

# 立法會 *Legislative Council*

LC Paper No. CB(2)1794/16-17

Ref: CB2/PL/MP

## **Report of the Panel on Manpower for submission to the Legislative Council**

### **Purpose**

This report gives an account of the work of the Panel on Manpower ("the Panel") during the 2016-2017 session of the Legislative Council ("LegCo"). It will be tabled at the Council meeting of 12 July 2017 in accordance with Rule 77(14) of the Rules of Procedure of the Council.

### **The Panel**

2. The Panel was formed by a resolution passed by the Council on 8 July 1998 and as amended on 20 December 2000, 9 October 2002, 11 July 2007 and 2 July 2008 for the purpose of monitoring and examining Government policies and issues of public concern relating to labour and manpower planning matters. The terms of reference of the Panel are in **Appendix I**.

3. The Panel comprises 27 members in the 2016-2017 session. Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung and Hon HO Kai-ming were elected Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Panel respectively. The membership list of the Panel is in **Appendix II**.

### **Major Work**

#### Protection of employees' statutory rights and benefits

##### *Implementation of the statutory minimum wage ("SMW")*

4. The Panel continued to follow up on the implementation of the statutory minimum wage ("SMW"). Noting that the establishment of the SMW regime

aimed to protect grassroots employees by providing a wage floor in the labour market, members were concerned about the compliance with the Minimum Wage Ordinance (Cap. 608) ("MWO") by employers of the low-paying sectors, including catering, retail, security services, cleaning services and elderly care services.

5. Members were advised that the Labour Department ("LD") adopted a multi-pronged enforcement strategy, including conducting workplace inspections to establishments of various trades and mounting targeted enforcement campaigns for low-paying sectors to ensure compliance with MWO. Should irregularities be detected during workplace inspections, labour inspectors would require employers to take appropriate measures to ensure their compliance with MWO including immediate payment of any wages falling short of SMW to employees. According to the Administration, since the implementation of the initial SMW rate in 2011 and the two subsequent upratings, SMW on the whole had been operating smoothly.

6. The level of the SMW rate was another issue of concern to the Panel. When the Panel was briefed on the major findings in the 2016 Report on the Annual Earnings and Hours Survey ("AEHS"), which was conducted to identify the level and distribution of wages of employees in Hong Kong, some members noted with concern that only 3% of the local labour force were receiving the SMW rate. These members considered that the SMW rate was too low. In their view, the SMW rate should be increased to benefit the lowest 10% of the labour force. The Administration advised that consequent upon the implementation of SMW, most low-paid employees got a pay rise above the SMW rate, and hence the number of employees earning just the SMW rate had reduced. Members were assured that in considering the SMW rate, the Minimum Wage Commission ("MWC") would give regard to the need of maintaining an appropriate balance between the objectives of forestalling excessively low wages and minimizing the loss of low-paid jobs and the need to sustain Hong Kong's economic growth and competitiveness. In addition to the wage distribution data from AEHS, MWC would consider an array of indicators covering latest information on the socio-economic and labour market conditions as well as price forecasts in making recommendation on the revised SMW rate.

*Handling of work injury compensation claims under the Employees' Compensation Ordinance (Cap. 282)*

7. Members noted that the statutory employees' compensation mechanism under the Employees' Compensation Ordinance ("ECO") was based on a no-fault system whereby compensation was payable by employers to employees

who sustained an injury as a result of an accident arising out of and in the course of their employment, irrespective of any fault of the parties and the industries concerned. Members, however, noted with concern that for work injury cases in dispute, the injured employees concerned would face undue financial hardship because of having no employees' compensation or income to support their livelihood while pending resolution of the disputes with their employers. Members called on the Administration to take concrete measures to ensure the expeditious handling of cases of work injury compensation claims.

8. Members were advised that most cases in dispute mainly related to issues of principle such as whether the case was a work injury. LD had since May 2016 introduced enhanced support services for non-fatal cases in dispute to enhance communication and expedite timely resolution of differences between employers and employees through dedicated follow-up, early intervention, proactive contact and arrangement of face-to-face meetings. Upon collation of all relevant information, LD would provide both parties with its views on the likelihood and relevance of the case being a work injury. According to the Administration, such views had been accepted by both parties in the majority of dispute cases, and some of them had been resolved through mediation. It would closely monitor the implementation of the enhanced support services for cases in dispute and strive to resolve labour-management dispute so as to safeguard the rights and benefits of employees.

9. Members also noted that in the event that injured employees could not recover employees' compensation from their employers, the compensation claims would have to be determined by the court. In light of the time-consuming legal proceedings, some members suggested that LD should be empowered to adjudicate on such compensation claims. The Administration advised that the handling of dispute between employers and employees in work injury compensation claims under the proposal of empowering LD to adjudicate would resemble the present handling arrangement whereby the majority of such dispute cases had been resolved after LD's follow-up. The Administration did not see the need to introduce an adjudicating mechanism in LD in addition to the existing judicial system.

#### *Proposal to revise the compensation levels under three Ordinances*

10. Members in general supported the Administration's proposal to increase the amounts of a total of 18 compensation items under ECO, the Pneumoconiosis and Mesothelioma (Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 360) and the Occupational Deafness (Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 469). Some members, however, expressed concern about the adequacy of the amounts of

compensation. These members considered that instead of making adjustment to the levels of compensation items with reference to the price and wage movements, the Administration should take into account the actual needs of the eligible claimants in proposing adjustments so as to ensure adequate compensation and protection for employees.

11. Members were advised that under the established mechanism which was agreed by the Labour Advisory Board ("LAB"), the levels of compensation under the three Ordinances were reviewed every two years. The amounts of the compensation items under the three Ordinances were set and adjusted according to a basket of objective indicators, including Nominal Wage Index, Consumer Price Index (A) and other relevant factors.

12. The three proposed resolutions which sought to increase the amounts of a total of 18 compensation items under the three Ordinances with effect from 1 April 2017 were passed at the Council meeting of 1 March 2017.

*Proposal to amend the reinstatement or re-engagement provisions of the Employment Ordinance*

13. The Panel was briefed on the Administration's plan to reintroduce the lapsed the Employment (Amendment) Bill 2016 ("the 2016 Bill"), which sought to amend the Employment Ordinance (Cap. 57) ("EO") for the making of compulsory reinstatement ("RI") and re-engagement ("RE") order for unreasonable and unlawful dismissal ("UUD"). It was proposed that, among others, the employer had to pay to the employee a further sum for non-compliance with the relevant order. Members were advised that the Employment (Amendment) Bill 2017 was essentially the same as the 2016 Bill, except for increasing the ceiling for the further sum from \$50,000 to \$72,500.

14. While supporting the legislative proposal, some members considered that the proposed revised ceiling of the further sum (i.e. \$72,500) was still too low to provide adequate protection for employees, in particular higher-salaried employees, who were unreasonably and unlawfully dismissed. Noting that there were only three to four cases in a year in which the employees requested RI or RE, these members were of the view that a further upward adjustment in the ceiling of the further sum would not bring significant impact on the vast majority of employers.

15. The Administration explained that the further sum was in addition to the terminal payments and compensation (up to a maximum of \$150,000) which an employer was liable to pay to the employee if the employer did not comply with

an order for RI or RE made in a case of UUD. The total cost to be borne by an employer for non-compliance for RI or RE could be substantial. Having regard to the affordability of employers, particularly those of small and medium enterprises, it was considered that the proposed revised ceiling of the further sum would achieve sufficient deterrence against non-compliance with an order for RI or RE by the employer. Moreover, currently around 75% of employees had a monthly salary below \$25,000, the revised ceiling of the further sum was thus considered adequate to protect most employees.

16. The Administration had also drawn members' attention to the fact that the revised ceiling of the further sum was a hard-earned consensus reached by LAB following rounds of discussion. Any significant amendments proposed to the revised bill would have to be reverted to LAB for consideration in accordance with the standing practice, and hence would inevitably delay its implementation.

17. The Employment (Amendment) Bill 2017 was introduced into LegCo on 18 May 2017, and is under the scrutiny by a Bills Committee.

#### Working hours policy

18. The subject of working hours policy was another major concern to the Panel. Noting that the Standard Working Hours Committee ("SWHC") had submitted its report to the Government in January 2017, which set out its recommendations on the working hours policy direction, members were gravely concerned about how the Administration would take forward SWHC's recommendations. At the request of members, the Administration briefed the Panel at its meeting in June 2017 on the working hours policy framework and the proposed measures. The Panel also received views from deputations at the meeting.

19. Members noted that SWHC recommended, among others, that a legislative approach should be adopted to mandate employers to enter into written employment contracts with lower-income grassroots employees, which would include terms on working hours and overtime compensation arrangements. SWHC had left it to the Government to define the scope of the lower-income grassroots employees. Members were advised that the Administration fully accepted SHWC's recommendations and proposed that the wage line of lower-income grassroots employees be set at monthly wages of \$11,000.

20. Members expressed diverse views on the Administration's proposal to legislate for written employment contracts with specification of working hours

and overtime compensation terms for the lower-income grassroots employees ("the Administration's proposal"). Some members expressed strong dissatisfaction and disappointment at the Administration's decision of not to pursue legislating for standard working hours ("SWH"). They considered that the Administration's proposal could hardly address the problem of long working hours and uncompensated overtime work generally faced by employees in various trades and industries. Moreover, the number of employees to be covered under the Administration's proposal was too small if the wage line was set at monthly wages of \$11,000. These members took a strong view that it was necessary to legislate for SWH (with a working hours standard of 44 hours per week and overtime pay rate of 1:1.5) to safeguard the rights of employees.

21. Some other members, however, considered that the Administration's proposal was a practical first step to take forward the working hours policy in Hong Kong, which had given due regard to the affordability of enterprises and the need to protect the rights of grassroots employees. These members stressed that they opposed an across-the-board working hours regulation or SWH legislation, which in their view, would undermine the flexibility of operation and increase the manpower cost of enterprises, particularly the small-to-medium ones.

22. Members were advised that the Administration would proceed to work out the contents of the legislative proposals and the implementation arrangements and seek LAB's views. It also planned to formulate working hours guidelines for specific sectors where long working hours were relatively more common. Members were assured that the Administration would review the effectiveness and impact of the proposals after two years of implementation, including whether there was a need for SWH legislation and if so, its contents and relevant arrangements.

#### Employment support services

23. The Panel continued to follow up on LD's employment support services for job seekers with employment difficulties, in particular ethnic minorities ("EMs"), persons with disabilities, mature persons and female employees.

#### *Employment assistance to ethnic minorities*

24. Members were concerned about the specific employment support services for EM job seekers, having regard to the unique difficulties encountered by these job seekers due to the language barrier and cultural difference. Members were of the view that LD staff should enhance their understanding and

sensitivity of the specific needs of EM job seekers and called on the Administration to provide dedicated employment support for EM job seekers.

25. Members were advised that in addition to LD's general employment services and facilities, special counters and resource corners were set up in all the job centres to provide personalized job referral service and employment information for EM job seekers. Specifically, LD piloted the Employment Services Ambassadors ("ESAs") Programme for EMs to employ trainees of the Youth Employment and Training Programme who could communicate in EM languages as ESAs to help EM job seekers make use of various job search facilities and services at job centres, industry-based recruitment centres and job fairs. In addition, leaflets on LD's employment services for EMs were printed in various ethnic languages and interpretation services would be arranged for job seekers who did not speak Chinese and English.

26. The Administration shared members' view about the importance of enhancing EM job seekers' awareness of LD's employment services. To this end, LD's job centres had been maintaining close contact with non-governmental organizations ("NGOs") serving EMs, EM religious bodies and schools with EM students in disseminating updated employment information to EMs regularly and encouraging them to refer EMs with employment needs to LD for employment services.

#### *Employment support for persons with disabilities*

27. Members noted with concern that of the 1 331 placement cases secured by LD from September 2015 to March 2016, there were only 462 cases involving employees with disabilities having been employed in the same post for six months or more. Members urged the Administration to review the effectiveness of its employment services for persons with disabilities in finding suitable jobs in the open market.

28. Members were advised that each job seeker with disability was assigned a placement officer from the Selective Placement Division of LD who provided job seekers with disabilities with personalized services which included employment counselling and job matching services. To further strengthen the employment support for these job seekers, LD had since September 2016 launched a two-year pilot scheme to engage an NGO to offer professional psychological and emotional counselling services to needy job seekers with disabilities registered with LD. In-depth psychological/emotional counselling service was provided by registered social workers of the NGO with expertise and experience in this respect to needy job seekers. LD would review the pilot

scheme upon its completion and revert to the Panel on the way forward in the light of the review findings.

### *Employment support for mature persons*

29. Some members considered that the barriers deterring mature persons from staying longer in employment or re-joining the labour market were largely due to long working hours and lack of appropriate job skills. They called on the Administration to provide appropriate training and encourage employers to provide more part-time posts to mature job seekers.

30. According to the Administration, LD had set up a dedicated webpage on part-time vacancies at its Interactive Employment Service website to facilitate job seekers interested in part-time employment to search for suitable vacancies. LD also staged large-scale thematic job fairs for middle-aged and mature persons and district-based job fairs on part-time employment since 2015. To encourage employers to engage mature persons, LD regularly organized experience sharing sessions for employers on the employment of mature persons and invited representatives of the Hong Kong Federation of Insurers to brief employers on matters relating to the taking out of employees' compensation insurance policies for mature persons. Furthermore, LD's Employment Programme for the Middle-aged ("EPM") which originally covered only full-time employment, had been extended to cover part-time jobs (i.e. working 18 hours to less than 30 hours per week) since September 2015 with a view to encouraging employers to provide more suitable employment opportunities for middle-aged and mature job seekers. Employers might apply for training allowance of up to \$3,000 per month for each full-time/part-time employee engaged under EPM for a period of three to six months.

### *Women employment*

31. Members were of the view that the provision of adequate child care support services was crucial to releasing female homemakers to join the labour market. Most members considered that abolition of the continuous contract requirement under EO could safeguard the rights and benefits of part-time employees and thereby facilitating female homemakers to take up casual employment. Members were advised that with a view to helping mothers balance family and work commitments, the Administration would continue to launch measures to enhance child care services. Members were also advised that LD had conducted a review of the continuous contract requirement and several approaches had been put forward for deliberations by LAB. Although LAB members had considered the issue at a number of its meetings since 2013,



a consensus on the approach was yet to be reached. The Administration would keep the Panel abreast of the latest progress of LAB's deliberation on the subject.

*Promoting family-friendly culture in employment*

32. Members were generally of the view that implementation of family-friendly employment practices ("FFEP") could help boost staff morale and attract talents, which in turn would enhance productivity and build a harmonious employer-employee relationship. Noting that only 2 555 companies and organizations were recognized as family-friendly employers under the Family-Friendly Employers Award Scheme, some members queried about the effectiveness of the Administration's publicity and public education efforts in encouraging employers to adopt FFEP. Some members urged the Administration to formulate performance indicators to assess the effectiveness of its effort in FFEP promotion and the adoption of FFEP by employers.

33. Some members also expressed reservations about adoption of FFEPs by employers on their own accord. These members held the view that FFEP could only be cultivated through legislative means, and called on the Administration to play a more proactive role in introducing labour legislation on family-friendly initiatives. Some other members suggested that the Administration should consider providing financial incentive, say, tax concession, to employers to adopt FFEP measures.

34. Members were advised that while it was difficult to quantify the benefits brought about by FFEPs to employers and employees in light of the unique business environment and mode of operations in different industries and establishments, LD had all along been adopting a three-pronged strategy to foster a family-friendly culture, including public education, publicity measures and promotion of effective FFEP measures. Relevant industry-based guidelines and publications had also been compiled to facilitate employers' understanding of their statutory responsibilities and their adoption of good people management practices. The Administration stressed that it would not rule out the possibility of implementing such measures through legislative means if so warranted. It was the Government's policy to gradually improve employees' benefits and protection in a way commensurate with the pace of Hong Kong's socio-economic development.

*Proposal to freeze two income limits under the Work Incentive Transport Subsidy Scheme*

35. The Panel was briefed on the Administration's proposed special one-off arrangement to freeze the income limits for (a) individual-based/one-person household-based applications, and (b) household-based applications from households of six persons or above under the Work Incentive Transport Subsidy ("WITS") Scheme. Members noted that the income limits for household sizes of two to five persons and the asset limits for individual-based applications and different household sizes had been adjusted upwards in accordance with the existing adjustment mechanism and taken effect from the claim month of February 2017. A strict adherence to the existing adjustment mechanism would result in reduction of the applicable income limit for individual-based/one-person household-based applications and that for applications from households of six persons or above. The Administration proposed to freeze the income limits for these two categories of applicants in the annual adjustment in 2017 pending the completion of the forthcoming overall policy review of the Low-income Working Family Allowance ("LIFA") Scheme which would also examine the interface issues between LIFA and WITS.

36. While expressing support for the proposal, most members expressed concern that the level of monthly subsidy of \$600 had remained unchanged since inception of the WITS Scheme in 2011. In these members' view, the amount of subsidy was insufficient for those residing in remote areas to cover their actual work-related travelling expenses and should be adjusted annually to cope with the significant rise in fares of various transport modes. Members were advised that according to the General Household Survey conducted by the Census and Statistics Department ("C&SD") in the third quarter of 2015, the average monthly expense of WITS target beneficiaries on public transport for travelling to and from work was \$442, and that for those working across districts and for those residing in the New Territories were \$481 and \$525 respectively. A transport subsidy of \$600 per eligible person per month was considered adequate to relieve the burden of travelling expenses of the beneficiaries. Nevertheless, LD had commissioned C&SD to collect such statistics in the fourth quarter of 2016. It was expected that the latest statistics would be available by mid-2017. Members were assured that any major changes to the WITS Scheme, including the eligibility criteria and level of subsidy rate, would be carefully considered in the context of the overall policy review of LIFA and the interface between the WITS and LIFA Schemes.

37. The Finance Committee was subsequently informed of the Administration's proposal to freeze the income limits for two categories of WITS applicants in May 2017 by circulation of an Information Note.

#### Hong Kong's occupational safety performance in 2016

38. In the light of members' concern about Hong Kong's occupational safety performance, the Administration made periodic reports to the Panel. The Panel examined the latest occupational safety situation at two meetings in this session.

39. Members noted with concern that the construction industry recorded the highest number of fatalities and accident rate among all industries. Members also noted that more than half of the construction fatal accidents in recent years were related to fall of persons from height. In the light of commencement in sequence a number of mega infrastructure projects, members expressed specific concern about the effectiveness of preventive and enforcement measures adopted by the Administration in ensuring the occupational safety of construction workers.

40. Members were advised that while LD would continue to combat work-at-height hazards through enforcement and publicity efforts, LD had started to step up engagement with the property management companies and further enhance the promotion work to the Owners' Corporations to raise their awareness of the common hazards associated with repair and maintenance works, including work-at-height safety. To reduce the risk of head injury arising from falling from height, LD also stepped up publicity efforts to promote the use of safety helmets with chin straps, including promotion through relevant trade associations and workers' unions, to further safeguard work safety of work-at-height. In addition, the Buildings Department would formulate guidelines to enhance the safety of building exterior works through building design.

#### *Occupational safety concerning the construction of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge local projects*

41. Following the occurrence of a fatal accident on 29 March 2017 at a construction site of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge ("HZMB") local project, the Panel held a special meeting in April 2017 to discuss with the Administration the occupational safety condition concerning the construction of HZMB local related projects. The Panel held another meeting in May 2017 to receive deputations' views and follow up discussion with the Administration on

the subject. Some members expressed grave concern as to whether such accidents had occurred because employers/contractors sought to catch up with works progress at the expense of safe work practices and the Administration's monitoring measures failed to achieve its purpose. Members took a strong view that the Administration should conduct in-depth investigation into the causes of such accidents as well as draw up preventive measures and take specific enforcement actions against unsafe work practices.

42. According to the Administration, LD had been closely monitoring the occupational safety of the HZMB local projects. Notwithstanding that the Highways Department had set up an Independent Investigation Task Force to investigate the possible causes of the fatal accident occurred on 29 March 2017 and to develop improvement measures on site safety, LD would also conduct thorough investigation to examine the causes of the accident and the legal liabilities of duty holders. LD would urge the contractor concerned to make improvement and take enforcement actions as appropriate. Members were also advised that given the commencement of various mega infrastructure projects in recent years, LD established a dedicated office in 2011, which was specifically tasked with inspecting these projects, including the construction of the HZMB local projects and conducting related law enforcement work. Since the commencement of the HZMB works project in 2011 till the first quarter of 2017, LD conducted a total of 1 384 inspections and issued 51 suspension notices and 230 improvement notices with 329 prosecutions initiated/taken. The number of days of works suspension resulted from the issuance of the suspension notices was 712 days.

43. Most members called for the imposition of heavier penalty on convicted cases related to fatal industrial accidents in the construction industry so as to increase the deterrent effect against non-compliance with the occupational safety legislation. These members suggested that more weightings should be given to the safety performance of individual contractors in assessing their future tenders for public works contracts. At the special meeting on 12 April 2017 when the occupational safety concerning the construction of the HZMB project was discussed, the Panel passed a motion urging the Government to increase the penalties by forbidding the companies concerned to tender in government contracts for one year after the occurrence of a fatal accident, and to introduce legislative amendments to subject those consultants and contractors who were found to be negligent in their safety performance to criminal liability so as to further enhance the deterrence effect.

44. In its written response to the abovementioned motion passed by the Panel, the Administration advised that the contractor's and consultant's past safety

performance would be a consideration factor for future tender evaluation and might affect the contractor's eligibility for tendering. In order to raise the deterrent effect of court penalties, LD had been adopting different approaches to seek heavier penalties for duty holders. For instance, LD had submitted comprehensive information to the court for reference in sentencing, in particular the serious consequences arising from the accidents in question. Depending on the circumstances of individual cases, LD would request the Department of Justice ("DoJ") to consider filing a review or an appeal to the court in respect of the conviction and the penalty when necessary. LD would, in consultation with DoJ, review provisions in relation to penalty under the occupational safety legislation, and amend the law if necessary to further enhance the deterrent effect of the penalty.

#### Regulation of employment agencies

45. Having consulted the Panel in the last session and completed the public consultation exercise on the draft Code of Practice for Employment Agencies ("the Code") in April to June 2016, LD promulgated the Code on 13 January 2017. Members noted that the Code highlighted the salient legislative requirements that employment agencies ("EAs") must follow, and set out the minimum standards which the Commissioner for Labour ("C for L") expected of EA licensees in their operations, some of which were particularly relevant to EAs providing placement service of foreign domestic helpers ("FDHs"). At the request of the Panel, the Administration reported to the Panel on the implementation of the Code. It also briefed members on its plan to introduce a legislative proposal to provide legal basis for the Code, to raise the maximum penalty on EAs operating without a licence or overcharging job seekers commission, and to extend the criminal liability of overcharging to responsible person other than the licensee.

46. Members generally supported the legislative proposal. Some members, however, expressed concern about the difficulty in requiring EAs to observe the Code if it was not legally binding, although the issuance of the Code would facilitate EAs' compliance as well as for ease of reference by FDHs and their employers. Some members were particularly concerned about whether the Code could adequately address issues relating to money-lending activities of intermediaries and the unscrupulous operation of EAs. To enhance the deterrence effect against unscrupulous operation of EAs, some members suggested that the standards which C for L expected from EAs, as stipulated in the Code, should be included in the legislative proposal.

47. Some other members, however, took the view that the Code should equally safeguard the interest of employers who suffered from the problem of job hopping of FDHs and EAs' provision of false or misleading information on FDHs' profile. Some members took the view that a probation period should be introduced for newly-recruited FDHs, so as to better protect the interests of both employers and employees. Besides, a complaint mechanism for handling disputes of FDH-related matters should be established.

48. The Administration advised that the Code was an administrative measure. EAs were expected to comply with the Code during their operations, and as a result EAs' professional level and service quality should be enhanced. C for L would duly take into account EA's compliance with the Code in considering, among others, whether to exercise his power under the relevant provisions of EO to refuse to issue or to renew, or even to revoke the EA's licence. The Administration further advised that the main purpose of the legislative proposal was to impose more potent deterrent to the illegal activity of overcharging job-seekers and to specify C for L's power to promulgate the Code so as to provide a legal basis for the Code. Nonetheless, it was set out in the Code that the licensee and staff of EA should provide accurate information and sound advice to employers when dealing with employers. FDH employers could lodge complaints with LD about malpractices of EAs. LD would consider taking follow up action, in consultation with DoJ, if deemed appropriate.

49. The Employment (Amendment) (No.2) Bill 2017 was introduced into LegCo on 28 June 2017, and is under the scrutiny by a Bills Committee.

#### Meetings held

50. During the period between October 2016 and June 2017, the Panel held a total of 10 meetings. A meeting has been scheduled for July 2017 to discuss "Review of statutory maternity leave", "Occupational disease and occupational health situation in 2016", and "Adjustment of the maximum rates of medical expenses under the Employees' Compensation Ordinance and the Pneumoconiosis and Mesothelioma (Compensation) Ordinance".

Council Business Division 2  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
3 July 2017

**Legislative Council**

**Panel on Manpower**

**Terms of Reference**

1. To monitor and examine Government policies and issues of public concern relating to labour, manpower planning, vocational training and education, and qualifications framework.
2. To provide a forum for the exchange and dissemination of views on the above policy matters.
3. To receive briefings and to formulate views on any major legislative or financial proposals in respect of the above policy areas prior to their formal introduction to the Council or Finance Committee.
4. To monitor and examine, to the extent it considers necessary, the above policy matters referred to it by a member of the Panel or by the House Committee.
5. To make reports to the Council or to the House Committee as required by the Rules of Procedure.

**Panel on Manpower**

**Membership list for the 2016-2017 session\***

<b>Chairman</b>	Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
<b>Deputy Chairman</b>	Hon HO Kai-ming
<b>Members</b>	Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP Hon CHAN Kin-por, GBS, JP Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki Hon KWOK Wai-keung, JP Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin Hon CHU Hoi-dick Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, JP Hon SHIU Ka-fai Hon SHIU Ka-chun Dr Hon Pierre CHAN Hon LUK Chung-hung Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho Hon Nathan LAW Kwun-chung Dr Hon LAU Siu-lai

(Total : 27 members)

<b>Clerk</b>	Miss Betty MA
--------------	---------------

<b>Legal adviser</b>	Miss Joyce CHAN
----------------------	-----------------

\* Changes in membership are shown in Annex.



## Panel on Manpower

## Changes in membership

Member	Relevant date
Hon Kenneth LEUNG	Up to 31 October 2016
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP	Up to 5 November 2016
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP	Up to 6 November 2016
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP	Up to 7 November 2016
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP	Up to 8 November 2016
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP	Up to 9 November 2016
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS	Up to 9 November 2016
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, BBS, JP	Up to 9 November 2016
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH	Up to 9 November 2016
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, GBS, JP	Up to 10 November 2016
Hon Claudia MO	Up to 10 November 2016
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding	Up to 10 November 2016
Hon IP Kin-yuen	Up to 13 November 2016
Dr Hon YIU Chung-yim	Up to 27 November 2016
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP	Up to 28 November 2016
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP	Up to 28 November 2016
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP	Up to 29 November 2016
Hon CHAN Chun-ying	Up to 29 November 2016
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP	Up to 30 November 2016
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP	Up to 1 December 2016
Hon KWONG Chun-yu	Up to 5 December 2016
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH	Up to 7 December 2016
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting	Up to 13 December 2016
Hon Alvin YEUNG	Up to 20 December 2016
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan	Up to 2 January 2017
Hon Dennis KWOK Wing-hang	Up to 3 January 2017
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP	Up to 12 January 2017
Hon Kenneth LAU Ip-keung, BBS, MH, JP	Up to 12 January 2017
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP	Up to 15 January 2017
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH	Up to 16 January 2017
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee, GBS, JP	Up to 17 January 2017
Hon HUI Chi-fung	Up to 22 January 2017
Hon Tanya CHAN	Up to 2 February 2017
Hon James TO Kun-sun	Up to 5 February 2017
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, SBS, JP	Up to 12 March 2017
Hon YUNG Hoi-yan	Up to 13 March 2017
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen	Up to 26 March 2017