

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(4)1418/14-15
(These minutes have been seen by
the Administration)

Ref : CB4/PL/TP/1

Panel on Transport

**Minutes of meeting held on
Friday, 17 April 2015, at 10:45 am
in Conference Room 3 of the Legislative Council Complex**

Members present : Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon TANG Ka-piu, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, BBS, MH
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP
Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Claudia MO
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

Member attending : Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan

Members absent : Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP

Public Officers attending : **Agenda item III**

Mr YAU Shing-mu, JP
Under Secretary for Transport and Housing

Miss Carrie CHANG
Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and
Housing (Transport) 1

Ms Sophia WONG
Principal Assistant Secretary (School Development)
Education Bureau

Miss Cindy LAW, JP
Deputy Commissioner/Transport Services and
Management
Transport Department

Ms Macella LEE
Assistant Commissioner/Management and Paratransit
Transport Department

Mr Vincent FAN
Chief Transport Officer/Bus & Railway 4
Transport Department

Agenda item IV

Mr YAU Shing-mu, JP
Under Secretary for Transport and Housing

Ms Ivy LAW
Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing
(Transport)3

Mr Eric CHU
Chief Treasury Accountant (Transport)
Transport and Housing Bureau

Mr Alfred LAM
Chief Engineer/Transport Planning
Transport Department

Attendance by invitation : Agenda item IV

Mr WONG Tze-kin
General Manager
Tate's Cairn Tunnel Company Limited

Ms Rowena LEE
Head of Finance & Administration Department
Tate's Cairn Tunnel Company Limited

Ms Donna YIP
Corporate Affairs Manager
Tate's Cairn Tunnel Company Limited

Clerk in attendance: Ms Sophie LAU
Chief Council Secretary (4)6

Staff in attendance : Ms Macy NG
Senior Council Secretary (4)6

Ms Emily LIU
Legislative Assistant (4)6

Mr Griffin FUNG
Legislative Assistant (4)8

Action

- I. Information papers issued since the last meeting**
(LC Paper No. CB(4)752/14-15(01) - Memorandum referring to the Panel the views and concerns raised by Sha Tin District Council members

on the franchises of bus routes in the Sha Tin district

- LC Paper No. CB(4)786/14-15(01) - Memorandum referring to the Panel the views and concerns raised by Sai Kung District Council members regarding the insufficient parking space problem in the Sai Kung District
- LC Paper No. CB(4)785/14-15(01) - Administration's response to Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen's enquiries raised at the meeting on 20 March 2015 on the fare adjustment arrangement for franchised buses)

Members noted the above papers issued since the last meeting.

II. Items for discussion at the next meeting in May 2015

- (LC Paper No. CB(4)763/14-15(01) - List of outstanding items for discussion
- LC Paper No. CB(4)763/14-15(02) - List of follow-up actions)

2. Members agreed to reschedule the next regular meeting from 15 May to 12 May 2015 and discuss the following items –

- (a) Government's response to the "Report on Study of Road Traffic Congestion in Hong Kong" submitted by the Transport Advisory Committee;
- (b) Replacement of tunnel lighting system in the Kai Tak Tunnel;
- (c) Public Transport Strategy Study - Seating capacity of public light buses; and
- (d) MTR fare adjustment for 2015.

In respect of item (d) above, the Chairman said that he would like to invite the Administration and the MTR Corporation Limited ("MTRCL") to attend the meeting and listen to the views of members before the proposed MTR fare adjustment was announced in June. Members agreed with the Chairman.

3. Mr Gary FAN said that the public was surprised to note that the MTR fares would be increased given MTRCL's poor performance. He noted that some Members had urged the Administration to advance the review of MTRCL's Fare Adjustment Mechanism and the Secretary for Transport and Housing had publicly said that the Administration did not object to the proposal, but would need to seek the consent of MTRCL if the review was advanced. He hoped that the Administration would report the relevant progress at the next regular meeting in May 2015.

4. In response to the Deputy Chairman's enquiry about whether the Administration would propose to the Panel on Transport ("the Panel") concrete measures formulated under the Traffic Congestion Study, the Chairman suggested that the Panel could first receive the briefing from the Administration at the next regular meeting.

5. Mr WONG Kwok-hing would like to discuss the following two items:

- (a) Exit package of Jay H Walder, the former Chief Executive Officer of MTRCL; and
- (b) The fatal traffic accident in April 2015 caused by a truck running out of control and hitting a taxi that stopped at a red traffic light in Kowloon Tong.

For item (b) above, Mr WONG considered that the Administration should provide an information paper with the input of relevant parties on the accident; and to advise the Panel measures which would be taken by the Administration to prevent similar accidents in the future.

6. The Chairman said that he would request the Administration to provide a written response in respect of the traffic accident for members' consideration. Subject to the availability of meeting venue, he might convene a special meeting to discuss the exit package of the former Chief Executive Officer of MTRCL. Members agreed.

III. Public Transport Strategy Study - Review on school bus service

- (LC Paper No. CB(4)763/14-15(03) - Administration's paper on Public Transport Strategy Study – Provision of student service vehicle
- LC Paper No. CB(1)238/14-15(07) - Paper on public transport strategy in Hong Kong prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (background brief)
- LC Paper No. FS04/14-15 - Paper on school bus service in Singapore prepared by the Research Office of the Legislative Council Secretariat (fact sheet)
- LC Paper No. CB(4)673/14-15(01) - Letter from Hon TANG Ka-piu on the proposed increase of licences for non-franchised bus (Student Service))

7. At the invitation of the Chairman, Under Secretary for Transport and Housing ("USTH") briefed members on the outcome of the Topical Study under the Public Transport Strategy Study on the supply and demand of student service vehicles ("SSVs") (commonly known as "school buses").

8. Members noted that in view of the community's concern about what appeared to be a rather tight supply of SSVs during the past few years, the Transport Department ("TD") had considered whether the flexibility of SSV supply should be suitably enhanced by: (a) relaxing the sourcing requirement and granting a new endorsement for "solely for student service" with a code of A03R ("Sole SSE") to non-franchised buses ("NFBs"); and (b) relaxing the sourcing requirement for private school buses (i.e. school buses with an endorsement of B01 owned and operated by schools or school sponsoring bodies). USTH advised members that as there had not been any adverse comments during consultation on (b), that proposal would be implemented as soon as possible.

General views

9. Mr Frankie YICK considered that the Administration should not simply grant "Sole SSE" to solve the difficulties faced by schools in inviting tenders for school bus service. He considered that the gist of the problem was insufficient number of students, scattered distribution of students and the increasing number of cross-boundary students, which should be solved by the Education Bureau ("EDB") at root. He added that although some SSVs which were granted "student service" (i.e. A03) endorsement ("SSE") only were financially viable, they were so because of other circumstances. In fact, the cost of procuring a new vehicle with "Sole SSE" would be very high.

10. Mr Frankie YICK further pointed out that unclear requirements in certain tender documents had hindered school bus operators from submitting bids for tenders. To address the problem, he had requested the Public Omnibus Operators Association Limited ("the Association") to design a template specifying the essential information which should be included in the tender documents for use by schools. He also requested EDB to inform all schools to approach the Association when they had difficulties in inviting tenders for school bus service. However, he said that the relevant schools should accept the arrangement that the same school bus would serve a number of schools.

11. Principal Assistant Secretary (School Development) of EDB ("PAS(SD)) said that EDB advised schools to stipulate concrete requirements in the tender documents for school bus service. It was noted that the majority of the tender documents had clearly spelt out the requirements, but the responses to the tendering exercises were still discouraging, with even zero bid. It was hoped that direct communication between the transport trade and the education sector through the ad hoc working group formed for service for the 2015 school year would help clarify the requirements expected of the trade.

12. Mr WU Chi-wai expressed doubts on whether the establishment of "Sole SSE" would solve the problem arising from uneven distribution of students and could relieve the financial difficulties of school bus operators. In his view, the Administration should take measures to solve the problems at root and should not interfere with the market operation. He asked about the justifications of the Administration for not allowing school buses to design their own routes.

13. USTH highlighted that the problem faced by schools in tendering was related to the supply and demand of the service, and the level of school bus fees which parents were willing to pay. He said that the Administration's proposal was to enhance the flexibility of SSV supply in response to the concerns of the

community and the Legislative Council ("LegCo") Members during the past few years. In respect of the financial viability of operating school bus service, the Administration noted that it depended on the size of school buses and the number of students using the service. Deputy Commissioner/Transport Services and Management of TD ("DC/TS&M") supplemented that for A03 endorsement, the operator was required to provide documental proof (such as service contracts) to the Commissioner for Transport to obtain the appropriate service endorsement(s). TD, however, would not regulate the routing of SSV. DC/TS&M further supplemented that there were about 1 900 nanny vans in operation. TD noted that these operators provided service to kindergartens and primary schools and could make several trips per day. She pointed out that the increase in the number of nanny vans in recent years reflected that using a vehicle of an appropriate size for student service only could be financially viable.

14. Mr Gary FAN also attributed the current school-bus problems faced by schools to the relevant Government's policy. He considered that the Administration should formulate policies to avoid the surge in school bus fees, instead of leaving it to the market to determine. He and Dr KWOK Ka-ki expressed concern that only about 70% of NFBs with SSE were actually providing student service. Mr FAN asked whether the Government would mandate those NFBs to accord priority to the provision of student service. He also suggested the Administration to make reference to Singapore and grant NFBs SSE once they met certain safety requirements.

15. USTH said that market force, such as parent's willingness to pay a higher amount of school bus fees, could be one of the incentives to attract those NFBs with SSE to provide student service. He explained that it was legitimate for NFBs with multiple endorsements to provide any of the services concerned. The Government had no authority to mandate NFBs with SSE to only provide student service or provide such service as a matter of priority. As such, TD was proposing to grant "Sole SSE" to NFBs to tackle this situation.

16. Ms Claudia MO hoped that the Administration would listen to the objection views regarding the establishment of "Sole SSE". She asked about the actual number of schools which had difficulties in the tendering exercises for school bus service and their relevant districts.

17. USTH said that the supply and demand of school bus service should ideally be left to the market. If the situation could be improved by enhanced communication between the transport trade and the education sector, there would then be no need for the Administration to pursue the A03R proposal.

He said that the Administration was willing to listen to the views of the relevant stakeholders. PAS(SD) supplemented that as reflected by the Subsidized Primary School Council comprising representatives from schools of 18 districts, schools from all districts had encountered different levels of difficulties in procuring school bus service, some with only one to two bids and others zero bid.

18. Pointing out that the policy of allowing NFBs to hold different endorsements had its historical reasons, Mr Albert CHAN disagreed to grant "Sole SSE" at this stage and considered that the proposal would push up the price of NFB licence. He noted that there were only ten odd schools which had difficulties in the tendering exercises of school bus service and hoped that the trade could solve the problem itself.

19. Mr Paul TSE also considered that TD's A03R proposal might not be able to solve the current problem faced by schools. He hoped that the Administration would thoroughly study the implications of its proposal and duly consult the relevant stakeholders. He was also concerned if a compromise could be reached or not by September 2015 when the new school year would start.

20. USTH said that the Administration was indeed consulting the trade and other stakeholders such as the education sector on how the arrangements with respect to the supply and demand of school bus service could be improved and the granting of "Sole SSE" was one of the proposals.

Working group to explore the arrangements with respect to the supply of and demand for school bus service

21. The Deputy Chairman and Mr WONG Kwok-hing appreciated that representatives of the transport trade and the education sector had set up a working group to actively explore how the arrangements with respect to the supply of and demand for school bus service could be improved for the new school year in September 2015. Nevertheless, they and Mr POON Siu-ping considered that both the Transport and Housing Bureau ("THB") and EDB should actively participate in the relevant discussion. Mr WONG asked about the timetable of the work of the working group. He and the Deputy Chairman also requested the Administration to seriously study the feasibility of the two suggestions raised by the Association in its submission (LC Paper No CB(4)812/14-15(02)), i.e. enhancing the tendering exercises for school bus services and substantially increasing the number of SSE (i.e. A03).

22. USTH said that it was the target of the working group to improve the situation for the new school year starting in September 2015. He said that the exchanges between the transport trade and the education sector had enabled both sides to understand the concerns and difficulties of each other. This would help formulate pragmatic and practical measures. Meanwhile, the Administration would bear in mind the suggestions made by the Association.

23. DC/TS&M supplemented that the working group had just held its first meeting in April 2015 to exchange views and was going to hold its second meeting soon. She said that TD would continue to monitor the progress. PAS(SD) added that EDB had taken part in the exchange of views with schools on the matter. She said that representatives of EDB had also attended the multipartite meeting with THB, TD, LegCo Members, as well as representatives of transport trade organizations and groups of the education sector to exchange views on TD's proposals in late March 2015.

Subsidizing the operation of school bus services or school bus fees

24. The Deputy Chairman and Mr POON Siu-ping expressed concern over the increasing difficulties in operating school bus services. They asked whether the Administration would consider subsidizing the provision of school bus services. The Deputy Chairman asked about the Administration's view on the level of school bus fees which was considered expensive. Mr POON considered that the granting of "Sole SSE" might not be able to address the crux of the problem, which was in part attributed to the education policy.

25. In response, USTH explained that as NFB service was arranged between the operator and the client group direct, the fare for such service was not regulated by the Administration. School bus service was a type of NFB service, and its fare was not regulated.

26. PAS(SD) supplemented that the Government had put in place the Student Travel Subsidy Scheme ("STSS") which provided appropriate assistance to eligible students who were allowed to choose suitable transport modes, including school buses, for home-school travels. Furthermore, school bus was only one of the many means of transport that parents could choose.

27. Mr Frankie YICK, however, said that to his knowledge, the amount of STSS was calculated based on the travelling distance within the same district. It could not address the problem faced by those students who needed to travel to other districts for schooling.

28. Mr Tony TSE considered that TD and EDB should actively coordinate the views of both the transport trade and the education sector, and provide advice to cater for the needs of the two sides. However, he disagreed to provide direct subsidy to school bus operators as this might push up the price of school bus licence. He asked about the measures and roles of TD and EDB in addressing the difficulties encountered by schools.

29. PAS(SD) said that EDB had all along been advising schools to discuss with parents in regard to the design of school bus routes to meet the needs of parents on one hand and keep the school bus fees at a reasonable level on the other. She hoped that the working group would provide a chance for the transport trade and schools to exchange views on the matter. Meanwhile, TD was the licencing authority for vehicles which could be used to provide student service.

30. Dr Helena WONG noted that due to the problem of high school bus fees, some schools were subsidizing their students on the relevant cost. She hoped that the Administration would facilitate those schools which were willing to procure a school bus to provide transport service for their students.

31. USTH advised that the B01 endorsement could cater for the arrangement as suggested by Dr WONG. He stressed that the level of school bus fees should be determined by the market. With an enhanced communication between the transport trade and the education sector, as well as more flexible arrangements on the part of the schools, the cost of operating school bus service might come down.

32. Dr KWOK Ka-ki opined that even if some schools were willing to procure a school bus to serve their students, the schools concerned, in particular those schools with many ethnic minority students, still needed to face the problems of scattered distribution of students and high operating cost. In his view, EDB should provide assistance to those schools accepting ethnic minority students. In addition, the Administration should extend the consultation period of TD's A03R proposal. PAS(SD) responded that EDB was currently providing additional resources for schools admitting non-Chinese speaking students to facilitate student learning.

IV. Application for toll increase by Tate's Cairn Tunnel Company Limited
(LC Paper No. CB(4)763/14-15(04) - Administration's paper on application for toll increase by Tate's Cairn Tunnel Company Limited

- LC Paper No. CB(4)763/14-15(05) - Tate's Cairn Tunnel Company Limited's paper on toll increase application
- LC Paper No. CB(4)763/14-15(06) - Paper on applications for toll increases by Tate's Cairn Tunnel Company Limited prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat (updated background brief)

33. At the invitation of the Chairman, USTH briefed members on Tate's Cairn Tunnel Company Limited ("TCTCL")'s application for an increase in tolls. The General Manager of TCTCL ("GM/TCTC") then made a powerpoint presentation to brief members on the details of the proposed toll increase.

(To allow sufficient time for discussion, the Chairman extended the meeting by 15 minutes.)

General views

34. Ms Claudia MO expressed regret that TCTCL had a shortfall of \$4,057 million cumulative profit as compared with the expected \$5,340 million in the company's base case projection. It seemed to her that TCTCL had been misled when bidding for the franchise. At the same time, she noted that due to big discrepancy of tolls at different tunnels, drivers tended to adopt the cheapest tunnel for travelling. In her opinion, TCTCL should consider freezing or lowering the tolls of Tate's Cairn Tunnel ("TCT") to get a larger share of the market whilst aiming for a small profit margin.

35. Mr WONG Kwok-hing and Mr CHAN Hak-kan also suggested TCTCL to lower the tolls or offer toll concessions for commercial vehicles. Mr WONG explained that this would help attract more traffic volume. He conveyed the suggestion of the Taxi Branch of the Motor Transport Workers General Union ("the Union") that toll concessions should be offered for the return trip of empty taxis. He also expressed the Union's objection to the proposed toll increase for taxis. Mr WONG indicated his disagreement to the proposed toll increase of 11.9% as the magnitude of toll increase had far exceeded the inflation rate. In addition, the toll increase might induce a spate of fare increases by public transport and would not help TCTCL achieve its expected Internal Rate of Return ("IRR").

36. GM/TCTC believed that convenience was a major factor of consideration by drivers over the choice of tunnels. He drew members' attention that TCTCL had already considered the public acceptability and affordability, and the cumulative change in Composite Consumer Price Index ("CCPI") since the last toll increase before applying for the current toll increase. He explained that the weighted average rate of increase, i.e. 11.9%, was even lower than the cumulative change in CCPI since the last toll increase from 1 August 2013 up to end November 2015, which was estimated to be 12.4%. He said that if the tolls of TCT were to be lowered, TCTCL could only make profits provided that there was a significant increase in traffic volume. However, experience showed that the traffic volume would not increase significantly with fare concessions. Nevertheless, he agreed to study the Union's suggestion of offering toll concessions for empty taxis.

37. Mr Gary FAN disagreed with the toll increase application by TCTCL. He explained that the proposed increase of TCT tolls would not significantly increase the IRR of TCTCL but would add burden to TCT's users. Mr POON Siu-ping was also concerned that the toll increase of TCT would become a pretext for bus companies to increase fares.

38. In response, USTH said that the Administration had persuaded TCTCL to pay heed to the public's views and to reduce the magnitude of the toll increase application. As a result, TCTCL had agreed not to increase the tolls for public light buses, and all types of goods vehicles. He added that the tolls of TCT constituted less than 1% of the total operating cost of franchised bus companies. As such, the proposed toll increase at TCT should not create pressure on the franchised bus companies to increase fares. He further pointed out that the major users of TCT were taxis and private cars, followed by goods vehicles which constituted about 17% of TCT's daily total traffic throughput; and that franchised buses only accounted for about 8% of TCT's daily total throughput.

39. In response to Mr POON Siu-ping's enquiry about the changes in annual operating cost of TCTCL, GM/TCTC said that TCTCL had been striving to reduce its cost by implementing a series of environmentally friendly or energy conservation measures. As a result, TCTCL had successfully reduced the electricity cost from \$14 million in 1997-1998 to \$6.12 million in 2013-2014.

40. Dr KWOK Ka-ki remarked that the toll increase of 18% and 15% for taxis and motorcycles respectively were too considerable. He requested TCTCL to shelve the toll increase for these two vehicle types as they were used mainly by the ordinary members of the public. Alternatively, the Administration could consider providing subsidies to them to mitigate the

impact of toll increase. He asked about the amount of tolls collected from these two vehicle types out of the total revenue.

41. GM/TCTC advised that motorcycles accounted for about 2% of the daily traffic throughput of TCT. He stressed that TCTCL had been very modest and had taken into account the distribution of different vehicle categories while deciding on the toll increase. It would be difficult to reduce further the magnitude of toll increase.

42. The Deputy Chairman asked how the Administration could guarantee that TCTCL would not apply for further toll increase any more during the remaining franchise period. He also enquired whether the Administration had ever considered not accepting TCTCL's toll increase application and allow TCTCL to resort to arbitration.

43. USTH said that TCTCL had undertaken not to apply for toll increase any more during the remaining franchise period. He explained that if an agreement on the tolls could not be reached, either party might resort to arbitration. According to the experience of the Eastern Harbour Crossing ("EHC"), the franchisee of EHC applied for a larger toll increase in the arbitration than its original application to the Government and the arbitrators awarded a larger increase as applied. He further said that as there were alternative routes connecting Shatin to the urban areas, the Administration believed that TCT's toll increase would not have a significant impact on drivers.

44. Mr CHAN Kam-lam did not support the proposed toll increase application by TCTCL. He pointed out that TCTCL was providing public service, the company should not let TCT's users bear all the operating cost of TCT; and that TCTCL should bear the risks of not achieving the expected IRR. In his view, given that the tolls of TCT were already higher than that of its alternative tunnels, if the toll increase application by TCTCL was approved, the Administration should guarantee that it would reduce the tolls of TCT after it was returned to the Government in 2018.

45. Mr CHAN Han-pan also indicated his disagreement with the proposed toll increase and was concerned that this would reduce the usage of TCT. He asked whether the Government would consider aligning the tolls of TCT with those of the alternative tunnels after the Government took over TCT upon its franchise expiry.

46. USTH said that the Government would consider a number of factors while determining the toll levels. These factors included the adoption of "user pays" principle, the cost of operating the tunnels, and traffic implications.

47. Mr Albert CHAN disagreed with the proposed toll increase. He noted that due to the development of other traffic infrastructure, the traffic throughput of TCT was not as high as that expected when it was built. Due to this objective factor, he wondered if TCTCL could increase its revenue by increasing tolls. He called on the Administration to establish a Tunnels and Bridges Authority and buy back all tunnels to solve the problems relating to tunnels. The Administration and TCTCL noted his views.

Traffic implications

48. Mr Gary FAN, Mr POON Siu-ping, Mr CHAN Hak-kan, Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Mr Albert CHAN expressed concern over the traffic implications of the proposed toll increase. Pointing out that the current traffic throughput of the Lion Rock Tunnel ("LRT") was far higher than that of TCT, Mr FAN asked about the Administration's measures to rationalize the traffic distribution between LRT and TCT to avoid aggravating the traffic congestion problem at LRT if the tolls of TCT were to be increased. He also asked whether the Administration's assessment was in line with TCTCL's estimation that about 700 vehicles per day would be diverted to LRT with its proposed toll increase.

49. Chief Engineer/Transport Planning of the Transport Department advised that the Administration's assessment of the traffic impact of the toll increase on other alternative roads was in line with that of TCTCL. He added that since both TCT and LRT were very congested during peak hours, traffic diversion between the two tunnels would only take place during non-peak hours.

50. At 12:47 pm, the Chairman informed members that Mr Gary FAN had submitted a motion to him under this agenda item. He explained that since the motion was handed to him during the period of extension of the meeting, the motion could not be dealt with at the meeting according to Rule 24A(f) of the House Rules. Members agreed.

V. Any other business

Report of the Delegation of the Panel on Transport on its duty visit to Singapore to study Singapore's experience in development and provision of public transport facilities and traffic control measures

(LC Paper No. CB(4)799/14-15(01) - Report on the duty visit to Singapore to study its experience in development and provision of public

transport facilities and traffic control measures)

51. The Panel noted the report of the delegation of the Panel on its duty visit to Singapore to study Singapore's experience in development and provision of public transport facilities and traffic control measures. The Chairman said that according to Rule 29A(f) of the House Rules, the report would be submitted to the House Committee. Members agreed.
52. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:55 pm.

Council Business Division 4
Legislative Council Secretariat
20 August 2015