to an extent that it could completely catch up with the pay levels of private legal practitioners. However, in light of the widening differentials between judicial pay and legal sector earnings in recent years, as well as the recruitment and retention difficulties encountered by the Judiciary, the Administration, after consulting the Judiciary and seeking views from legal practitioners, considered that it was necessary to give an additional pay rise as currently proposed. On the other hand, the Judiciary had tried to improve the conditions of service for JJOs by making enhancements to items such as cash housing allowances, medical benefits and local education allowances. Such proposals were supported by the Judicial Committee. In the view of the Judicial Committee and senior members of the legal profession, the enhanced conditions of service, coupled with the proposed pay adjustments adding up to an increment close to 10%, would render the remuneration package of JJOs attractive on the whole and would be conducive to the recruitment and retention of talents to serve as Judges. As for when the next review would be conducted, she said that under the current mechanism, the benchmark study was conducted once every five years and the next benchmark study would be carried out in 2020.

18. Dr YIU Chung-yim pointed out that the formula currently adopted for calculating the differential between judicial pay and legal sector earnings (i.e. by first subtracting legal sector earnings from judicial pay and then dividing the difference by the legal sector earnings) would come up with a percentage which represented an underestimation of the true gap. In his view, the differential should be calculated by directly dividing judicial pay by legal sector earnings so that the former would be expressed as a proportion of the latter to better reflect the differential.



Action

19. Noting the view of Dr YIU, D of Admin said that information on the levels of earnings collected from legal sector respondents was available in the benchmark study report published by the Judicial Committee for readers' reference. As the purpose of the judicial remuneration review was not to bring judicial pay in line with legal sector earnings but to assist the Administration in understanding whether there had been a widening differential between the two, the adoption of the current formula would serve the purpose better.

Other conditions of service

20. Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Mr Dennis KWOK asked why the Judiciary Quarters Allowance ("JQA") was not provided to JJOs above the Magistrate level across the board. They pointed out that the Judiciary was facing difficulties in the recruitment of District Court Judges and Magistrates as well.

21. D of Admin said that JQA was only available to Judges at the High Court ("HC") level and above. She explained that whereas Judges at the HC level and above were eligible for the allocation of JQs, JQs were in short supply. Therefore, JQA, which was a non-accountable cash allowance, was offered to serve as an alternative housing benefit comparable to JQs for Judges at the HC level and above if they were not provided with JQs. She added that the rate of allowance which was currently at the level of more than \$50,000 would reach some \$160,000 after adjustment. She said that as the Judiciary had been facing persistent difficulties in recruiting Judges at the HC level and above in recent years, and the recruitment of District Court Judges and Magistrates was comparatively easy, the Judiciary held that the housing allowance should be increased.

22. Noting that the Judiciary intended to provide allowances for JJOs to take out medical insurance, Dr KWOK Ka-ki enquired whether JJOs, after retirement, would be entitled to the same medical benefits as retired civil servants.

23. D of Admin said that the reimbursement to serving JJOs (including new recruits) and their eligible dependents for the premium of taking out medical insurance which conferred medical coverage was a complementary medical benefit that supplemented the existing provision of medical and dental benefits provided by the Department of Health and the Hospital Authority. JJOs, after retirement, would be entitled to the same medical benefits as retired civil servants.

Action

Recruitment difficulties

24. Ms Claudia MO expressed grave concern about the difficulties facing the Judiciary in recruiting Judges at the CFI level and above, and asked the Administration to give details of the challenges. Ms MO enquired about the number of recommendations on judicial appointments made by the Judicial Officers Recommendation Commission which were not accepted by the Chief Executive ("CE") and the proportion of such cases, as well as the proportion of appointed judges who were barristers and solicitors.

[*Post-meeting note:* The supplementary information provided by the Administration in response to members' enquiries was issued to members vide LC Paper No. FC50/16-17 on 27 February 2017.]

25. D of Admin responded that according to the views given by barristers and solicitors respondents in the 2015 Benchmark Study on the Earnings of Legal Practitioners in Hong Kong, the reasons for them to have interest in joining the Bench included "serving the community", "career choice", "benefits", "pay", "pension" and "prestige and honor". On the other hand, the reasons for not having interest in joining the Bench included that it was not their career choice to join the Bench, benefits and pay were unattractive, and the workload was demanding. Some of them also indicated that they had no intention to have a career change since they were about time to retire, and they would lack freedom and privacy after joining the Bench. She said that members might see the difficulties facing the Judiciary in recruiting Judges at the CFI level and above from the survey findings. Among the respondents who were interested in joining the Bench, barristers accounted for a significantly higher proportion than solicitors; and among those who had interest in serving as CFI Judges, most of them were Senior Counsels with more than 25 years of professional experience.

26. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan asked the Administration about the manpower wastage in courts at the HC level and above in the past three years and the reasons behind. Mr KWONG Chun-yu expressed concern about the overall manpower wastage in the Judiciary. Mr Alvin YEUNG noted that, in the Judiciary, quite a large number of judge or magistrate posts were currently filled by Deputy Judges or Magistrates. Mr YEUNG asked whether the existing vacancies would continue to be filled by temporary appointments and whether there was a need to expand the judicial establishment so as to address the manpower shortage.

Action

27. D of Admin said that retirement was the main reason for Judges at the HC level and above to leave the Bench in the past three years. The Judiciary had from time to time conducted internal reviews since 2008 to assess its manpower situation and it would communicate its manpower needs to AW, which always did its best to accommodate. She said that the Judiciary had created seven JJO posts in 2008, two each in 2012 and 2013, and seven in 2015 (three of which were Justices of Appeal of the Court of Appeal). It had also proposed to create three posts in 2015-2016, and would continue to create JJO posts in 2017 and 2018. She stressed that the Judiciary had a good grasp of its own manpower requirement and staffing establishment, and AW would act in concert to meet its needs. Regarding the fact that a considerable number of judge and magistrate vacancies in the Judiciary were currently filled by Deputy Judges and Magistrates, she clarified that it was not solely due to recruitment difficulties. The Judiciary did so also to allow senior legal practitioners to gain experience in the Bench so that the interested aspirants could better assess if they were suitable for the jobs.

28. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Ms YUNG Hoi-yan and Mr Alvin YEUNG considered that the Judiciary should increase its manpower to support Judges at the HC level and above. In the view of Mr LEUNG, the main cause of recruitment difficulties was a lack of talents and not the lower pay levels; therefore, he was against the pay adjustment proposal. Mr LEUNG said that apart from lack of talents, the Judiciary was also troubled by the problem of insufficient courts. Mr LEUNG was concerned that the resources, including land resources, for the Judiciary might be reduced as the Administration had planned to implement a policy to develop Hong Kong into an international arbitration centre. Ms YUNG pointed out that if pay adjustments could be made and additional staff could be deployed to support Judges in their performance of duties, other than studying the law and conducting trials, it would be easier for the Judiciary to resolve its difficulties in recruiting Judges, especially those at the HC level and above. Mr YEUNG said that the Civic Party was in support of the pay adjustment proposal. He agreed with Ms YUNG's observation in this respect. Mr YEUNG noted that the Judiciary had created the post of Judicial Assistants ("JAs") in recent years to support Judges at the District Court level and above, and such positions were mainly taken up by admitted barristers or solicitors. However, noting that they would normally be recruited for a two-year term, he was concerned about the short term of appointment as it might not be able to attract high-quality professionals. Mr YEUNG enquired about the term of appointment of JAs in the Judiciary.

Action

[*Post-meeting note:* The supplementary information provided by the Administration was issued to members vide LC Paper No. FC50/16-17 on 27 February 2017.]

29. D of Admin said that the Judiciary had created the post of JAs since 2010 to provide assistance to appellate judges in the Court of Final Appeal ("CFA") and the Court of Appeal of HC in conducting research on law points and provide legal support to the Competition Tribunal. At present, a total of five JAs were appointed by the Judiciary to support the Chief Justice, Permanent Judges and Non-Permanent Judges of CFA. Meanwhile, JAs were recruited for HC, four each for supporting the handling of criminal and civil cases.

30. Noting that the Judiciary had commenced a study on the extension of retirement ages for JJOs, Mr Dennis KWOK enquired about the progress of the study. Mr KWOK suggested the Administration conducting worldwide recruitment so that it could directly identify candidates eligible for judicial appointments at the HC level or above from other common law jurisdictions.

31. D of Admin said that the consultant commissioned by the Judiciary had already completed the study on the extension of retirement ages for JJOs and would submit its study report to the Judiciary in the first half of this year. She supplemented that the study had drawn reference to the retirement situation of JJOs in other common law jurisdictions, including the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand and Singapore. She said that recruitment advertisements for judicial appointments at the levels of CFI and above were available at the Judiciary's website; relevant information was therefore accessible to candidates in other jurisdictions. Regarding Mr KWOK's suggestion, she said that she would convey it to the Judiciary.

32. Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung considered that JJOs had been facing increasing political pressure in recent years when they tried cases of political nature. Dr CHENG Chung-tai was of the view that after the judicial establishment became independent of the establishment of the Civil Service years ago, the remuneration package and job security for JJOs were not as good as before, as shown by the fact that their pay adjustment proposal was currently subject to criticism from members in the Legislative Council and judicial appointments must be supported by the recommendation of the Judicial Officers Recommendation Commission, which might be under the indirect influence of CE. In recent years, there were even views that judicial officers must be patriotic. The unnecessary political pressure deterred aspirants from

Action

joining the Bench. Dr CHENG said he would not vote on this agenda item.

33. While Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung were speaking, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan said that they should first declare if they were involved in any pending court cases or else there might be bias in their speeches. She considered that the Chairman should make a ruling on whether they had any indirect pecuniary interests or conflicts of interests. The Chairman said that according to the Rules of Procedure, members should declare any pecuniary interests relating to the item under discussion. The Chairman also reminded members to avoid referring to pending court cases when speaking. Dr CHIANG reiterated that she considered Dr CHENG and Mr LEUNG as having indirect pecuniary interests in this agenda item. While Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung was speaking, the Chairman remarked that no member should make use of this forum to declare his/her intention to run for the CE election.

Voting on FCR(2016-17)81

34. There being no further questions from members, the Chairman put the item FCR(2016-17)81 to vote. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division and the division bell was rung for five minute. The Chairman declared that 30 members voted in favour of and 1 member voted against the item. The votes of individual members were as follows —

*For:*

Mr Abraham SHEK Lai-him  
Mr Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung  
Ms Claudia MO  
Mr YIU Si-wing  
Mr Charles Peter MOK  
Mr Dennis KWOK Wing-hang  
Mr Martin LIAO Cheung-kong  
Mr CHU Hoi-dick  
Dr Junius HO Kwan-yiu  
Mr LAM Cheuk-ting  
Mr SHIU Ka-chun  
Dr Pierre CHAN  
Ms Tanya CHAN  
Mr KWONG Chun-yu  
Dr YIU Chung-yim  
(30 members)

Prof Joseph LEE Kok-long  
Mr WONG Ting-kwong  
Mr Frankie YICK Chi-ming  
Mr MA Fung-kwok  
Mr LEUNG Che-cheung  
Mr IP Kin-yuen  
Mr Alvin YEUNG  
Mr Jimmy NG Wing-ka  
Mr HO Kai-ming  
Mr SHIU Ka-fai  
Ms YUNG Hoi-yan  
Mr CHAN Chun-ying  
Mr LUK Chung-hung  
Mr Jeremy TAM Man-ho  
Dr LAU Siu-lai

Action

*Against:*

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung  
(1 member)

35. The Chairman declared that the item was approved.
36. The meeting ended at 12:48 pm.

Legislative Council Secretariat  
26 July 2017