

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. FC66/11-12
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/1/2

Finance Committee of the Legislative Council

Minutes of the 12th meeting
held at the Legislative Council Chamber
on Friday, 25 February 2011, at 5:05 pm

Members present:

Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP (Chairman)
Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, SBS, S.B.St.J., JP
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan
Hon Fred LI Wah-ming, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Margaret NG
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, GBS, JP
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong, GBS
Hon WONG Yung-kan, SBS, JP
Hon LAU Kong-wah, JP
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yee, GBS, JP
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, SBS, JP
Hon LI Fung-ying, SBS, JP
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, SBS, JP
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP

Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH
Hon LEE Wing-tat
Dr Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, SBS, JP
Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, GBS, JP
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, GBS, JP
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, BBS, JP
Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC
Hon CHIM Pui-chung
Hon KAM Nai-wai, MH
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, JP
Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai, BBS, JP
Hon CHAN Hak-kan
Hon Paul CHAN Mo-po, MH, JP
Hon CHAN Kin-por, JP
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun
Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che
Hon WONG Sing-chi
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, BBS
Hon IP Wai-ming, MH
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yea, GBS, JP
Dr Hon PAN Pey-chyou
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun
Dr Hon Samson TAM Wai-ho, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Hon Tanya CHAN
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon WONG Yuk-man

Members absent:

Dr Hon David LI Kwok-po, GBM, GBS, JP
Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP

Public officers attending:

Mr Stanley YING, JP	Permanent Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)
Ms Alice LAU, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) ¹
Ms Elsie YUEN	Principal Executive Officer (General), Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau (The Treasury Branch)
Mr Matthew CHEUNG, GBS, JP	Secretary for Labour and Welfare
Ms Irene YOUNG, JP	Deputy Secretary for Labour and Welfare (Welfare)
Mr W H CHEUK, JP	Commissioner for Labour
Miss Mabel LI	Assistant Commissioner for Labour (Development)
Ms Betty NG Shuk-fong	Senior Labour Officer (Employment Services) (Transport Support Scheme), Labour Department

Clerk in attendance:

Mrs Constance LI	Assistant Secretary General 1
------------------	-------------------------------

Staff in attendance:

Ms Annette LAM	Chief Council Secretary (1)7
Mr Daniel SIN	Senior Council Secretary (1)7
Mr Frankie WOO	Senior Legislative Assistant (1)3
Ms Christy YAU	Legislative Assistant (1)8

Action

Item No. 1 - FCR(2010-11)60 and FCR(2010-11)60A

HEAD 90 – LABOUR DEPARTMENT

Subhead 700 General non-recurrent

New Item "Work Incentive Transport Subsidy Scheme"

The meeting resumed discussion on this item which was carried over from the preceding meeting at 3:00 pm on the same day.

Assessment on impact of WITS Scheme on TSS beneficiaries

2. Mr Ronny TONG said that the household-based income assessment criteria would penalize households with more working members. As the income thresholds for different household sizes were set at too low a level, those households with more members in employment were more likely to exceed the income threshold even though some of these members might only be earning the statutory minimum wage (SMW). Noting with concern that many low-income workers who were currently eligible for the Transport Support Scheme (TSS) would become ineligible for the Work Incentive Transport Subsidy (WITS) Scheme, he questioned why the Administration would not simply extend TSS to all 18 districts rather than implementing the new WITS Scheme. He also queried the rationale behind the Administration's decision of not adopting a dual-track approach for the means test, and asked whether it was due to financial consideration.

3. Secretary for Labour and Welfare (SLW) explained that TSS was a time-limited pilot project. The Administration had drawn from the experience of TSS and taken into account the views of the public in developing a territory-wide WITS Scheme to assist the working poor who had genuine need. SLW reassured the meeting that the design of the WITS Scheme was not intended to save Government's expenditure. As a matter of principle, however, it was incumbent upon the Administration to ensure that public resources were channelled to low-income households genuinely in need. A household-based means test that assessed the overall financial situation of the household was considered more equitable than one that assessed only an individual member's income and assets. He added that the WITS Scheme had no deadline for application and more people would benefit from it than TSS. Moreover, a singleton who satisfied the income and asset limits for a one-member household could also apply for WITS.

4. Mr WONG Yuk-man said that if applying the Taiwan model, Hong Kong's SMW should be set at \$37.5 per hour, as against the current rate of \$28 per hour. He considered that all low-income employees should be

Action

provided, without the means test, with the \$600 transport subsidy, in order to raise their minimum wage level to about \$31 per hour. He added that the Administration should provide the estimated number of TSS recipients who would not qualify for WITS, to enable members to consider the funding proposal. Sharing a similar view, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung urged the Administration to provide the financial implications for adopting a dual-track approach for the subsidy.

5. Mr WONG Sing-chi criticized the Administration for terminating TSS before having evaluated its effectiveness in meeting the employment promotion objective. He said that the Administration should not rush the launch of the WITS Scheme without first assessing how the scheme would impact the existing TSS beneficiaries. He also criticized the Administration for not providing the financial implications if a dual-track approach was adopted. Mr Frederick FUNG expressed a similar view.

6. SLW said that the Administration did not have the necessary information to make an estimation of the additional cost likely to be incurred for adopting a dual-track approach. The Administration was also in no position to estimate the number of TSS recipients who might become ineligible for the new scheme, as TSS applicants needed not provide information about the employment status and income of other household members. The Administration therefore could not estimate how many TSS recipients would apply for WITS.

7. Mr Ronny TONG was dissatisfied with the Administration's response. He said that if the number of TSS recipients who might not qualify for WITS was insignificant, there was no case for the Administration to exclude them from WITS. However, if the household-based means test approach would drive a substantial number of TSS beneficiaries out of the WITS net, this would give rise to the concern whether the WITS Scheme was against social justice. He maintained that the Administration had the responsibility to assess the impact of the new scheme on TSS recipients.

8. Dr Margaret NG referred to a published article in which the author was of the view that a woman, though earning a meagre income, should not be eligible for WITS if the household income exceeded the income threshold. She did not subscribe to the author's view because one objective of providing transport subsidy to low-income workers was to address women poverty by encouraging women to seek employment. She was concerned that the household-based means test requirement of the WITS Scheme would have an adverse impact on grass-root women workers and deprive them of the subsidy.

She queried why the Administration did not adopt a dual-track approach as suggested.

9. SLW explained that the Administration had already relaxed the eligibility criterion to provide a half-rate subsidy of \$300 to qualified applicants who worked for less than 72 hours but at least 36 hours per month. The Administration believed that the relaxed measure would provide a work incentive for part-time workers and benefit more part-time workers, especially female workers and local domestic helpers.

Mid-term review and comprehensive review

10. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung enquired about the scope of the mid-term review. He cautioned against approving the WITS Scheme and doubted whether the Administration would seriously consider members' request for a dual-track approach in the mid-term review.

11. SLW advised that a comprehensive review on the objectives, eligibility criteria, modus operandi and effectiveness of the WITS Scheme would be conducted after the first three years of operation. A mid-term review would also be conducted in the light of operational experience gained during the first year of implementation. He assured members that the Administration would seriously and proactively examine, during its future reviews, whether there was any room for further improvement.

12. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung said that the Administration was misleading FC and the public about the improvements that could be introduced to the WITS Scheme in the mid-term review to be conducted in one year's time. He asked what support would be provided to the working poor and TSS beneficiaries who might be left out of the new scheme.

13. SLW replied that those in need would be provided with assistance through the existing welfare and employment measures such as the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA) Scheme of the Social Welfare Department (SWD) and the Employment Navigator Programme of the Labour Department (LD). TSS beneficiaries who were not eligible for WITS and faced financial or employment difficulties could seek help from SWD or LD as appropriate.

14. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung and Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung criticized the Administration for making empty promises that assistance, such as CSSA, might be available for low-income workers who were not qualified for WITS. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung said that the Administration should not push

low-income employees to the social security net when they could stay in employment with the transport subsidy. He said that with Hong Kong's Gini Coefficient rising to 0.53, which was the highest among advanced economies, the Administration should address the plight of the low-income workers with increased rigor.

15. Dr Priscilla LEUNG asked whether the Administration would synchronize the adjustment of income thresholds for different household sizes and the subsidy rate with SMW during the review of the WITS Scheme.

16. SLW explained that income thresholds under the WITS Scheme and the levels of SMW were not directly linked. The Administration would take into consideration the socio-economic circumstances in determining the adjustments to the subsidy rate and the eligibility criteria of the WITS Scheme.

Definition of "household" and "family"

17. Dr Priscilla LEUNG questioned the rationale of adopting the "household" concept for means test. Noting that "household" meant a unit which constituted person(s) with close economic ties and living on the same premises which included those who shared the provisions for a living, irrespective of their relationship under the law, she doubted whether it was worth the effort to identify and verify the economic ties between unrelated persons living on the same premises. She also asked whether SWD had encountered such CSSA cases in the past.

18. SLW replied that similar to other Government financial assistance schemes, such as CSSA, applicants of the WITS Scheme would be means-tested on a household basis. LD would first consider whether the members in the applying household were core family members. If they were not, LD would then look into their economic links.

19. Mr WONG Sing-chi enquired whether inmates of bedspace apartments or caged hostels would be considered as members of the same household and treated as economically linked. Commissioner for Labour (C for L) replied that these occupants, though living on the same premises, would not be considered as members of the same household in their WITS applications when they did not have close economic ties. In response to Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che's enquiry, C for L confirmed that unmarried siblings would be considered as core family members constituting a household under the WITS Scheme.

Action

20. Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che considered it unfair that under a household-based means test, a low-income earner living with family members with a high pay would be disqualified for WITS. He was concerned that the household-based means test requirement might create conflicts among household members and gave rise to family disputes, thereby destabilizing the society.

21. Sharing a similar view, Mr Frederick FUNG said that it was unfair to low-income earners if they were deprived of the subsidy just because the combined household income had exceeded the specified household income thresholds. He said that these low-income household members might be eligible for WITS if they were allowed to apply on individual basis. Referring to the option for a couple to choose between submitting a joint or separate tax return for the purpose of income assessment, he questioned why applicants for the WITS Scheme were not allowed the choice of undergoing a means test on an individual or household basis.

22. SLW said that the WITS Scheme was a transport subsidy and employment promotion measure and should not be compared directly with the tax assessment options which were designed to reduce tax burden on tax payers. He added that household members who had difficulty providing the necessary information for WITS applications could seek advice from LD.

23. Dr LEUNG Ka-lau pointed out that if one household member had a large personal saving, the whole household would not qualify for WITS under the asset means test even though the household members were earning a low income. He asked whether the Administration, in drawing up the eligibility criteria of the WITS Scheme, would make reference to the legal aid scheme whereby only the combined income of the applicant and his/her spouse would be subject to means test.

24. SLW replied that the legal aid scheme was different from the WITS Scheme. The former was designed having regard to the high cost of litigation, whereas the WITS Scheme was introduced to provide work-related transport support to low-income households and at the same time promote employment.

25. In response to Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che's enquiry regarding fraudulent cases under TSS, C for L said that 32 cases had been referred to the Police for follow-up. Out of these, applicants in four fraudulent cases were convicted, whereas prosecution in respect of two cases was unsuccessful and 10 cases were still under investigation.

Action

26. Mr WONG Sing-chi said that Members belonging to the Democratic Party (DP) would abstain from voting on this item. Although the WITS Scheme would benefit certain low-income households, DP remained of the view that a dual-track approach should be adopted if the scheme were to achieve its purported objective as a form of income subsidy welfare measure. The TSS providing transport subsidy to low-income workers should also be continued as an employment promotion measure to facilitate the unemployed to seek jobs and helped the working poor to stay in employment.

27. Mr TAM Yiu-chung welcomed the territory-wide WITS Scheme which he considered would benefit more low-income earners and those in genuine need. He said that Members belonging to the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong would support the funding proposal so as to kick off the WITS Scheme as early as possible to benefit more low-income workers. Referring to the community concern that some low-income earners who were currently eligible for TSS might be left out from the WITS Scheme, he urged the Administration to review the scheme as early as possible to address the issue.

28. SLW said the Administration would conduct a mid-term review one year after the implementation of the WITS Scheme and would consider changes to improve the Scheme if necessary.

29. Ms Miriam LAU said that the Liberal Party (LP) had all along pressed for income subsidy for low-income households and supported the provision of transport subsidy to help low-income employees to reduce the burden of home-to-work travelling expenses as well as facilitating those in remote districts to take up cross-district employment. Although the proposed criteria of the scheme might drive TSS recipients out of the WITS net, the scheme nonetheless would serve the purpose of both an income supplement and work incentive for low-income families. She was glad that, to address the problem that some TSS beneficiaries might not qualify for WITS Scheme, the Administration had taken on board LP's suggestion of raising the income threshold of two-member households so that more low-income families would benefit. Noting that the Administration would review the scheme in one year's time following implementation, she said that Members belonging to LP would support the scheme although there were still room for further improvement. She said that the scheme should be allowed to operate for a period of time. She also suggested the Administration to consider grandfathering existing TSS recipients so that they would automatically be qualified for WITS.

30. Dr PAN Pey-chyou appreciated that the Administration had, in response to the Federation of Trade Unions (FTU)'s request, raised the income

Action

thresholds for the WITS Scheme and agreed to provide half-rate subsidy to part-time workers who worked less than 72 hours but at least 36 hours per month. He, however, expressed disappointment that a dual-track approach was not adopted for means test. Noting that subject to FC's approval at this meeting, the scheme could not be launched until October this year, Dr PAN sought details of the implementation plan and asked why such a long lead time was required for the implementation.

31. SLW and C for L said that the Administration planned to start receiving WITS applications from October 2011 onwards. For the first round of application, 1 April 2011 would be taken as the effective date for subsidy payment. Applicants could either immediately apply for WITS in October 2011 for the six months from April to September 2011 or submit an application later covering a longer payment period not exceeding 12 months. It took time to set up a new WITS Division, develop the necessary information technology infrastructure to facilitate case processing and guard against abuse, finalize the operational arrangements, and recruit and train staff to perform all operational functions, including receiving and processing applications, handling appeals, effecting subsidy payments, etc. Trial run would need to be conducted to enable staff to familiarize with the operations of the scheme. SLW added that the proposed eight months' lead time for launching the WITS Scheme was already very compressed.

32. The Chairman enquired whether the amount of funding sought would be sufficient if it turned out that there were more people applying and qualified for WITS.

33. SLW said that it was difficult to have an estimate of the take-up rate and the actual number of persons who would benefit from the scheme. Based on the General Household Survey in the second quarter of 2010, the Administration estimated that the proposed further enhancement would bring the total number of potential eligible applicants meeting the household income levels and working hours requirement up to 436 000, representing an increase of 58 500 persons over the previous proposals. Assuming that half of the potential applicants would apply and they were eligible, the Administration estimated that the implementation of the further enhanced scheme would require a non-recurrent commitment of \$4,805 million for the first three years of operation. Additional provision from FC would be sought if the funding was not sufficient to meet the actual demand.

34. Mr Paul TSE said that he supported the funding proposal on the basis that the WITS Scheme, when compared with TSS, would benefit more low-income working poor, and that the Administration had pledged to review

the scheme in one year's time to identify deficiencies for improvement. He said that the Administration should be given more room to experiment with different schemes so as to develop more effective measures to address the problem of working poverty. However, he held the view that the long-term solution for the working poor would be to create more business activities and relocate more business centres to remote areas to provide local employment.

35. Mr CHAN Kin-por and Mr Paul CHAN held the view that the WITS Scheme had evolved into a form of income supplement rather than a work incentive measure to promote employment. They said that they would endorse the funding proposal on the premise of providing support to low-income households so that the scheme could be launched without further delay. They urged the Administration to consider relaxing the asset threshold and to pledge to address members' concerns and suggestions in the mid-term review. Mr CHAN Kin-por suggested that the Administration should rename the WITS Scheme to reflect its nature as an income subsidy scheme while introducing a separate transport subsidy measure.

36. Mr WONG Kwok-kin said that despite the improvements made to the income thresholds for two-member households and the working hour requirement, the further enhanced WITS Scheme had the shortcoming of driving some eligible TSS recipients out of the net. While Members from the FTU would support the funding proposal to kick-start the scheme first, FTU members would continue to press for a dual-track approach. He said that FTU would collect information about actual number of cases where low-income TSS recipients were not qualified for WITS due to the change in application criteria. He requested the Administration to seriously consider the dual-track approach before the mid-term review if a large number of TSS recipients were found to fall out of the WITS net.

37. Mr Andrew CHENG said that despite the enhanced improvements, the WITS Scheme was a retrogressive proposal compared with TSS which assessed only the individual's income and assets. He said that it was absurd that some existing TSS recipients would lose out under the WITS Scheme. He doubted if the Administration would seriously consider the dual-track approach after the funding application was approved. He said that members should keep pressing the Administration to adopt the dual-track approach before approving the funding application.

38. SLW assured members that the Administration would conduct a comprehensive review of the scheme including its objectives, eligibility criteria, modus operandi and effectiveness with experience gained in the first three years

Action

of operation whilst a mid-term review would also be carried out to identify areas of improvement.

39. Mr Albert CHAN criticized that the WITS Scheme could not address the problem of the working poor and that the Administration was misleading members and the public into believing that the scheme could promote employment. He appealed to members to vote against the funding proposal thereby forcing the Administration to reconsider the dual-track approach for means test.

40. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan expressed concern that the Administration had agreed to only review the effectiveness of the WITS Scheme, but made no commitment to consider adopting the dual-track approach in the mid-term review. He strongly requested that two separate schemes, i.e. an income supplement for low-income families and a transport subsidy to encourage employment, should be implemented to assist the working poor.

41. SLW reiterated the Administration's stance that public resources should be targeted at helping those with genuine need. He further advised that there would be a greater risk of abuse and confusion in implementation if applicants were allowed to choose whether to be means-tested on a household or individual basis. He highlighted that the Administration would closely monitor the operation of the scheme and give serious consideration to the views and suggestions raised by members in refining the scheme during the mid-term review.

Motion to adjourn discussion of the funding proposal

42. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung moved a motion to adjourn the discussion of the item under paragraph 39 of the FC Procedure. Mr LEUNG and Mr LEE Cheuk-yan said that the WITS Scheme was a misnomer as it could not encourage employment as its name purported. They were of the view that the scheme could neither alleviate working poverty nor encourage employment and personal saving. They appealed for members' support to adjourn discussion of the item, so as to press the Administration to conduct more thorough public consultation with a view to drawing up well thought-out measures to promote employment, and to enable all existing TSS recipients to continue to receive subsidy.

43. Sharing a similar view, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung maintained that the Administration should assess how the WITS Scheme would impact existing TSS beneficiaries and also to allow applicants the choice of a means test on an individual or household basis. He said that members should not approve the

funding proposal until the Administration had provided the details to facilitate deliberation.

44. The Chairman extended the meeting by fifteen minutes.

45. Mr WONG Sing-chi said that Members belonging to DP supported adjourning discussion of the item because the Administration was unable to address members' concern over the impact of WITS Scheme on TSS recipients, and had not estimated the financial implications of the dual-track approach. He said that putting the funding application on hold would leave the Administration more time to reconsider the proposal.

46. Mr Alan LEONG said that Members belonging to the Civic Party supported the motion to adjourn discussion as the Administration had failed to convince members how the proposed enhanced scheme could promote employment as its title purported, and that the Administration had failed to provide details of how the scheme would affect existing TSS beneficiaries and what assistance would be provided to those TSS beneficiaries who would not benefit from the new scheme. Adjourning discussion on the funding proposal would allow the Administration more time to address the issues.

47. The Chairman put the motion to adjourn discussion on the funding proposal to vote. As requested by Mr LEE Cheuk-yan, the Chairman ordered a division. A total of 53 members voted, with 23 members voted for the motion and 30 voted against. The voting results of individual members were as follows:

For:

Mr Albert HO Chun-yan

Mr Fred LI Wah-ming

Mr James TO Kun-sun

Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung

Mr Frederick FUNG Kin-kee

Mr LEE Wing-tat

Mr Ronny TONG Ka-wah

Ms Cyd HO Sau-lan

Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che

Mr Alan LEONG Kah-kit

Ms Tanya CHAN

Mr WONG Yuk-man

(23 members)

Mr LEE Cheuk-yan

Dr Margaret NG

Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong

Mr Andrew CHENG Kar-foo

Ms Audrey EU Yuet-mee

Dr Joseph LEE Kok-long

Mr KAM Nai-wai

Dr LEUNG Ka-lau

Mr WONG Sing-chi

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung

Mr Albert CHAN Wai-yip

Against:

Ir Dr Raymond HO Chung-tai	Mr CHAN Kam-lam
Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun	Dr Philip WONG Yu-hong
Mr WONG Yung-kan	Mr LAU Kong-wah
Ms Miriam LAU Kin-yee	Mr Timothy FOK Tsun-ting
Mr Tam Yiu-chung	Mr Abraham SHEK Lai-him
Ms LI Fung-ying	Mr Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan
Mr Vincent FANG Kang	Mr WONG Kwok-hing
Mr Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung	Mr Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen
Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming	Mr WONG Ting-kwong
Prof Patrick LAU Sau-shing	Ms Starry LEE Wai-king
Dr LAM Tai-fai	Mr CHAN Hak-kan
Mr Paul CHAN Mo-po	Mr CHAN Kin-por
Dr Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun	Mr WONG Kwok-kin
Mr IP Wai-ming	Mr IP Kwok-him
Dr PAN Pey-chyou	Dr Samson TAM Wai-ho

(30 members)

48. The Chairman declared that the motion to adjourn discussion of the item was negatived.

(At this juncture, some members of the public in the public gallery threw some plastic bottles down. The Chairman appealed to the members of the public to cease such disorderly act. As such disorderly act persisted, the Chairman ordered the removal of this group of members of the public from the public gallery. The Chairman suspended the meeting at 7:10 pm.)

(The meeting resumed at 7.13 pm.)

49. The Chairman put to vote the item FCR(2010-11)60 as modified by FCR(2010-11)60A. As requested by Mr WONG Sing-chi, the Chairman ordered a division.

50. A total of 30 members voted, with all voted for the funding proposal and none voted against. Seven members abstained from voting. The voting results of individual members were as follows:

For:

Ir Dr Raymond HO Chung-tai	Mr CHAN Kam-lam
Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun	Dr Philip WONG Yu-hong
Mr WONG Yung-kan	Mr LAU Kong-wah

Action

Ms Miriam LAU Kin-ye
Mr Tam Yiu-chung
Ms LI Fung-ying
Mr Vincent FANG Kang
Mr Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung
Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming
Prof Patrick LAU Sau-shing
Mr CHAN Hak-kan
Mr CHAN Kin-por
Dr LEUNG Ka-lau
Mr IP Wai-ming
Dr PAN Pey-chyou
(30 members)

Mr Timothy FOK Tsun-ting
Mr Abraham SHEK Lai-him
Mr Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan
Mr WONG Kwok-hing
Mr Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen
Mr WONG Ting-kwong
Ms Starry LEE Wai-king
Mr Paul CHAN Mo-po
Dr Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun
Mr WONG Kwok-kin
Mr IP Kwok-him
Dr Samson TAM Wai-ho

Against:
(0 member)

Abstain:

Mr Albert HO Chun-yan
Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong
Dr Joseph LEE Kok-long
Mr WONG Sing-chi
(7 members)

Mr Fred LI Wah-ming
Mr LEE Wing-tat
Mr KAM Nai-wai

51. The Chairman declared that the Committee approved the funding proposal.

52. The meeting was adjourned at 7:16 pm.

Legislative Council Secretariat
14 March 2012