

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. FC50/03-04
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/1/2

Finance Committee of the Legislative Council

Minutes of the 5th meeting
held at the Legislative Council Chamber
on Wednesday, 7 January 2004, at 9:00 am

Members present:

Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong, GBS (Chairman)
Hon NG Leung-sing, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Kenneth TING Woo-shou, JP
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP
Dr Hon David CHU Yu-lin, JP
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, JP
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan
Hon Martin LEE Chu-ming, SC, JP
Dr Hon Eric LI Ka-cheung, GBS, JP
Dr Hon David LI Kwok-po, GBS, JP
Hon Fred LI Wah-ming, JP
Dr Hon LUI Ming-wah, JP
Hon Margaret NG
Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-ye, GBS, JP
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong
Hon HUI Cheung-ching, JP
Hon CHAN Kwok-keung, JP
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, JP
Hon Bernard CHAN, JP
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, JP
Hon SIN Chung-kai
Hon Andrew WONG Wang-fat, JP
Hon WONG Yung-kan

Hon Jasper TSANG Yok-sing, GBS, JP
Hon Howard YOUNG, SBS, JP
Dr Hon YEUNG Sum
Hon YEUNG Yiu-chung, BBS
Hon LAU Chin-shek, JP
Hon LAU Kong-wah, JP
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yee, JP
Hon Ambrose LAU Hon-chuen, GBS, JP
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon CHOY So-yuk
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
Hon SZETO Wah
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, SBS, JP
Dr Hon LAW Chi-kwong, JP
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Dr Hon TANG Siu-tong, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP
Hon LI Fung-ying, JP
Hon Henry WU King-cheong, BBS, JP
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, JP
Hon Michael MAK Kwok-fung
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon LEUNG Fu-wah, MH, JP
Dr Hon LO Wing-lok, JP
Hon WONG Sing-chi
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee
Hon IP Kwok-him, JP
Hon LAU Ping-cheung
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
Hon MA Fung-kwok, JP

Members absent:

Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, SBS, JP
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBS, JP

Public officers attending:

Mr Frederick MA Si-hang, JP

Secretary for Financial Services and the
Treasury

Mr Alan LAI Nin, GBS, JP

Permanent Secretary for Financial Services
and the Treasury (Treasury)

Miss Elizabeth TSE, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) 1
Mr K K LAM	Principal Executive Officer (General), Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau (Treasury)
Prof Arthur LI Kwok-cheung, GBS, JP	Secretary for Education and Manpower
Mrs Fanny LAW, GBS, JP	Permanent Secretary for Education and Manpower
Miss Charmaine WONG	Deputy Secretary-General, University Grants Committee
Mr Martin SIU	Assistant Secretary-General, University Grants Committee

Clerk in attendance:

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

Staff in attendance:

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

Action

Item No. 1 - FCR(2003-04)50

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ESTABLISHMENT SUBCOMMITTEE
MADE ON 10 December 2003**

The Committee approved the proposal.

Item No. 2 - FCR(2003-04)51

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE
MADE ON 17 December 2003**

2. The Committee approved the proposal.

Item No. 3 - FCR(2003-04)52

HEAD 190 – UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMITTEE

♦ Subhead 000 Operational expenses

Total recurrent grant for the University Grants Committee-funded institutions for the 2004/05 academic year

3. The Chairman informed members that the Item was a re-submission of a proposal withdrawn at the Finance Committee (FC) meeting on 19 December 2003. The Panel on Education had been consulted on the earlier proposal at its meetings on 1 and 9 December 2003.

4. The following members declared an interest on the Item:

- Dr YEUNG Sum as teaching staff of The University of Hong Kong (HKU)
- Dr LAW Chi-kwong as teaching staff of HKU
- Dr David LI as Pro-Chancellor of HKU
- Mrs Selina CHOW, Mr James TO, Mr LAU Chin-Shek, Dr TANG Siu-tong, and Mr IP Kwok-him as Court Members of HKU
- Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong and Mr CHAN Kam-lam as Council members of the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK)
- Mr James TIEN as a Council member of CUHK and a Court Member of the Polytechnic University of Hong Kong (PUHK)
- Mr Henry WU as a Council member of PUHK
- Mr Kenneth TING as a Council Member of PUHK
- Mr LAU Ping-cheung as a Council member of City University of Hong Kong
- Mr NG Leung-sing as a Council member of Lingnam University
- Mr Bernard CHAN as a Council Member of Lingnam University
- Ir Dr Raymond HO as the former Chairman of the Council of City University of Hong Kong
- Mr Tommy CHEUNG declared that his wife was a university lecturer

5. Mr YEUNG Yiu-chung, on behalf of Members of the Democratic Alliance for Betterment of Hong Kong (DAB), stated that the Administration had already twice reduced the funding for the University Grants Committee (UGC)-funded institutions. The matter had sparked off wide concern among staff in higher education. DAB Members had discussed the matter with the Administration, but had not been given any undertaking that there would not be further cuts in the financial commitment for the 2005-08 triennium. The Financial Secretary (FS) had nevertheless stated that cut in education funding would be far less than the 11% for other policy areas. Without any concrete information on the education spending for 2005-08, DAB Members could not support the proposal.

6. The Secretary for Education and Manpower (SEM) said that he was fully aware of DAB's stance but he was not in a position to make any undertaking in respect of the expenditure level for 2005-08. He stressed that the proposal in question was related to the funding requirements of the UGC-funded institutions for the 2004/05 academic year. Funding proposal for the 2005-08 triennium would be submitted to FC for approval in due course. SEM pointed out that since the withdrawal of the proposal at the last FC meeting on 19 December 2003, he had discussed with the Heads of the Universities who had reaffirmed their acceptance of the 10% reduction in the funding for the 2004/05 academic year. He expressed appreciation for their acceptance and commitment in maintaining the quality of higher education notwithstanding a reduced budget necessitated by fiscal deficit. With the acceptance of UGC and the Heads of the Universities, the Administration had re-submitted the proposal. He hoped members would not reject the proposal merely for the sake of opposition.

7. Dr YEUNG Sum opined that the proposed funding cut in education to reduce deficit was at variance with the Chief Executive (CE)'s earlier statement that education was crucial for a knowledge-based society, and that investments in education were necessary. Apart from the proposed 10% funding cut for the 2004/05 academic year, it had been said that there might be a further 30% reduction in funding for the 2005-08 triennium. He said that Members of the Democratic Party (DP) were opposed to such a large-scale funding cut in education which would be detrimental to the quality of higher education. To his disappointment, the Administration had made no particular efforts to review the situation since its withdrawal of the proposal and had now re-submitted the proposal intact with no alterations whatsoever. He urged the Administration to clarify whether there would be further funding cuts for the 2005-08 triennium and if so, how developments in higher education should proceed.

8. SEM reiterated that the purpose of the proposal was to seek funding for the 2004/05 academic year which had already had the support of the Heads of the Universities. The heads of the institutions had confirmed that they should be able to maintain the quality of education despite the funding cuts. Their decision should be respected. As for the funding for the 2005-08 triennium, he was still awaiting the indicative figures. SEM emphasized that he also hoped that there would not be

any further cuts in education funding, but each bureau had the responsibility to assist the Government in reducing the huge budget deficit. By rejecting cuts in one policy area, greater savings would have to be achieved through larger cuts in other areas, such as environment, welfare, medical, security etc. which would not be welcomed by the public. He assured members that they would be duly consulted on the funding for the 2005-08 triennium when the relevant proposal was submitted to FC. Members could then decide on whether the funding for 2005-08 triennium should be supported.

9. Referring to the statement made by FS on education funding cuts, Mr LEE Cheuk-yan opined that if the cut for education would be far less than 11%, there should not be any more cuts for the 2005-08 triennium as the targeted funding cuts for higher education would have been achieved through the present proposal. He could not understand why SEM found it difficult to pledge no further cut in higher education spending. He suggested that the Administration should withdraw the proposal and clarify its policy direction on funding for education before reverting to FC. He also suggested that consideration should also be given to spreading the funding cuts evenly over the 2005-08 triennium, thereby obviating the need for a drastic cut in the funding for the 2004/05 academic year. He cautioned that if the Administration refused to withdraw the proposal, members would have no choice but to reject the proposal to make way for the review.

10. SEM affirmed that both CE and FS placed great importance on education and there was no disagreement within the Government over the need for investing in education. He could not defer the proposal as he had earlier committed to the Heads of the Universities that the funding proposal for the 2004/05 academic year would be submitted to the FC as scheduled. Any further delay would give rise to uncertainties, thereby affecting the forward planning of institutions. SEM reiterated that funding for the 2004/05 academic year and the 2005-08 triennium were two separate proposals which should be dealt with separately. Since a decision on the funding for the 2005-2008 triennium had yet to be made, it would be irresponsible to force the Administration to accede to something which had yet to be decided.

11. Dr YEUNG Sum opined that the Administration should not pressurize members to support the proposal on the basis of its agreement with the Heads of the Universities. He had been approached by staff and student associations of UGC-funded institutions which did not agree with the funding proposal and urged him to uphold his objection against it.

12. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong responded to SEM's earlier comment and said that members were not opposed to the proposal for the sake of objection. They were in fact reflecting the views of some staff and students affected by the funding cuts. He further pointed out that it was members of FC who were pressurized by the Administration as it said that the institutions would have no funds to pay their staff if the funding proposal was not approved. He agreed with Mr LEE Cheuk-yan

that there was an unclear delineation of authority in approving education funding. He considered it necessary to hold a meeting with CE, FS and SEM to find out who was actually behind the funding cuts since all three of them had stressed on the need for investment in education. Mr CHEUNG added said that it had all along been the stance of DP Members that the resources saved from the funding cuts should be ploughed back to the education sector. He also hoped that funding cuts would not be applied to primary and secondary schools.

13. Mr IP Kwok-him said that DAB Members had no intention to pressurize the Administration but were concerned about the scale of funding cuts which had aroused much dissatisfaction among staff and students. In order not to aggravate the situation, DAB Members considered it necessary for the Administration to provide the funding proposal for the 2005-08 triennium for members' consideration. At a recent meeting with SEM, DAB Members were impressed by his commitment to reducing the funding cuts for the 2005-08 triennium. However, as SEM was not in charge of the overall budget and funding allocation, DAB Members had requested for an undertaking to be made by the Administration that there would not be further funding cuts for the 2005-08 triennium. As DAB Members' support for the funding proposal for the 2004/05 academic year was conditional upon the said undertaking which the Administration had failed to give, DAB Members would object to the proposal.

14. Ms Emily LAU said that Members of the Frontier had conveyed to CE and FS their objection to funding cuts in education, particularly in the course of economic restructuring. Given the low education level of one-third of the working population, it was necessary for more resources to be invested in education otherwise Hong Kong would lag behind its competitors. Ms LAU added that members were not trying to politicize the issue but vetoing the proposal would be the only means within the prerogative of members to indicate their support for more resources to improve higher education in a value for money manner. Besides, it would not be prudent for members to approve the proposal having regard to the strong opposition from various staff and students associations of UGC-funded institutions attending the meeting of the Panel on Education on 1 December 2003.

15. SEM said that while some of the staff and students might oppose to the proposed funding for the 2004/05 academic year, they had to respect the decision of their university heads who were in the best position to assess the acceptability of the proposal. SEM clarified that the staff and students associations were opposed to the funding cuts for the 2005-08 triennium rather than that for the 2004/05 academic year. The Permanent Secretary for Education and Manpower (PSEM) supplemented that the funding proposal for the 2004/05 academic year had been endorsed by the university heads who had signed a joint statement to re-affirm their acceptance. They had also requested Members to support the funding proposal so that they would have the certainty in making academic plans for their institutions. PSEM informed members that at a recent meeting with staff and student associations, SEM had pledged that upon the passage of the funding proposal for

the 2004/05 academic year, the Administration would work out the funding proposal for the 2005-08 triennium with FS in consultation with staff and students. The staff and students in turn were willing to accept a proportionate reduction in education funding if this was considered justified. In other words, the university heads, staff and students were not insisting on zero reduction in education funding. She urged members to support the funding proposal for the 2004/05 academic year.

16. Regarding the effect of the proposed funding cut on education, PSEM remarked that funding for education had drastically increased during the period from 1988 to 1998. At present, education funding comprised 4.8% of the Gross Domestic Product. While agreeing to the need to maintain the quality of higher education, measures had to be put in place to reduce budget deficit. Following the implementation of the Enhanced Productivity Programme to cut down Government expenditure, the student unit cost for the higher education sector had been reduced by 10% in the 1998-2001 triennium from point to point. The full triennium effect of the reduction for 1998-2001 was only reflected in the 2001-04 triennium. Besides, half of the savings were ploughed back as research funding. Therefore, the overall funding reduction was in fact only 5% over the six-year period from 1998 to 2004. Furthermore, the across-the-board efficiency savings of 1.8% for the financial year of 2003/04 did not apply to the tertiary education sector. To assist the institutions in diversifying their funding resources, a Matching Grant Scheme of \$1 billion was established to provide dollar-for-dollar matching grants for private donations secured by the institutions. As a result, a total of \$2 billion one-off additional resources would be made available to the sector, as opposed to the required efficiency savings of about \$1.1 billion for 2004/05. PSEM added that the 13% reduction on education funding for 2004/05 academic year had included deflation and reduction in staff costs. If these elements were taken out, the actual reduction was only 8.9% which was less than the 11% reduction as proposed by FS.

17. Mr Tommy CHEUNG asked if there would be a net gain in education funding after offsetting the efficiency savings of about \$1.1 billion with the one-off additional resources of \$2 billion from the Matching Grant Scheme. If so, he enquired in what manner would the salary of teaching staff be adjusted. SEM advised that the institutions had a high degree of autonomy on the use of funds received from donations so long as these were invested in academic rather than building purposes. On staff remuneration, SEM said that while funding was based on the salary structure of civil servants, individual institutions could choose to delink from the civil service and decide on their own salary structure. As the Matching Grant Scheme was a one-off exercise, Dr LAW Chi-kwong expressed concern that this might not be able to cover the funding cuts which were made on a recurrent basis. He asked whether the Matching Grant Scheme could be made on a continuous basis. SEM confirmed that consideration would be given to extending the Matching Grant Scheme so as to encourage more private donations.

18. Ms Emily LAU questioned the delay in submitting the funding proposal for the 2005-08 triennium which should have been prepared months ago. PSEM clarified that there was no question of delay. As UGC had to ascertain the funding requirements based on the academic plans of individual institutions, the funding proposal for the 2001-04 triennium was only submitted in February 2001. In considering the funding requirements for the 2005-08 triennium, UGC had requested the eight institutions to provide indicative figures on the expected expenditure for the triennium for submission to the Administration in January 2004.

19. Given the need to reduce budget deficit, Dr LAW Chi-kwong opined that the indicative figures for funding cuts for the 2005-08 triennium should be known by now. He queried why SEM had kept members in the dark about the scale of reduction while requesting for the early approval of funding for the 2004/05 academic year. He said that members were opposed to the scale of reduction rather than the funding proposal itself.

20. Mr Martin LEE was concerned that the funding cuts for the 2005-08 triennium would be more drastic than that of 2004/05 academic year. He cautioned that any cuts on higher education funding would have serious impact, particularly on smaller colleges and certain faculties such as the faculty of liberal arts which had difficulty in securing private donations. He would regard rejection of the proposal as an opportunity for SEM to go back to FS and seek more funds for the education sector. SEM said that the consensus with university heads was reached after prolonged negotiation. It was clear to the public that the Administration had reached consensus with UGC and university heads on the funding proposal for the 2004/05 academic year. He reiterated his appreciation for the unwavering support given by university heads in re-affirming their acceptance of the proposal. He hoped that FC would respect the decision of the university heads and take into account public interest in making decisions.

21. Mr MA Fung-kwok said that he was disappointed that the Administration had only sought the re-affirmation of UGC and the Heads of the Universities and made no efforts to review the proposal before re-submitting it to FC. As the funding for the 2004/05 academic year as well as the 2005-08 triennium both fell within the tenure of service of the first term of Principal Officials under the Accountability System, there was a need for these officials to demonstrate their vision and capability in working out a feasible solution to reduce the budget deficit. As the Principal Official in charge of the education portfolio, SEM had the responsibility to explain to the public the future development plans for higher education. In the absence of such plans, particularly the funding for the 2005-08 triennium, he found it difficult to support the proposal. In the event that the proposal was not passed, he urged the Administration to critically review the funding for education with a view to working out an acceptable solution to address the legitimate concerns of both staff and students. SEM affirmed that concerted efforts had been made to work out the development plans for education as well as other policy areas.

22. Ir Dr Raymond HO said that he had met with staff and student associations to gauge their views on the funding proposal. In gist, they were concerned that the uncertainty over the funding for the 2005-08 triennium would affect the academic plans of the institutions, and that there should be a clear indication on the funding for the 2005-08 triennium. SEM said that he had made an undertaking to DAB Members that efforts would be made to reduce funding cuts for the 2005-08 triennium, and that staff and students would be consulted in due course. However, it would take time to work out an acceptable proposal which could reduce the deficit on the one hand and maintain the quality of education on the other.

23. Mr NG Leung-sing said that education was a form of investment but it was also important to rationalize the allocation of resources. He acknowledged that more time was required to formulate the funding proposal for the 2005-08 triennium, and therefore appreciated the need for timely provision of funds to the institutions for the 2004/05 academic year to enable them to make the necessary academic plans.

24. Mrs Selina CHOW noted that DP Members were not opposed to the funding proposal but the scale of reduction while DAB Members refused to support the proposal unless an undertaking to the effect that there would be no funding cuts for the 2005-08 triennium was made. She however pointed out that these requests were beyond what FC was considering in the present funding proposal and also beyond the scope of FC's responsibility. While accepting that investments in education was necessary, these needed not rely solely on public funding but could be met by private donations as in the case of many overseas universities. An undertaking that no funding cuts for higher education for the 2005-08 triennium might entail further cuts to be made in other areas. Besides, the Public Accounts Committee had revealed that there was scope for reduction in the administrative costs of UCG-funded institutions. She said that Members of the Liberal Party held the view that the funding proposal for the 2004/05 academic year, which had the consensus of UGC and the Heads of the Universities, should be considered separately from that for the 2005-08 triennium, and that the approval of funding proposal for the 2004/05 academic year should not be conditional upon any undertaking for the 2005-08 triennium as this would hinder the Administration in meeting its plans to reduce the deficit.

25. Mr Tommy CHEUNG was concerned that the institutions would not have the needed funds to pay their staff if the funding proposal was not approved. He enquired about the date on which the funds from last year would be depleted. SEM explained that if the funding proposal was not approved by the Legislative Council, there would not be any funding for the institutions for the 2004/05 academic year starting 1 July 2004. This would have serious consequences as he could not re-submit the same proposal to FC again.

26. Mr SZETO Wah was not convinced of the Administration's response. He said that under normal circumstances, a funding proposal which had been withdrawn could be re-submitted to FC after suitable amendments were made or consensus was reached after lobbying. However, the Administration had re-submitted the proposal without any alterations despite that DP and DAB Members had maintained their objection, and then claimed that the proposal would not be re-submitted if rejected. The way the Administration handled the proposal was more like a threat. He requested SEM to confirm if it was true that the institutions would have no funds to pay their staff if the proposal was not approved. SEM affirmed that if FC were to veto the funding proposal, no funds could be released to the institutions for the 2004/05 academic year. This was a reality and was by no means a threat. He reiterated that the re-submission of the proposal after its withdrawal at the FC meeting on 19 December 2003 was made consequent upon the re-affirmation of acceptance of the proposal by the Heads of the Universities and UGC.

27. Mr LAU Ping-cheung enquired whether the institutions could use its reserves to pay for staff salary. SEM explained that each institution had its own reserves and was given the flexibility to use the reserves subject to the approval of its Councils.

(The meeting was suspended at this juncture so that the Establishment Subcommittee (ESC) could hold its meeting at 10:45 am as scheduled. To enable FC to complete scrutiny of the funding proposal, ESC members agreed to suspend their meeting. The ESC meeting was subsequently re-convened at 11:30 am.)

28. Mr James TIEN said that owing to the huge budget deficit, there was a need for the Administration to cut funding across the board in order to achieve a balanced budget. He cautioned that if all proposals for funding cuts were turned down, the Administration would have no other means to reduce deficit but to resort to tax increase which would not be welcomed by the middle class. He therefore extended his appreciation for the eight university heads who had re-affirmed their acceptance for the funding cuts. He then requested the Administration to elaborate on FS's statement that education funding cuts would be far less than 11% and to explain whether funding cuts in other areas would have to be correspondingly increased. He also asked if there was room for further funding cuts in education in the future given the decreasing birth rate.

29. SEM said that while the funding for the 2005-08 triennium was under active negotiation, he had not been advised by FS on the extent to which "far less than 11%" should apply. Given CE and FS's commitment on education investments, he was confident that the cuts would be mild. The Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury affirmed that Government attached great importance in providing quality education as evidenced by the fact that some \$50 billion or 24% of recurrent public expenditure had been spent on education, the policy portfolio which had received the highest funding. In view of the huge deficit, FS had decided that on average an 11% efficiency saving should be applied to different policy portfolios

with a view to containing Government's operating expenditure to \$200 billion and achieving a balanced budget by the 2008-09 financial year. Despite the need to cut costs across the board, funding for education for 2004-05 would remain largely comparable to that for 2003-04, representing a much lower funding cut for the education sector as compared to other policy areas. He therefore urged members to support the funding proposal for the UGC sector for the 2004/05 academic year, adding that the Administration was well aware of members' concerns and would take these into account in the preparation of the funding proposal for the 2005-08 triennium.

30. Mr Albert CHAN said that he had mixed feelings about the strong objection against the funding cuts for education. He recalled that the proposals for reduction in welfare expenditure and Comprehensive Social Security Assistance were not met with the same opposition from members, albeit the strong protest from the welfare sector. This might be attributable to the political reality that voices from staff and students were taken heed of while those from the underprivileged were not. He said that it was very unusual for FC to refuse a funding proposal which had the support of both UGC and university heads. While it was difficult to decide whether the proposal should be supported or rejected, he would tend to object against the proposal as this might give the Administration a chance to review the situation.

31. Mr Andrew WONG asked whether the present funding proposal (which was for a rollover year and not a triennium year), if rejected or withdrawn, could still be included in the forthcoming budget. The Permanent Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (PSTsy) said that it was necessary to ascertain FC's endorsement of the funding proposal for the 2004/05 academic year before it could be included in the budget for the 2004-05 financial year. As FC had only approved funding for the 2003/04 academic year up to 30 June 2004, the tertiary institutions would not be able to commit any funding for the 2004/05 academic year unless the relevant funding proposal was approved by FC. As to whether partial funding could be sought, PSTsy said that approval had to be sought from FC for the funding proposal covering a full academic year before any funding could be included in the budget for 2004/05.

32. The Chairman put FCR(2003-04)52 to the vote. 23 members voted for the proposal, 31 members voted against and one member abstained. The individual results were as follows:

For :

Mr Kenneth TING Woo-shou
Dr David CHU Yu-lin
Dr David LI Kwok-po
Mr NG Leung-sing
Mr HUI Cheung-ching
Mr Andrew WONG Wang-fat

Mr James TIEN Pei-chun
Dr Eric LI Ka-cheung
Dr LUI Ming-wah
Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-yee
Mr Bernard CHAN
Mr Jasper TSANG Yok-sing

Mr Howard YOUNG
Mr Ambrose LAU Hon-chuen
Dr TANG Siu-tong
Ms LI Fung-ying
Mr Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan
Mr LAU Ping-cheung
(23 members)

Ms Miriam LAU Kin-yee
Mr Timothy FOK Tsun-ting
Mr Abraham SHEK Lai-him
Mr Henry WU King-cheong
Dr LO Wing-lok

Against :

Ms Cyd HO Sau-lan
Ir Dr Raymond HO Chung-tai
Mr Martin LEE Chu-ming
Miss Margaret NG
Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong
Miss CHAN Yuen-han
Mr SIN Chung-kai
Dr YEUNG Sum
Mr LAU Chin-shek
Ms Emily LAU Wai-hing
Mr Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
Dr LAW Chi-kwong
Mr Michael MAK Kwok-fung
Mr LEUNG Fu-wah
Mr Frederick FUNG Kin-kee
Ms Audrey EU Yuet-mee
(31 members)

Mr Albert HO Chun-yan
Mr LEE Cheuk-yan
Mr Fred LI Wah-ming
Mr James TO Kun-sun
Mr CHAN Kwok-keung
Mr CHAN Kam-lam
Mr WONG Yung-kan
Mr YEUNG Yiu-chung
Mr LAU Kong-wah
Miss CHOY So-yuk
Mr SZETO Wah
Mr TAM Yiu-chung
Mr Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Mr WONG Sing-chi
Mr IP Kwok-him

Abstention :

Mr MA Fung-kwok
(1 member)

33. The Committee rejected the proposal.
34. The meeting was adjourned at 11:25 am.