

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(1)31/05-06

Ref : CB1/SS/9/04

**Paper for the House Committee meeting on 14 October 2005**

**Report of the Subcommittee to Study  
Tate's Cairn Tunnel Ordinance (Replacement of Schedule) Notice 2005 and  
Tai Lam Tunnel and Yuen Long Approach Road Ordinance  
(Replacement of Schedule 1) Notice 2005**

**Purpose**

This paper reports on the deliberations of the Subcommittee to Study Tate's Cairn Tunnel Ordinance (Replacement of Schedule) Notice 2005 and Tai Lam Tunnel and Yuen Long Approach Road Ordinance (Replacement of Schedule 1) Notice 2005.

**Background**

Tate's Cairn Tunnel Ordinance (Replacement of Schedule) Notice 2005

2. In 1988, Tate's Cairn Tunnel Company Limited (TCTC) was granted a 30-year franchise under the Tate's Cairn Tunnel Ordinance (Cap. 393) to build and operate the Tate's Cairn Tunnel (TCT). Under section 36 of Cap. 393, the tolls specified in the Schedule to the Ordinance may be varied by agreement between the Chief Executive (CE) in Council and TCTC, or in default of agreement, by submission of the question of the variation of tolls to arbitration. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) shall amend the Schedule by notice in the Gazette as soon as is practicable after such agreement or arbitration award.

3. After three toll increases in May 1995, November 1996 and January 2000, TCTC applied for the fourth toll increase in October 2000 but subsequently accepted the Administration's request to defer the application given the poor economic conditions at that time. In the following few years, TCTC further deferred its application twice at the Administration's request.

4. In October 2004, TCTC revived its toll increase application. When the proposed toll increase was discussed at the meeting of the Legislative Council (LegCo) Panel on Transport (TP) on 2 February 2005, a motion was passed stating that in view

of the gradually improving financial position of TCTC, the Panel considered it inappropriate to increase the tunnel tolls at that stage.

5. On 7 June 2005, the CE in Council decided that TCTC's application for toll increase should be approved, and that the new tolls should take effect from 1 August 2005. The notice on the new tolls, i.e. the TCT Ordinance (Replacement of Schedule) Notice 2005 (L.N. 93 of 2005), was published in the Gazette on 10 June 2005 and tabled before LegCo on 15 June 2005. At the special meeting of the TP on 15 June 2005, a motion was passed urging the Government to withdraw the notice.

#### Tai Lam Tunnel and Yuen Long Approach Road Ordinance (Replacement of Schedule 1) Notice 2005

6. In 1995, Route 3 (CPS) Company Limited (Route 3 Company) was granted a 30-year franchise under the Tai Lam Tunnel and Yuen Long Approach Road Ordinance (Cap. 474) to build and operate the Tai Lam Tunnel and Yuen Long Approach Road. Under section 39(1) of Cap. 474, Route 3 Company may give effect to a toll increase on each specified date referred to in Schedule 3 to the Ordinance (1 January of 2003, 2010 and 2017). However, under section 40(1), if the Actual Net Revenue (ANR) of the Company for any year, which is not a year ending immediately before a specified date, is less than the Minimum Estimated Net Revenue (MENR) for that year as specified in Schedule 4 to the Ordinance, the Company may advance the toll increase. Under section 45(1), where a toll is increased, the C for T shall by notice published in the Gazette amend Schedule 1 to the Ordinance, which specifies the tolls.

7. After two toll increases in April 2000 and April 2001, Route 3 Company was entitled to effect another toll increase in January 2002 because its ANR for 2000-01 (\$55 million) was lower than the MENR for that year specified in Schedule 4 to Cap. 474 (\$149 million). The Company subsequently agreed to defer the toll increase given the economic conditions at that time. However, it decided earlier this year to effect the toll increase on 19 June 2005. The notice on the new tolls, i.e. the Tai Lam Tunnel and Yuen Long Approach Road Ordinance (Replacement of Schedule 1) Notice 2005 (L.N. 95 of 2005), was published in the Gazette on 10 June 2005. At the special meeting of the TP on 15 June 2005, a motion was passed urging the Government to withdraw the notice.

#### **The two Notices**

8. The TCT Ordinance (Replacement of Schedule) Notice 2005 substitutes the Schedule to Cap. 393 with a new Schedule to reflect the increase of tolls (other than motorcycles and motor tricycles) payable under Cap. 393. A comparison of the toll levels before and after the toll increase on 1 August 2005 is attached in **Appendix I**.

9. The Tai Lam Tunnel and Yuen Long Approach Road Ordinance (Replacement of Schedule 1) Notice 2005 substitutes Schedule 1 to Cap. 474 with a new Schedule to reflect the increase of tolls payable under Cap. 474. A comparison of the toll levels before and after the toll increase on 19 June 2005 is attached in **Appendix II**.

### **The Subcommittee**

10. The House Committee agreed at its meeting on 17 June 2005 to form a Subcommittee to study the two Notices. The Subcommittee first met on 23 June 2005 and Hon LAU Kong-wah was elected Chairman. The membership list of the Subcommittee is in **Appendix III**.

11. The Subcommittee held two meetings to discuss the two Notices with the Administration, and invited TCTC and Route 3 Company to attend one of the meetings.

### **Deliberations of the Subcommittee**

12. Whilst recognizing that the current toll increases for TCT and Route 3 are in compliance with the toll adjustment mechanisms provided in the relevant ordinances, the Subcommittee is gravely concerned whether the toll increases are justified, and the impact of the toll increases on the public and traffic flow. In this connection, the Subcommittee has considered whether and how far LegCo can amend the two Notices.

13. The Subcommittee notes that the TCT Ordinance (Replacement of Schedule) Notice 2005, which was tabled before LegCo, is subject to the negative vetting procedure of LegCo. The scrutiny period of the notice will expire on the day after the second LegCo meeting in the 2005-06 session on 19 October 2005. However, the power of the C for T to make the notice does not cover the determination of toll levels and the timing for implementation of the new tolls. According to section 34(2) of the Interpretation and General Clauses Ordinance (Cap. 1), LegCo's power to amend subsidiary legislation has to be consistent with the power to make such subsidiary legislation. In other words, there is little room for Members to amend the notice other than making minor technical amendments. Similarly, LegCo could not repeal the notice as the exercise of such power is also inconsistent with the power of the C for T to make the notice.

14. As regards the Tai Lam Tunnel and Yuen Long Approach Road Ordinance (Replacement of Schedule 1) Notice 2005 which was not tabled before LegCo, the Subcommittee notes that section 45(3) of Cap. 474 expressly provides that section 34 of Cap. 1 shall not apply in respect of such notice. Accordingly, the notice is not required to be tabled before LegCo and therefore not subject to the scrutiny of LegCo.

15. While LegCo is not in a position to amend or repeal the two Notices, the Subcommittee has examined the justifications for and implications of the toll increases, and how the current toll adjustment mechanisms could be improved. The Subcommittee has also explored measures to enhance the transparency of the franchisees' financial position and performance. In this connection, it has come to the Subcommittee's attention that the Administration has so far not fulfilled the three undertakings made by the then Secretary for Transport (S for T) during the resumption of the Second Reading debate on the Tai Lam Tunnel and Yuen Long Approach Road Bill on 24 May 1995 to enhance the transparency of the franchisee's plans and performance. Details of the Subcommittee's deliberations are summarized in the following paragraphs.

#### Justifications for and implications of the toll increase for TCT

16. Given that TCTC has been making profit since 2000-01, the Subcommittee queries whether the current toll increase is justified. The Subcommittee is advised by the Administration that despite the profits made in the recent few years, TCTC has suffered losses before 2000-01 and has an accumulated loss of \$453.3 million as at 30 June 2004<sup>Note 1</sup>. Moreover, if no toll increase were to be made, TCTC will only achieve an internal rate of return (IRR) of 3.87% which would fall short of a reasonable but not excessive remuneration for such a large-scale and long-term infrastructure investment. Based on the financial data available, it is estimated that even if the current toll increase is effected, TCTC will only achieve an IRR of 4.9%, which is lower than that of 13.02% over the 30-year franchise period as assumed by TCTC in planning its franchise bid in 1988. If there were six further toll increases after the current one, TCTC will be able to achieve an IRR of 7.62%. The Subcommittee is gravely concerned that six or more toll increases will be approved by the Administration in future until TCTC achieves an IRR of 13.02%. The Administration advises that such will not be the case and that each application for toll increase will be considered in the light of the then prevailing circumstances. The achievement of an IRR of 13.02% over the 30-year franchise period was an assumption made by TCTC, and there has not been any agreement between TCTC and the Administration that such an IRR must be achieved within the franchise period.

17. On the current toll increase, members express concern that the 20% toll increase for private cars may impose substantial financial burden on the public and discourage them from using TCT. As a result, motorists may prefer to use Lion Rock Tunnel (LRT), thus aggravating the traffic congestion there. Members query whether the Administration has considered the impact of the toll increase on the general public. In this connection, members note the Administration's view that the magnitude of the toll increase for private cars from \$10 to \$12 is moderate and acceptable, and the traffic implications of the toll increase should be minimal. It is estimated that some

---

<sup>Note 1</sup>

TCTC's financial year-end is 30 June. According to the information provided by the Administration at the Subcommittee's request, TCTC's accumulated loss as at 30 June 2005 is \$343 million. However, this is an estimated figure since the actual profit figure for the year 2004-05 is being finalized and subject to audit.

900 vehicles will be diverted to LRT per day after the toll increase. Members do not consider the 20% toll increase moderate. Given that Cap. 393 has not set out the criteria for determination of toll adjustments by the CE in Council, it is not clear on what basis the Administration has reached a decision that the application for toll increase should be approved. The Administration explains that in reaching its decision, the CE in Council has considered all the relevant factors, including the financial position of TCTC, the magnitude and traffic implications of the toll increase, public acceptability and whether the remuneration of TCTC is reasonable but not excessive, etc. The CE in Council has also taken into account the views of the Transport Advisory Committee and the TP. Members however point out that TCTC's application for toll increase does not have the support of the TP.

18. Some members are of the view that the Administration should resort to the arbitration mechanism under section 36 of Cap. 393, which provides the guiding principle and a number of objective criteria to be considered by the arbitrators. The Administration highlights that as provided under section 36, the arbitration mechanism should only be resorted to if an agreement cannot be reached between the CE in Council and TCTC on the question of variation of tolls. In the current case, as the CE in Council has approved the application, the question of whether to resort to arbitration does not arise.

#### Justifications for and implications of the toll increase for Route 3

19. Noting that Route 3 Company has been making profits in the recent few years, the Subcommittee queries whether the toll increase is justified. The Subcommittee is advised by the Company that despite the profits made since 2000-01, the Company has an accumulated loss of \$381 million and an outstanding bank loan of \$3,653 million as at end of July 2004. Rising interest rates will make the Company's financial position in the coming future far more vulnerable. The Subcommittee however is of the view that apart from the Company's financial position, other factors such as traffic implications and public acceptability, should also be taken into account in considering whether the toll should be increased.

20. On traffic implications, members express concern that the toll increase for Route 3 may have traffic implications on Tuen Mun Road (TMR), thus aggravating the traffic congestion there. Members point out that all along, the TP has expressed concern that after the commissioning of the Hong Kong – Shenzhen Western Corridor in 2006, the existing road network in North West New Territories would not be able to cope with the increased traffic flow, and the traffic conditions in the district would become worse. As such, the TP has repeatedly called on the Administration to take prompt actions to divert traffic from TMR to Route 3. However, the current toll increase may have the effect of diverting traffic from Route 3 to TMR. Members are assured by the Administration that the traffic implications of the current toll increase should be minimal as it is estimated that about 1 000 vehicles would be diverted to TMR or Tolo Highway after the toll increase.

21. The Subcommittee notes that Route 3 Company is required under section 37 of Cap. 474 to submit, not later than 30 days after the end of a year, an audited statement of its ANR for that year to the Secretary for the Environment, Transport and Works (SETW). SETW shall then inform the Company whether or not she is satisfied with the statement. If she is not satisfied with the statement and an agreement cannot be reached by negotiation with the Company in accordance with the terms of the Project Agreement, the matter shall be referred for resolution to an independent expert appointed for the purpose. For the current toll increase, the Subcommittee is concerned what factors and information that SETW has considered before coming to a view that she is satisfied with the Company's 2000-01 ANR statement, and whether she has considered referring the matter to an independent expert for resolution. The Subcommittee is advised by the Administration that upon receipt of the 2000-01 ANR statement, it verified the information according to the requirements set out in Cap. 474 and the Project Agreement. The question of referring the ANR statement to an independent expert did not arise as the Administration was satisfied that the statement was accurately calculated and properly audited.

22. Noting that Route 3 Company's ANRs for 2001-02, 2002-03 and 2003-04 were less than the MENRs for the respective years as specified in Schedule 4 to Cap. 474, the Subcommittee is concerned that the Company may apply to SETW again in the near future to give effect to the next anticipated toll increase. To address the problem once and for all, the Subcommittee stresses the need for the Administration to work out a long-term solution. Given that the MENRs set out in Schedule 4 to Cap. 474 were drawn up ten years ago and may not suit present day circumstances, the Administration is requested to consider whether, and if so, how, Schedule 4 could be amended; and the implications, if any, of the amendments. The Administration points out that the MENRs set out in Schedule 4 to Cap. 474 form part of the agreement between the Government and the Company in awarding the franchise in 1995. The Government cannot propose amendments to the Schedule unilaterally. The Administration would take these issues into account when it discusses with the Company measures to enhance the utilization of Route 3.

23. As the Administration has been negotiating with Route 3 Company for several years on possible measures to enhance the utilization of Route 3 and the idea of extension of its franchise, the Subcommittee urges that a deadline or timetable should be set for the negotiation. The Administration is however of the view that setting a deadline for the negotiation will reduce the Government's flexibility in getting a good deal, which in turn may not be in the best interest of the general public. Given that significant public interests are involved, the Subcommittee considers it essential for the Administration to report progress of the discussion to the TP. As a start, the Administration is invited to report progress to TP before the end of 2005. The Subcommittee is assured that the Administration would report to the TP as much progress as possible, provided that the discussion at the Panel should not compromise the Administration's position in the discussion with the Company.

Transparency of the franchisees' financial position and performance

24. To enhance the transparency of the franchisees' financial position and performance, the Subcommittee is of the view that relevant information, such as actual profit/ANR, should be disclosed to the public. In this connection, members are pleased to note that TCTC has made public such information. As regards Route 3 Company, it has initially provided the Subcommittee with information on its ANRs from 1998-99 to 2003-04 on a confidential basis. Members stress the importance of transparency and that the public should not be deprived of the right of access to such information. They therefore urge the Company or the Administration to make public the relevant information. While the Company has finally agreed to provide more relevant information<sup>Note 2</sup> and to make the information public, the Subcommittee considers that the disclosure should be made on a regular basis to enhance transparency and ensure protection of public interests. In this connection, the Subcommittee notes that during the resumption of the Second Reading debate on the Tai Lam Tunnel and Yuen Long Approach Road Bill on 24 May 1995, the then S for T has undertaken that the Administration would adopt the following steps to enhance the transparency of the franchisee's plans and performance:

- (a) The Administration will require the tabling in LegCo in July each year (before the summer recess) the franchisee's plan as embodied in its three-year rolling projection of net revenue and its annual budget of operating costs, together with a statement;
- (b) The Administration will table in LegCo in October each year the franchisee's annual audited statement of ANR, and will make a statement on that occasion on both the figures and any application for a toll increase; and
- (c) The Administration will brief the TP on the Administration's findings before deciding by the end of October whether a toll increase should be agreed or whether the Administration should proceed to arbitration. Members will then have the opportunity to debate the findings if they so wish.

25. Members express dissatisfaction that the Administration has so far not fulfilled the three undertakings. At the Subcommittee's request, the Administration has examined the matter in detail. The Administration's findings are that during the various stages of a bill's passage through LegCo, it is indeed not uncommon for the Administration to provide clarifications or assurances to address certain concerns raised by Members. In some cases, they are enshrined in the text of the legislation by way of committee stage amendments. As such, they are enforceable through legal

---

Note 2

Route 3 Company has provided information on tolls, toll revenue, average daily traffic and income statement for 1998-99, 1999-2000, 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03 and 2003-04. It has also provided information on the amounts of investment made by its shareholders and bank loan.

means. In some other cases, they reflect the policy intent of the Administration, and can only be implemented with the Administration's best endeavours through administrative means. For this particular case, it appears that the assurances given by the then S for T in 1995 were to some extent not consistent with the provisions of the Project Agreement and Cap. 474, which was enacted on the same date when the undertakings were made.

26. On the first two undertakings mentioned in paragraph 24(a) and (b) above, the Administration points out that under the Project Agreement, the Government may not disclose the financial information delivered by Route 3 Company without its consent. Nonetheless, in the light of LegCo Members' concern, the Administration has been urging the Company to make available more information.

27. As regards the third undertaking mentioned in paragraph 24(c) above, the Administration points out that the toll adjustment mechanism has been enshrined in sections 39 and 40, as well as other provisions in Part X of Cap. 474. The entitlement of Route 3 Company to a toll increase depends entirely on the net revenue and application of the provisions in Part X sections 39 and 40 of the Ordinance. Such entitlement does not depend on the Administration's agreement to the toll increase. On receipt of a toll increase application, the Administration only has two options, i.e. either to inform the franchisee that the toll increase may be effected, or that payment shall be made from the Tai Lam Tunnel and Yuen Long Approach Road Toll Stability Fund. As there is currently no money in the Fund, the Administration can only take the first action. The Administration emphasizes that SETW may, as set out in Cap. 474, agree to an ANR statement, or question it if there are reasonable grounds to do so. It is however not for SETW to decide whether or not to agree to a toll increase application. The Administration also points out that the assurances given by the then S for T refers to "...or whether the Administration should proceed to arbitration....". However, the toll adjustment mechanism as enshrined in Cap. 474 has not provided for arbitration to determine the question of toll increase. The then S for T may possibly be talking about referring disagreements on the ANR statement to an independent expert when he referred to "arbitration".

28. In the light of the above, the Administration finds it impracticable to implement the assurances in the manner suggested by the then S for T. The Administration has to act in accordance with Cap. 474 and the Project Agreement. Notwithstanding the above problems, the Administration points out that it has over the years maintained the practice of informing LegCo when Route 3 Company decides to exercise its entitlement to a toll increase. In the relevant papers for the TP, it has included information on the ANR statement on which the toll increase is based, and LegCo Members may consider debating the matter, if they so wish. In the current toll increase, Members have discussed the matter twice, the first occasion on 15 June 2005 (meeting of TP), and the second on 23 June 2005 (meeting of the Subcommittee). The Administration considers that this is in line with the spirit of enhancing transparency.



29. Members are surprised to note the Administration's view that the assurances given by the then S for T were to some extent not consistent with the provisions of the Project Agreement and Cap. 474, and the Administration finds it impracticable to implement the assurances in the manner suggested by the then S for T. Some members consider this a demonstration of a lack of credibility of the Government. Whilst appreciating the need to comply with the relevant provisions of the Project Agreement and the Ordinance, members consider it important for the Administration to seek to enhance the transparency of the franchisee's financial position and performance, and work out a long-term solution to address the problems caused by the current toll adjustment mechanism and under-utilization of Route 3 so as to ensure protection of the interests of the public. The Subcommittee therefore requests the Administration to continue to liaise with Route 3 Company with a view to fulfilling the undertakings made by the then S for T as far as practicable. The Subcommittee also urges the Company to consider disclosing the required information set out in the first two undertakings made by the then S for T so as to enhance transparency and enable the Administration to fulfil the undertakings.

30. The Subcommittee is advised by Route 3 Company that it appreciates LegCo Members' appeal that there should be more transparency with regard to the Company's financial information and it is willing to comply as far as practicable. However, it considers that a balanced view between transparency of financial information and commercial interest of private investors is important for a society in harmony. The Company has submitted all information as required under the Project Agreement, and has further provided the Company's actual financial information. On the first undertaking mentioned in paragraph 24(a) above, the Company points out that the disclosure of three-year projection and annual budget is neither a general practice for transport operators, nor a statutory disclosure requirement of listed companies. The toll increase mechanism for Route 3 is based on the actual financial position of the Company rather than the budget and projection, which are only estimates of the future and may be subject to the change of market conditions and various other factors. The actual results are the information relevant to LegCo Members and the public. Therefore, the Company considers that it cannot agree to disclose the three-year rolling projection of net revenue and its annual budget of operating costs in LegCo.

31. Nevertheless, Route 3 Company states that it has no objection to allowing the Government to disclose in LegCo in October each year the Company's annual audited statement of ANR and to make a statement on that occasion on both the figures and any application for a toll increase, so as to enable the Government to fulfil the undertaking mentioned in paragraph 24(b) above. Given the Company's reply, the Subcommittee urges the Administration to fulfil the undertaking. The Subcommittee notes the Administration's reply that it is currently examining the Company's audited statement of ANR for 2004-05 and will submit a statement to LegCo when it has completed the assessment. The Subcommittee urges the Administration to fulfil the undertaking fully on a yearly basis.

### Other relevant issue

32. To better protect the interests of the public, a member suggests that the Administration should set up a task force to monitor the toll levels of the various tunnels in Hong Kong, in particular the three road harbour crossings, and to collect views on how the toll adjustment mechanisms could be improved. The Administration points out that toll adjustments for various tunnels are made in accordance with the requirements set out in the relevant ordinances and Project Agreements. Given that on-going discussions are being held between the Administration and the operators of the three road harbour crossings and Route 3 on any possible improvements to the existing toll adjustment mechanism, the Administration does not see the need for the setting up of a task force as suggested.

### **Way Forward**

33. In view of the limited power which LegCo can exercise in respect of the two Notices, the Subcommittee decides that it should conclude its deliberations. It however urges the Administration to take the following actions:

- (a) To report to the TP before the end of 2005 the progress of its discussion with Route 3 Company on possible measures to enhance the utilization of Route 3 and the idea of extension of its franchise; and
- (b) To fulfill the undertaking mentioned in paragraph 24(b) above fully on a yearly basis and to continue to urge Route 3 Company to provide as much relevant information as possible.

34. The Subcommittee also recommends that the TP should continue to follow up on the related issues.

### **Advice sought**

35. The House Committee is invited to note the deliberations of the Subcommittee.

## Tate's Cairn Tunnel

**Comparison of the toll levels  
before and after the toll increase on 1 August 2005**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Vehicle</b>	<b>Toll (\$) (as from 1 August 2005)</b>	<b>Toll (\$) (before 1 August 2005)</b>
1.	Motorcycles, motor tricycles	10	10
2.	Private cars, electrically powered passenger vehicles, taxis	12	10
3.	Public and private light buses	18	17
4.	Light goods vehicles and special purpose vehicles of a permitted gross vehicle weight not exceeding 5.5 tonnes	18	17
5.	Medium goods vehicles and special purpose vehicles of a permitted gross vehicle weight of or exceeding 5.5 tonnes but not exceeding 24 tonnes	23	20
6.	Heavy goods vehicles and special purpose vehicles of a permitted gross vehicle weight of or exceeding 24 tonnes but not exceeding 38 tonnes	23	20
7.	Public and private single-decker buses	24	20
8.	Public and private double-decker buses	26	20
9.	Each additional axle in excess of 2	15	13

**Tai Lam Tunnel and Yuen Long Approach Road**

**Comparison of the toll levels  
before and after the toll increase on 19 June 2005**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Vehicle</b>	<b>Toll (\$)*</b> <b>(as from 19 June 2005)</b>	<b>Toll (\$)</b> <b>(before 19 June 2005)</b>
1.	Motorcycles, motor tricycles	25 (17)	20 (17)
2.	Private cars, electrically powered passenger vehicles, taxis	30 (25)	25 (22)
3.	Public and private light buses	75 (75)	60 (60)
4.	(a) Light goods vehicles and special purpose vehicles of a permitted gross vehicle weight not exceeding 5.5 tonnes	75 (28)	60 (25)
	(b) In a vehicle specified in paragraph (a), each additional axle in excess of 2	35 (0)	30 (0)
5.	(a) Medium goods vehicles and special purpose vehicles of a permitted gross vehicle weight exceeding 5.5 tonnes but not exceeding 24 tonnes	85 (35)	70 (35)
	(b) In a vehicle specified in paragraph (a), each additional axle in excess of 2	35 (0)	30 (0)
6.	(a) Heavy goods vehicles and special purpose vehicles of a permitted gross vehicle weight exceeding 24 tonnes	105 (40)	90 (40)
	(b) In a vehicle specified in paragraph (a), each additional axle in excess of 2	35 (0)	30 (0)
7.	Public and private single-decked buses	75 (75)	60 (60)
8.	Public and private double-decked buses	90 (90)	75 (75)

\* Tolls in brackets are the actual concessionary tolls.

研究《2005年大老山隧道條例(替換附表)公告》及  
《2005年大欖隧道及元朗引道條例(替換附表1)公告》小組委員會  
Subcommittee to Study  
Tate's Cairn Tunnel Ordinance (Replacement of Schedule) Notice 2005 and  
Tai Lam Tunnel and Yuen Long Approach Road Ordinance  
(Replacement of Schedule 1) Notice 2005

委員名單  
Membership List

<b>主席</b> <b>Chairman</b>	劉江華議員, JP	Hon LAU Kong-wah, JP
<b>委員</b> <b>Members</b>	何俊仁議員	Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
	周梁淑怡議員, GBS, JP	Hon Mrs Selina CHOW LIANG Shuk-ye, GBS, JP
	劉健儀議員, GBS, JP	Hon Miriam LAU Kin-ye, GBS, JP
	鄭家富議員	Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
	張宇人議員, JP	Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, JP
	陳偉業議員	Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
	王國興議員, MH	Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH
	李永達議員	Hon LEE Wing-tat
	梁國雄議員	Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
	湯家驊議員, SC	Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC
	(總數：11位委員) (Total : 11 members)	
<b>秘書</b> <b>Clerk</b>	陳美卿小姐	Miss Salumi CHAN
<b>法律顧問</b> <b>Legal Adviser</b>	馮秀娟女士	Ms Connie FUNG
<b>日期</b> <b>Date</b>	2005年6月23日 23 June 2005	