

立法會 *Legislative Council*

LC Paper No. CB(1)1031/15-16

Ref : CB1/PL/HG

Report of the Panel on Housing for submission to the Legislative Council

Purpose

This paper gives an account of the work of the Panel on Housing ("the Panel") during the 2015-2016 Legislative Council session. It will be tabled at the meeting of the Council on 29 June 2016 in accordance with Rule 77(14) of the Rules of Procedure of the Council.

The Panel

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

3. The Panel comprises 25 members, with Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun and Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen elected as Chairman and Deputy Chairman respectively. The membership list of the Panel is in **Appendix II**.

Major work

Excess lead in drinking water in public rental housing estates

4. In mid-2015, drinking water samples taken from some public rental housing ("PRH") estates were found to contain lead that exceeded the World Health Organization ("WHO")'s provisional guideline value¹. From July to September 2015, the Hong Kong Housing Authority ("HA") conducted water sampling tests covering all PRH developments. Excess lead was found in water samples taken from 11 PRH developments².

¹ The provisional guideline value of WHO's "Guidelines for Drinking-water Quality" (2011) is 10 micrograms per litre for lead in drinking water.

² The 11 PRH developments includes the Kai Ching Estate, Kwai Luen Estate (Phase 2), Wing Cheong Estate, Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate (Phase 1), Shek Kip Mei Estate (Phase 2), Hung Hom Estate (Phase 2), Tung Wui Estate, Yan On Estate, Choi Fook Estate, Un Chau Estate (Phases 2 and 4), and Ching Ho Estate (Phase 1).

5. To investigate into the "lead-in-drinking-water" incidents, the Development Bureau established a Task Force on Excessive Lead Content in Drinking Water ("the Task Force"), and HA formed a Review Committee on Quality Assurance Issues Relating to Lead in Fresh Water of Public Housing Estates ("the Review Committee"). A Commission of Inquiry ("CoI") was also set up on 13 August 2015 under the Commissions of Inquiry Ordinance (Cap. 86) to investigate into the matter.

6. The Panel was gravely concerned about the incidents. It discussed the incidents with the Administration on 2 November 2015 and 1 February 2016.

Source of excess lead in tap water

7. Members noted the Task Force's conclusion that leaded solder joints installed in the inside service were the cause of excess lead in drinking water in Kai Ching Estate and Kwai Luen Estate (Phase 2). Members also noted the Review Committee's view that the "lead-in-drinking-water" incidents were, to a large extent, caused by a "lack of awareness" in the industry as well as within HA and the Housing Department ("HD").

Measures to assist affected tenants

8. Members stressed the need for ensuring temporary water supply and its quality to the affected PRH estates. Some members suggested that the Administration should install lead-reducing water filters for affected tenants. Members also urged the Administration to replace sub-standard water taps/pipes of the affected PRH estates as soon as practicable.

9. The Administration advised that for PRH estates where water samples were found to contain excess lead, HD and the Water Supplies Department had arranged for temporary water supply, including the supply of bottled water and the installation of temporary water tanks and pipes outside each block. Connection pipes had also been extended from the roof-top water tanks to each floor of the building, and lead-reducing water filters had been installed for the affected tenants. HA announced on 2 March 2016 that the four contractors concerned³ would replace non-compliant water pipes in the common areas in the 11 PRH developments with excess lead in water starting from 14 March 2016. HA further advised on 9 March 2016 that the four contractors had started to change or clean the filter cores for the affected tenants.

³ The four contractors concerned are China State Construction Engineering (Hong Kong) Limited, Paul Y General Contractors Limited, Shui On Building Contractors Limited and Yau Lee Construction Company Limited.

10. Following the incidents, the Department of Health had provided free blood tests for the more easily affected groups, namely infants, young children under six years of age, pregnant women and lactating women, and developed care plan for tenants and arranged for development assessment on children whose blood lead level exceeded the reference value⁴. In response to members' request, the Administration announced on 3 August 2015 that the scope of free blood tests would be extended to cover children who were under eight years old when moving into the concerned PRH estates.

11. Some members opined that counselling and emotional support should be provided to affected tenants by setting up one-station service counters at the PRH estates concerned and stationing social workers thereat. Some members requested the Administration to waive the water charges and/or rentals of the households concerned for a certain period of time and pay the medical expenses for the affected tenants with an elevated blood lead level. HA announced on 11 November 2015 that from 1 January 2016, tenants in 11 PRH developments in which excess lead in drinking water had been found would receive a subsidy amount of \$660 for offsetting part of the water charges and sewage charges payable. The subsidy involved some \$20 million and would be provided by the four building contractors concerned.

Long Term Housing Strategy

12. The Panel received a briefing by the Administration on the Long Term Housing Strategy ("LTHS") Annual Progress Report 2015 at the meeting on 4 January 2016.

13. The Panel noted that the Government adopted a total housing supply target of 460 000 units for the ten-year period from 2016-2017 to 2025-2026, as opposed to the target of 480 000 units for the ten-year period from 2015-2016 to 2024-2025 announced in December 2014. With a public-private split of 60:40, the public housing supply target would be 280 000 units, comprising 200 000 PRH units and 80 000 subsidized sale flats, whereas the private housing supply target would be 180 000 units.

14. Some members sought justification for the downward adjustment of the housing supply target. In view of the large number of applicants for PRH, members sought the Administration's assurance that the supply target for public housing would not be reduced further.

⁴ The reference value of blood lead level for the more easily affected groups is 5µg per deciliter ("dL"), and is 10 µg/dL for adults aged 18 or above.

15. The Administration explained that the updating of housing supply target for 2016-2017 to 2025-2026 was mainly due to the need to take into account the latest domestic household projection published by the Census and Statistics Department in September 2015, which indicated that the net increase in the number of households was less than previously projected. The Administration assured members that the supply target of PRH units for the coming 10 years would remain unchanged.

16. Noting that the Administration had identified land for the construction of about 255 000 public housing units for the ten-year period from 2016-2017 to 2025-2026, some members cast doubt on whether the Administration could secure the land required for producing the remaining 25 000 units. Some other members held the view that the Administration should introduce measures to speed up processing rezoning and planning applications. Concern was also raised about the impact of judicial review cases on public housing production.

17. The Administration advised that production of several thousand public housing units were currently put on hold due to the judicial reviews on the proposals to amend the relevant Outline Zoning Plans. Notwithstanding this, the Administration would spare no efforts in consulting local communities and addressing their concerns in order to secure their support for public housing developments.

Housing-related initiatives in the 2016 Policy Address and Policy Agenda

18. The Panel received a briefing by the Secretary for Transport and Housing on the new and ongoing housing-related initiatives in the Policy Address at its meeting on 1 February 2016.

Public housing construction

19. Members in general expressed concern on the availability of land, manpower and financial resources which were critical for taking forward the public housing initiatives. According to the Administration, land for public housing developments for the second five-year period of the coming 10 years was less certain as the majority of the sites identified were not "spade-ready" and required rezoning and planning applications. To cope with the shortage of construction workers, the Labour Department would liaise with HA regarding contractors' applications to the Labour Advisory Board to import workers as and when necessary. As for financial resources, upon further injection in December 2015, the Housing Reserve now stood at about \$74 billion.

Average waiting time

20. In view that the latest average waiting time ("AWT") for general applicants (i.e. family and elderly one-person applicants) of PRH had risen to 3.6 years as at end-September 2015, some members considered it important for the Administration to introduce measures to restore the AWT to three years, and to inform PRH applicants their approximate waiting time at the time of application.

21. The Administration pointed out that due to an increasing number of PRH applicants and the time required for identifying land for public housing production, HA had found it increasingly difficult to meet the target of providing first flat offers to general applicants at around three years on average. HA would consider reviewing the presentation of information related to the waiting time to help applicants better understand the relevant situation.

Tenancy control and rent subsidies

22. Some members reiterated their request for the Administration to reinstate rent control to protect tenants of subdivided units and to grant rent subsidies to those on the Waiting List for PRH for a certain number of years. The Administration emphasized that the most effective way to address the housing needs of the inadequately-housed households was to increase the supply of public housing, and that introducing other short-term measures, such as rent control and rent subsidies, might be counter-productive in the midst of tight housing supply.

Public Housing Construction Programme

23. As the production of PRH involves a number of factors such as planning, construction and resource allocation, HA has put in place a Public Housing Construction Programme ("PHCP") which rolls forward on a yearly basis. The Panel continued to monitor the progress, and discussed PHCP for 2015-2016 to 2019-2020 at the meeting on 2 November 2015.

24. The Panel noted that according to HA's rolling PHCP, there would be about 93 300 new PRH flats produced for the five-year period from 2015-2016 to 2019-2020. Some members cast doubt on HA's ability to meet the target in view of the unsatisfactory progress made so far. They asked whether the Administration would adjust downward the ten-year public housing supply target having regard to the current progress. Also, some other members expressed concern on whether "spade ready" sites had been secured for public housing projects estimated to be completed in 2020-2021 and beyond.

25. The Administration advised that about 30 public housing projects were expected to be completed in 2020-2021 or beyond. Most of the sites identified for such projects were however not "spade ready". The pace of housing production hinged essentially on the timely availability of "spade ready" sites, and the Administration would endeavor to enhance inter-departmental coordination to provide the sites required and to take forward the projects expeditiously.

Application for public rental housing

Review of income and asset limits for public rental housing

26. Under the existing policy, eligibility of PRH applicants is determined by way of income and asset limits which are reviewed annually. The Panel examined the results of the Administration's annual review of the income and asset limits for PRH for 2016-2017 at its meeting on 7 March 2016.

27. Some members expressed concern that with an increase in income and asset limits, more people would become eligible for PRH, resulting in further lengthening of the waiting time of non-elderly one-person applicants under the Quota and Points System ("QPS"). The Administration explained that in light of the limited PRH resource, it was the policy of the Government and HA to accord priority to general applicants over non-elderly one-person applicants in the allocation of PRH units. That said, refinements had been introduced to QPS since February 2015 to give priority to older applicants who might have relatively limited upward mobility.

28. On some members' concern that the inclusion of the Consumer Price Index ("CPI(A)") (net of housing cost) in the assessment of income limit could not reflect the cost of living accurately, the Administration advised that since 2013, the Administration had made reference to the latest movement in CPI(A) (excluding housing cost) or the change in the nominal wage index, whichever was higher, as the income factor in adjusting the non-housing cost component in the review.

Issues relating to old application forms for public rental housing

29. The Panel discussed with the Administration on 6 June 2016 about the cases concerning the cancellation of PRH applications by HA for reason of applicants' failure to declare their insurance schemes in the application forms.

30. The Panel noted with concern that as insurance scheme was not specifically mentioned as an asset item to be declared in the old version of the PRH application form, it was unreasonable for HA to cancel the applications concerned. Some members were against HA's decision to cancel applications in which the omission of declaration would not affect the eligibility of the applicants concerned practically since even if the relevant schemes had been

declared, the inclusion of the their value would not result in the applicants exceeding the required asset and income limits. These members considered it grossly unfair to applicants who had been waiting for PRH for years only to be told that they had failed to make proper declarations at the outset and they might even be liable for prosecutions. They requested HA to remove the legal liability of the applicants concerned for the inadvertent omission in the declaration, and to reinstate such applications. Members also urged the Administration to review the mechanism in processing PRH applications, including verifying applicants' eligibility before placing them on the Waiting List, and to make clear to applicants whether various insurance schemes and the contributions made to the Mandatory Provident Fund Scheme should be duly declared in the application for PRH.

Management and maintenance of public rental housing estates

Marking Scheme for Estate Management Enforcement in Public Housing Estates

31. The Panel continued to monitor HA's implementation of the Marking Scheme for Estate Management Enforcement in Public Housing Estates ("the Marking Scheme") and received an update at its meeting on 6 June 2016.

32. Members reiterated their views that an individual who committed the misdeeds under the Marking Scheme should be held liable and be punished accordingly but this should not affect the rights of other family members to continue to live in the PRH unit. There was a view that eviction of the family member who committed the misdeeds would effectively prevent that family member from committing the misdeeds again.

33. The Administration explained that allocation of PRH units was on a household and not individual basis. According to HA's terms of tenancy, tenants were required to take responsibility for their own actions and those of their household members. The Administration stressed that the purpose of the Marking Scheme was not to terminate tenancies but to change the behavior of the tenants who committed the misdeeds, and family pressure and education would be more effective ways to deal with the issue.

34. Pointing out that guide dogs should start to be trained when they were puppies, some members called for the Administration to allow guide dog puppies that had been registered with the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department to live with their hosts or trainers living in PRH. The Administration advised that as there was a strong call from PRH tenants for disallowing dog-keeping, it had to strike a balance between maintaining the living environment of PRH and containing dog-keeping to cases with truly justifiable grounds.

Drainage Ambassador Scheme

35. HA launched the Drainage Ambassador Scheme ("the Scheme") in 2003 as a one-off comprehensive inspection and repair of drain pipes in all PRH units. The Panel received a briefing by the Administration on the implementation of the Scheme at its meeting on 4 January 2016.

36. Noting that some tenants of Yau Oi Estate had complained about persistent odour in their toilets and found out that cast iron drain pipes were still in use for the Estate, members enquired if a timetable was in place to replace such pipes by unplasticized polyvinyl chloride ("uPVC") pipes in all PRH estates. Some other members expressed concern on the provision of W-trap system in PRH estates and the public education in place to remind tenants to flush the floor drain with diluted bleaching agent to prevent floor traps from drying up.

37. The Administration explained that odour in toilets was commonly caused by ageing of horizontal branch pipes. An exercise, tying in with the Total Maintenance Scheme ("TMS") inspection cycle and expected to be completed in six years, was being conducted to systematically replace cast iron branch pipes by uPVC branch pipes for PRH estates aged above 30 years. Pipe replacement would be carried out for cases complaining odour even for estates aged below 30 years. As regards provision of W-trap system, the Administration advised that such system was limited by the design of existing PRH estates. Design enhancements had however been made to connect household wash basins to sewage pipes to prevent drying up of floor traps.

Provision of Interim Housing

38. At its meeting on 10 May 2016, the Panel was briefed on the Administration's latest planning of Shek Lei Interim Housing ("IH"). According to the Administration, the vacancy rate of Shek Lei IH was about 60% as at the end of December 2015 whereas Po Tin IH in Tuen Mun, which provided about 3 200 units, could effectively meet the demand of IH in case of disasters. Given the construction of PRH could address the housing needs of low-income households in the long term effectively, HD was studying to convert Shek Lei IH for PRH development, and discussions with relevant departments were ongoing.

39. Members in general ascribed the high vacancy rate of IH to the stringent admission requirements. They considered it most undesirable to remove IH in the urban and extended urban districts and admit victims of natural or man-made disasters to Po Tin IH, as it would cause hardships to those who worked and went to school in the urban and extended urban districts. The Panel passed a motion at the meeting requesting HA to, in the redevelopment of the IH blocks of Shek Lei Estate, properly rehouse the existing tenants and reserve some of the units for use as IH after redevelopment.

Issues relating to the retail facilities divested to The Link Properties Limited by the Hong Kong Housing Authority

Conversion of Tin Yiu Market into shopping complex

40. The Panel noted with grave concern the plan of the Link Asset Management Limited ("Link") for converting Tin Yiu Market into a shopping complex. The Panel decided to invite representatives of the Administration and Link to its meeting on 7 December 2015 to discuss the matter. Link declined the invitation. The Panel also conducted a visit to Tin Yiu Estate on 1 February 2016 to evaluate the impact posed by the conversion plan.

41. Members criticized Link for failing to consult the Government of its conversion plan which would seriously affect the market service currently available to the residents of Tin Yiu Estate. Members also expressed dissatisfaction over HA's failure to honour its undertaking made during the divestment exercise to take measures to regulate the continued provision of services to residents.

42. The Administration advised that in July 2005, the Court of Final Appeal affirmed that the divestment by HA of its retail and car-parking facilities was consistent with HA's object "to secure the provision of housing and such amenities ancillary thereto as the Authority thinks fit" as laid down in section 4(1) of the Housing Ordinance (Cap. 283). Even though the provision of retail and car-parking facilities might be considered by HA as necessary, the facilities could be provided by a third party over whom HA did not have control. As a private entity, Link had sole discretion on how it should respond to market demand.

43. The Panel passed two motions at the meeting condemning Link for declining the Panel's invitation to the meeting, opposing the closure of Tin Yiu Market by Link without consulting the residents, and requesting HD to increase the number of commercial units in Tin Yiu Estate and consider the use of temporary stalls to provide services to residents.

44. The Administration pointed out that there were markets managed by Link, those managed by HA as well as commercial facilities operated by private entities available in Tin Shui Wai. A new market would also be provided along with the new subsidized housing development south to the Tin Yiu Estate. The availability of vacant land in the vicinity of existing public housing estates in Tin Shui Wai for setting up of bazaars was in question.

Suggestion to increase the number of commercial units and set up holiday bazaars in public rental housing estates

45. Following the motions passed on 7 December 2015 in relation to Link's plan to convert Tin Yiu Market into a shopping complex, the Panel pursued the suggestion of increasing the number of commercial units and setting up holiday bazaars in PRH estates with the Administration at the meeting on 10 May 2016.

46. According to the Administration, setting up bazaars at PRH estates would need to have regard to factors such as environmental hygiene problems, obstruction of public passage, nuisances to residents and the risk of drawing in illegal hawkers.

47. Members were unconvinced of the Administration's viewpoints. They held the common view that holiday bazaars provided foods and goods at prices more affordable to PRH tenants without causing prolonged nuisance to the estates as they would operate during public holidays only. The constraints as cited above could be tackled through administrative means upon coordinating inter-departmental efforts. The Panel passed a motion urging HD to expeditiously increase the number of commercial units and set up holiday bazaars in PRH estates so as to counteract Link's monopoly.

Issues concerning excessive charges imposed on operators of welfare and education facilities operating in a shopping centre in a public rental housing estate

48. The Panel was concerned about the incident regarding non-profit-making organizations operating at premises subject to Welfare Letting Covenant ("the Covenant") in Kwong Tin Estate and Choi Ha Estate being asked to pay management fee. On the request of the Panel, the Administration briefed members on the relevant issue at the meeting on 10 May 2016.

49. Members expressed concern that with Link kept disposing of its retail facilities divested by HA, similar incidents concerning non-profit-making organizations being imposed additional charges might happen again. They sought clarification on whether new owners of facilities sold by Link could charge fees other than the Concessionary Rent from non-profit-making organizations nominated by the Nominating Authorities.

50. The Administration pointed out that the assignment deeds signed between HA and The Link Properties Limited for the divested commercial facilities contained certain restrictive covenants, including the Covenant. The Covenant required that the owners of the facilities concerned, including The Link Properties Limited and any successors in title, should let out certain designated commercial units at certain rent levels to non-profit-making

organizations nominated by the Nominating Authorities. Following the disposal of the commercial facilities concerned by Link, HD issued letters to the new owners of the welfare premises in Choi Ha Estate and Kwong Tin Estate to set out the requirements of the Covenant and requested their compliance. HD would continue to monitor compliance with the requirements of the Covenant, and would take appropriate action in the event of non-compliance.

Work of the Sales of First-hand Residential Properties Authority

51. The Residential Properties (First-hand Sales) Ordinance ("the Ordinance") came into full implementation on 29 April 2013 and the Sales of First-hand Residential Properties Authority ("SRPA") was established to implement the Ordinance. The Panel was briefed on the latest work of SRPA on 10 May 2016.

52. Pointing out that the coverage of important information in printed advertisements of first-hand residential properties was in general too small to draw the attention of readers, some members asked if SRPA would consider making it mandatory that such information be made reasonably conspicuous to readers. Some other members, however, were concerned whether the existing requirements on advertisements were too stringent for the trade to comply with.

53. SRPA advised that the Ordinance stipulated the fonts used for printed advertisements of various sizes and required that the coverage of important information should be at least 30% of the full advertisement. It was noted that vendors had made good efforts to comply with the requirements.

54. Some members held the view that SRPA should act in line with Consumer Council's practice of making public the details of the complaint cases which had been referred to the Department of Justice for consideration of initiating prosecution action or cases that warranted attention of prospective purchasers.

55. SRPA advised that the proposal would give rise to legal implications. In fact, for situations involving suspected contraventions of the Ordinance and would possibly affect prospective purchasers' interest seriously, SRPA would, apart from instigating investigations, alert prospective purchasers of the situations concerned through the media in the first instance. SRPA had mentioned specifically the names of the developments/phases concerned in those reminders as and when necessary.

Work of the Hong Kong Housing Society

56. In view of the tight housing supply, the Government had been actively exploring ways to increase the supply of subsidized housing through engaging different organizations including the Hong Kong Housing Society ("HS"). At the Panel meeting on 4 January 2016, HS was invited to discuss with members its senior citizen residences scheme, subsidized sale flats projects, and mechanism for rental adjustment of its rental estates.

57. Noting that HS had completed The Tanner Hill project in October 2015 which provided flats to elderly aspiring a high living standard, members shared the view that HS should attend to the wider needs of the community by concentrating its business on rental housing and subsidized sale housing. HS assured members that HS would keep focusing on the provision of rental housing and subsidized sale housing as well as the redevelopment of aged rental estates.

58. Members also expressed concern on HS upcoming rental adjustment which was reviewed every two years. Members requested HS to set the rental increase, if any, at a rate lower than that of the inflation rate. Some members urged HS to introduce rent assistance comparable to that currently provided by HA.

59. HS explained that rental adjustment was made based on operating costs so that rental income could cover the recurrent management expenses, tenancy administration costs, rents and rates; and provision for major improvement works, repair and maintenance. Tenants' ability to afford rent and economic situation would also be considered in determining rental adjustment. The percentage of HS's past rental increments was in fact all lower than that of HA. As regards suggestion of introducing rent assistance, HS advised that various resources were currently available in the community that rendered appropriate assistance for households with financial difficulties. Given the fact that the rental level of HS's estates was as low as 24% of the market rates, providing rental assistance would mean an additional subsidy to tenants.

Other issues

60. In the session, the Panel deliberated various housing issues such as security concerns arising from the metal gates of PRH units. The Panel also received an update on the performance of HA in respect of its environmental targets and initiatives in 2014-2015 and TMS for PRH estates.

61. The Panel has scheduled another meeting on 29 June 2016 to discuss the 2016 rent review of PRH, water pressure in PRH units, and the performance of the environmental targets and initiatives of HA in 2015-2016.

62. During the session, the Panel was consulted on the following Public Works Programme items and staffing proposals –

- (a) community facilities and infrastructure to support public housing development at Northwest Kowloon Reclamation Site 6, Sham Shui Po;
- (b) infrastructure works for development at Lin Cheung Road, Sham Shui Po and Queen's Hill, Fanling;
- (c) infrastructure, community and transport facilities to support public housing developments at Sham Shui Po, Kwun Tong and Tuen Mun; and
- (d) creation of one supernumerary Chief Engineer post in Civil Engineering Development Department, and one permanent Chief Estate Surveyor post and one permanent Chief Housing Manager post in Housing Department.

Meetings and visits

63. From October 2015 to June 2016, the Panel held a total of ten meetings. The Panel also conducted the following visits –

- (a) visit to The Tanner Hill invited by HS to have a preview of the new elderly housing project; and
- (b) visit to Tin Yiu Estate to evaluate the impact posed by Link's plan to convert Tin Yiu Market into a shopping complex.

Legislative Council

Panel on Housing

Terms of Reference

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

**Legislative Council
Panel on Housing**

Membership list for 2015-2016 session

Chairman Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP

Deputy Chairman Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP

Members

Hon LEE Cheuk-yan
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, BBS, MH
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP, PhD, RN
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon WONG Yuk-man
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP
Hon KWOK Wai-keung
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

(Total : 25 members)

Clerk Mr Derek LO

Legal Adviser Miss Winnie LO