

立法會 *Legislative Council*

LC Paper No. CB(4)1202/18-19
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB4/PL/PS

Panel on Public Service

**Minutes of meeting held on
Friday, 21 June 2019, at 8:45 am
in Conference Room 3 of the Legislative Council Complex**

Members present : Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai (Chairman)
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, SBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, GBS, JP
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee, GBS, JP
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP
Hon KWOK Wai-keung, JP
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, BBS, JP
Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, SBS, JP
Hon HO Kai-ming
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting
Hon SHIU Ka-fai
Dr Hon Pierre CHAN
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS
Hon CHAN Hoi-yan

Members absent : Hon IP Kin-yuen
Hon CHU Hoi-dick

Public Officers attending : **Agenda item III**
Mr Joshua LAW, GBS, JP
Secretary for the Civil Service

Mr Thomas CHOW, JP
Permanent Secretary for the Civil Service

Ms Amy WONG
Deputy Secretary for the Civil Service 2

Mr Benjamin MOK
Principal Assistant Secretary for the Civil Service (Pay
& Leave)

Clerk in attendance : Mr Anthony CHU
Chief Council Secretary (4)1

Staff in attendance : Miss Shirley HAU
Senior Council Secretary (4)1

Ms Maggie CHUNG
Council Secretary (4)1

Mr Griffin FUNG
Legislative Assistant (4)7

Mr Terry HON
Clerical Assistant (4)1

Action

**I. Information papers issued since the last regular meeting on
20 May 2019**

(LC Paper No. CB(4)985/18-19(01) -- Letter dated 5 June
2019 from Hon
LAM Cheuk-ting on
issues relating to the
integrity management
policy of the
Correctional Services
Department ("CSD")
(Chinese version only)

Action

LC Paper No. CB(4)1021/18-19(01) -- Administration's response to the letter dated 5 June 2019 from Hon LAM Cheuk-ting on issues relating to the integrity management policy of CSD)

Members noted that the above papers had been issued since the last regular meeting on 20 May 2019.

Letter from Mr LAM Cheuk-ting

2. The Chairman drew members' attention to the letter from Mr LAM Cheuk-ting suggesting that the Panel on Public Service ("the Panel") should discuss two cases relating to the integrity management policy of CSD, namely, Tong Fuk Correctional Institution staff alleged of fabricating records of the Annual Fitness Test ("Case 1") and alleged "exchange of night shift duty" of CSD frontline officers ("Case 2") at a regular Panel meeting or a special meeting to be scheduled. The Chairman invited members' views on the letter.

3. Some members expressed objection to discussing the two cases at a Panel meeting at this stage. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan and Mr Tony TSE were of the view that it was a usual practice for the Panel to follow up with the Administration in writing on concerns raised by individual members. In case the members concerned were not satisfied with the reply, the Administration should be requested to provide further information. In this case, as Case 1 was still under investigation, Dr CHIANG and Mrs Regina IP opined that instead of discussing the issues at a Panel meeting, the Panel might follow up with the Administration by writing to seek further information, such as the timeline of the investigation and findings of the investigation report when available. Mr Tony TSE and Mr SHIU Ka-fai took the view that Mr LAM Cheuk-ting himself should write to the Administration to follow up the cases.

4. Mr WONG Ting-kwong opined that as CSD had concluded that there was no evidence to support the alleged "exchange of night shift duty" of frontline officers after investigation of Case 2, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting should provide evidence to prove otherwise if he disagreed with CSD's conclusion.

Action

5. Dr Elizabeth QUAT and Ms CHAN Hoi-yan opined that the Panel should discuss Government policies and issues relating to the civil service as a whole, instead of individual cases. Items which required the Panel's discussion should be included in the Panel's "List of outstanding items for discussion", in order not to affect the timely discussion of other items already on the List.

6. Mr KWOK Wai-keung and Mr HO Kai-ming considered it outside the ambit of the Panel's terms of reference to discuss the two cases as the Panel's counterpart, the Civil Service Bureau ("CSB"), was not responsible for investigating complaints of individual bureaux/departments ("B/Ds"). On the other hand, as the Panel on Security monitored issues of public concern relating to security, public order, public safety and corruption-related matters etc., they considered it more appropriate for the Panel on Security to follow up the cases.

7. To facilitate members to consider how the two cases should be followed up, Dr CHIANG Lai-wan requested the Secretariat to study the issues and report at the next meeting whether the two cases fell under the terms of reference of the Panel or the Panel on Security. CSB could also be consulted on whether staff conduct problems and disciplinary issues of individual B/Ds were under its purview.

8. Mr LAM Cheuk-ting opined that the two cases involved quite a number of CSD staff, and this might indicate problems in CSD's integrity management policy. However, the Administration had been evasive and did not directly address the issues in its reply. Mr LAM further informed the meeting that he had sought information from CSD direct on the investigation timeline of Case 1 and the investigation report/summary of both cases but the reply was not satisfactory. Given that it was a matter of concern to the media and the public, he opined that the Administration should explain the two cases openly. Instead of revealing details of Case 1 which was under investigation, CSD could provide information on the administrative procedures of the Annual Fitness Test, the mechanisms on monitoring the process and verifying the authenticity of the relevant test records, etc. He remained of the view that these were not law enforcement issues of the disciplined services, but policies relating to administrative management and integrity management which were civil service policies under the purview of CSB.

9. Mr Jeremy TAM and Mr Charles Peter MOK supported discussing the two cases at a Panel meeting. Mr TAM opined that CSD, under the pretext of an ongoing investigation of Case 1, did not respond direct to the problem of its integrity management policy. Besides, he

Action

did not agree that the two cases fell outside the purview of the Panel, as according to its terms of reference, the Panel monitored Government policies and issues of public concern relating to the civil service which were involved in the cases raised by Mr LAM Cheuk-ting. As CSD had completed investigation on Case 2, it was reasonable for the Panel to discuss the issues if members had queries on CSD's conclusion. Mr TAM further pointed out that if some members agreed that the Panel should further follow up the two cases in writing instead of discussing them at a Panel meeting, this meant that they considered that the cases were within the ambit of the Panel and could be dealt with by the Panel.

10. The Deputy Chairman considered that under the Panel's terms of reference, only those issues of public concern relating to the civil service, Government-funded public bodies, and other public service organizations should be followed up by the Panel.

11. The Chairman said that in line with the past practice, he would try his best to respond to members' requests, such as holding a meeting to discuss issues relating to the lifeguards of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department with the relevant staff unions. For the two cases, he considered them issues related to civil servants and civil service policies. Since the Administration's reply was considered unsatisfactory, he suggested that the Panel first followed up the cases with the Administration in writing. Should the reply still be unsatisfactory, he would consider including the policy issues arising from the two cases at the next regular meeting having regard to time availability and the Administration's views. He would also consult the Panel on Security in this regard.

12. Mr HO Kai-ming and Mr KWOK Wai-keung held the view that invitation of lifeguard unions to the Panel meeting was not comparable to the two cases as the former concerned a request of the lifeguards of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department for a grade structure review which was under the purview of CSB, while the Panel on Security was a more appropriate forum in the Legislative Council ("LegCo") to discuss the policy issues arising from the two cases.

(Post-meeting note: The Secretariat had requested the Administration to provide further information on the two cases and the Administration's further response was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1101/18-19 on 11 July 2019.)

Action

II. Date of next meeting and items for discussion

(LC Paper No. CB(4) 1006/18-19(01) -- List of outstanding items for discussion

LC Paper No. CB(4) 1006/18-19(02) -- List of follow-up actions)

13. Members agreed that the next regular Panel meeting would be held on 15 July 2019 to discuss the following items:

- (a) Grade structure review of disciplined services; and
- (b) An overview of medical and dental benefits for civil servants, pensioners and eligible dependants.

14. Regarding item (b) above, Mrs Regina IP conveyed the request of some civil service unions to provide Chinese medicine services for eligible civil servants through the families clinics and the 18 Chinese Medicine Centres for Training and Research under the Hospital Authority.

15. To allow more time for members to discuss with the relevant staff unions/associations on item (a) above, the Chairman suggested and members agreed that the next regular meeting would be extended to 2.5 hours scheduling from 10:30 am to 1:00 pm.

(Post-meeting note: As the LegCo Complex would not be opened for meetings due to safety reasons after the incident on 1 July 2019, the meeting originally scheduled for 15 July 2019 was cancelled. Notice of the cancellation of meeting was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1095/18-19 on 8 July 2019.)

Letter from the Chairman

16. The Chairman drew members' attention to his letter dated 20 June 2019 (LC Paper No. CB(4)1030/18-19(01)) which was circulated to members on 20 June 2019 and was also tabled at the meeting. He suggested in the letter that the Panel should discuss at the next regular Panel meeting two incidents reported on the Internet relating to the work of the ambulance personnel being obstructed during the large-scale protest in Admiralty on 12 June 2019, namely, an armed police officer was alleged of dragging an injured protester off an ambulance heading to

Action

hospital ("Incident 1") and police officers were alleged of blocking emergency ambulance from passing through Harcourt Road ("Incident 2").

17. In response to the Deputy Chairman's enquiry about the propriety of the Chairman chairing the discussion of his own letter, the Clerk advised that there were no provisions in the Rules of Procedure of LegCo against such possible or perceived conflict of roles. The Deputy Chairman suggested and the Chairman agreed that the Deputy Chairman should preside over the discussion of this item.

(At 9:35 am, the Deputy Chairman took the chair.)

18. The Chairman explained that he considered the two incidents mentioned in his letter under the purview of the Panel given that the incidents involved significant public interest as injured people might be delayed to be sent to hospitals in time to receive proper treatment. Besides, these incidents might also bring about negative impacts on the staff morale and the cooperation between the Hong Kong Police Force and the Ambulance Command of the Fire Services Department, the issues of which were within the terms of reference of the Panel. As regards the proposed timeline for discussion, he opined that there was an urgency to discuss the issues at a Panel meeting as soon as possible, given that similar incidents could happen again in view of the current political situation in Hong Kong.

19. Mr Jeremy TAM pointed out that Incident 2 had indeed taken place as evidenced by the videos taken by Internet media. While acknowledging that it might not be the usual practice for the Panel to deal with individual cases at a Panel meeting, he opined that policy issues relating to the efficacy in the collaboration between the two departments concerned and the morale of civil servants were within the purview of the Panel.

20. The majority of the members present objected to the proposal to discuss the two incidents at the next Panel meeting. Mr HO Kai-ming and the Deputy Chairman pointed out that Incident 1 mentioned in the Chairman's letter was based on a media report quoted by a Mr LAM, who declared that he had not verified the authenticity of the incident. The Deputy Chairman added that he had checked with the Hong Kong Police Force and the Fire Services Department, and they both replied that there were no official records filed nor any complaints received on the incident so far. In this connection, Mr HO, the Deputy Chairman, Mr WONG

Action

Ting-kwong and Dr Elizabeth QUAT considered it inappropriate for the Panel to discuss those issues based on unfounded allegations.

21. As regards Incident 2 where police officers were alleged of blocking emergency ambulance from passing through Harcourt Road, Ms CHAN Hoi-yan and Mr SHIU Ka-fai opined that the video footage might have only captured a partial picture, given the chaotic situation on that day.

22. Mrs Regina IP and Mr SHIU Ka-fai held the view that instead of discussing the incidents at a Panel meeting, the parties concerned might lodge complaints about the incidents to the Complaints Against Police Office and the Independent Police Complaints Council under the established police complaint handling mechanism if necessary. Mrs IP further opined that members should not allow the unilateral allegation on the police to undermine the police morale.

23. Dr Elizabeth QUAT, Mr KWOK Wai-keung, Mr Tony TSE, Mr POON Siu-ping and the Deputy Chairman considered that issues related to the two incidents were outside the ambit of the Panel and it was inappropriate for the Panel to discuss individual cases at the meetings. If deemed necessary, individual members might consider following up the incidents direct with the departments concerned. Mr POON added that even for policy issues which were under the ambit of the Panel, they should not jump the queue and affect the timely discussion of the items already on the Panel's "List of outstanding items for discussion". Dr CHIANG Lai-wan opined that, similar to the cases quoted in Mr LAM Cheuk-ting's letter discussed in paragraphs 2 to 12 above, the incidents should not be discussed at a Panel meeting unless the Secretariat had clarified that they were within the terms of reference of the Panel.

24. Having regard to the views of members expressed, the Deputy Chairman concluded that the two incidents would not be discussed at the next regular Panel meeting.

(At 10:04 am, the Chairman resumed the chair.)

Ruling on spousal benefits of a civil servant

25. Noting that the Court of Final Appeal had ruled in favour of a male Senior Immigration Officer who had requested the granting of spousal benefits to his same-sex partner in June 2019, Mrs Regina IP

Action

requested the Administration to report to the Panel the implications of the ruling on the policies of civil service benefits and the relevant matters in due course.

III. 2019-2020 civil service pay adjustment

(File Ref.: -- LegCo Brief
CSBCR/PG/4-085-001/82
(issued by CSB on 11 June 2019))

File Ref.: -- LegCo Brief
CSBCR/PG/4-085-001/82
(issued by CSB on 19 June 2019)

LC Paper No. CB(4)1006/18-19(03) -- Paper on 2019-2020
civil service pay
adjustment prepared by
the LegCo Secretariat
(updated background
brief))

26. The Chairman reminded members that, in accordance with Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure, they should disclose the nature of any direct or indirect pecuniary interests relating to the subject under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the subject.

27. At the invitation of the Chairman, Secretary for the Civil Service ("SCS") briefed members on the decision of the Chief Executive ("CE")-in-Council made on 19 June 2019 that, with retrospective effect from 1 April 2019, civil service pay for 2019-2020 should be adjusted in accordance with the following pay offers made to the staff side of the four central consultative councils, details of which were set out in the LegCo Briefs issued by CSB on 11 and 19 June 2019 respectively:

(a) a pay increase of 4.75% for civil servants in the upper salary band and the directorate, subject to the pay points referred to in (i) and (ii) below the dollar values of which should be as specified –

(i) Master Pay Scale ("MPS") 34 at \$74,515 and MPS 35 at \$75,265; and

Action

(ii) General Disciplined Services (Officer) Pay Scale (GDS(O)) 20 and Police Pay Scale ("PPS") 36 at \$74,390, and GDS(O) 21 and PPS 37 at \$75,135;

(b) a pay increase of 5.26% for civil servants in the middle salary band; and

(c) a pay increase of 5.26% for civil servants in the lower salary band, by invoking the "bring-up" arrangement.

28. SCS said that, having regard to concerns expressed by the staff side of the civil service and the Panel about the payroll cost of increments ("PCIs") which to be deducted from the gross Pay Trend Indicators ("PTIs") to arrive at the net PTIs, the Administration decided, from 2019-2020, to adopt the average PCIs for each salary band from 1989-1990 to 2019-2020, or the actual PCIs for the particular salary band for the year, whichever was the lower, for deriving the net PTI for that salary band.

Calculation of net PTIs

29. Members in general supported the Administration's civil service pay adjustment proposal. Mr HO Kai-ming and Mrs Regina IP welcomed the Administration's arrangement to put a cap on PCIs as a response to the staff side's concern about the erosion of the net PTIs by the rising PCIs. Nevertheless, noting that about 70 000 civil servants (40% of the civil service) were currently at their maximum pay points, Mr HO and Mr POON Siu-ping were of the view that PCIs deduction was unfair to these civil servants who were no longer receiving increments. Mr HO thus recommended the Administration to consider conducting a comprehensive review on the PCIs deduction arrangement.

30. Noting that different civil service staff unions/associations had all along been calling for the abolition of the PCIs deduction arrangement, Dr Elizabeth QUAT asked whether the Administration had any plan to conduct a comprehensive review of the arrangement in response to the staff side's request.

31. SCS replied that the Administration had been having in-depth exchanges with the staff side and was fully aware of their views on the issue. Nevertheless, the Administration did not consider that there were strong justifications to cease the PCIs deduction arrangement for the time being. He explained that the arrangement was meant to offset exceptional merit pay (that could not be distinguished from general merit

Action

pay) and in-scale increment in the private sector. According to the 2019 Pay Trend Survey ("PTS"), 74% of the private sector companies participating in the survey still took merit pay as one of the considerations when deciding pay adjustment for their employees.

32. Dr Elizabeth QUAT conveyed the staff side's view that PTS was based on data which lagged behind actual market conditions, and that private sector companies offered allowances, year-end bonuses, commissions, etc. which were not comparable to civil service pay. In this connection, she urged the Administration to conduct a comprehensive review on the inadequacies of the existing pay adjustment mechanism in consultation with the staff side.

33. SCS replied that he did not consider there was a need to conduct a review on the existing pay adjustment mechanism as the current level of civil service pay was generally sufficient to attract, retain and motivate staff of suitable calibre to join and stay in the civil service, and, according to the findings of regularly conducted surveys, civil service pay was broadly comparable to private sector pay. In any event, the Administration would take into account all relevant factors when deciding on the rates of civil service pay adjustment.

34. Responding to Mr POON Siu-ping's question on whether the Administration would take into account the overall wastage of the civil service when determining the pay adjustment under the established mechanism, SCS advised that the Administration would take into account all the six relevant factors, i.e. the net PTIs, the state of Hong Kong's economy, changes in the cost of living, the Government's fiscal position, the pay claims of the staff side and civil service morale when making a pay adjustment decision. All other views expressed by the staff side would also be reflected for consideration by CE-in-Council.

Morale of civil servants

35. Pointing out that civil service morale was one of the factors that the Administration would take into account when deciding on the rates of civil service pay adjustment, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting said that the morale of some civil servants, in particular some Administrative Officers, was adversely affected by the controversies in society arising from the recent introduction of the Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation (Amendment) Bill 2019 ("the Bill") by the Government. He said that these Administrative Officers were worried about the impact of the widespread discontent against the Government might have on their work in promoting policies on people's livelihood.

Action

Mr LAM therefore asked how SCS would address the issue of low morale among the civil service.

36. SCS replied that the Administration had all along attached great importance to the issue of civil service morale. Now that CE had already responded to the disputes arising from the Bill, he hoped that the society as a whole could move on to support the further development of Hong Kong. He was confident that the civil service, as the cornerstone of the Government, would continue to discharge their duties professionally in accordance with the law.

37. In response to Mr LAM Cheuk-ting's enquiry on whether SCS would consider conducting an internal study on the morale of civil servants and introducing measures to boost their morale, SCS replied that CSB had all along maintained contact with civil servants at different levels under the established mechanism. His colleagues would continue their work in this regard to ensure the quality of the services delivered by civil servants.

Enhancing communications with the staff side

38. Noting that the staff side of the Disciplined Services Consultative Council ("DSCC") and three of the four constituent associations of the Police Force Council had withdrawn from the work of the PTS Committee since 2013 with the latter re-joined the meeting of the Committee in end 2018, Dr Elizabeth QUAT asked whether the Administration would invite DSCC to join the meeting of the Committee again. Mr POON Siu-ping also called on the Administration to make extra efforts in strengthening the communications with the staff side of the disciplined services, given the importance of their views to the PTS Committee. SCS replied that despite the absence of DSCC from the meetings of the PTS Committee, the PTS Committee Secretariat had continued to send meeting papers and minutes of meetings to DSCC, and there were established channels for the staff side of DSCC to reflect their views to the PTS Committee. In addition, the Administration had regular meetings with the staff side of the disciplined services to discuss issues of concern. He also met with various staff unions/associations of the disciplined services to listen to their pay claims personally during the course of the civil service pay adjustment exercise.

Timetable for seeking approval from the Finance Committee

39. Pointing out that there were still some 20 outstanding agenda items to be discussed by the Finance Committee ("FC"),

Action

Ms CHAN Hoi-yan and Mrs Regina IP were concerned about whether the civil service pay adjustment proposal could be approved by FC before the LegCo summer recess. They expressed great concern that any delay in approving the proposal would have an adverse impact on the staff morale of the civil service and subvented organizations. Mrs IP was of the view that the pay adjustment for civil servants should be accorded a high priority and be discussed as soon as possible by FC.

40. SCS replied that the Administration would submit the pay adjustment proposal to FC as soon as practicable after securing the support of the Panel. In determining the order of items on the FC agenda, the Administration would adopt a holistic approach by taking into account a host of factors including the importance and urgency of the funding proposals. Generally speaking, any delay in the pay adjustment exercise would affect civil servants in the lower salary band more than those in the other salary bands. Hence, he hoped that FC would, in the remaining time that was available before the LegCo summer recess, process all the items, including civil service pay adjustment.

41. In response to Ms CHAN Hoi-yan's enquiry on precedent cases of pay adjustment approved after the LegCo summer recess, SCS said that the 2017-2018 civil service pay adjustment proposal was only approved in late October 2017 and the revised pay together with the back pay were made to civil servants by end November 2017.

42. As regards Mrs Regina IP's question on the number of staff of the subvented organizations being affected by the pay adjustment, SCS said that while he did not have the figure, he reminded members that the additional funding to be provided to the subvented bodies (including the Hospital Authority, institutions funded by the University Grants Committee, aided schools, etc.) under the 2019-2020 pay adjustment exercise would be greater than that to the civil service.

Pay adjustment and leave entitlement for non-civil service contract staff

43. Given that non-civil service contract ("NCSC") staff would not benefit from the 2019-2020 civil service pay adjustment, Mr HO Kai-ming asked whether the Administration would consider establishing a mechanism to give the same pay rise to NCSC staff, especially for those who had worked in the Government for many years, when their contracts were renewed. Expressing concern that more than 10% of NCSC staff were entitled only to statutory holidays, Mr HO further enquired if the Administration would consider aligning the leave entitlement of NCSC staff with their civil service counterparts, such that

Action

they might also enjoy general holidays and achieve a better work-life balance.

44. SCS explained that Heads of Departments had the discretion to determine the pay adjustment rates and leave entitlement for their NCSC staff having regard to the operational and service needs of their offices. According to the statistics gathered by CSB, the pay rise for NCSC staff in recent years was generally comparable to their civil service counterparts. As regards leave entitlement, since each B/D had different holiday arrangements for its NCSC staff, he was of the view that Heads of Departments were in the best position to decide whether there was room for improvement having regard to their respective operational needs.

Motion proposed by the Chairman

45. The Chairman referred members to his proposed motion as follows:

"鑒於本年6月12日，在金鐘一帶發生反對《逃犯條例》修訂的大型示威活動中，有警務人員涉嫌向示威者使用過度武力，導致多名市民受傷，而大量香港市民極度不滿及嚴重質疑警方處理手法；為此，本事務委員會要求政府暫緩向香港警務處實施2019-2020年度薪酬調整方案，直至政府正式成立獨立調查委員會，並完成調查警方當天使用過度武力的事件為止。"

(Translation)

"During the mass demonstration in protest against the proposed amendment to the Fugitive Offenders Ordinance taking place in the vicinity of Admiralty on 12 June 2019, police officers allegedly used excessive force against protesters and causing injuries to a number of citizens; many Hong Kong citizens are extremely unsatisfied with the Police and they vehemently query the manner of the Police in handling the incident. In this connection, this Panel demands that the 2019-2020 civil service pay adjustment offer for the Hong Kong Police Force be suspended pending the commissioning of an independent inquiry committee and conclusion of investigation on the use of excessive force by the Police on the said day."

Action

46. The Chairman ordered that the voting bell be rung for five minutes. As a majority of the members present disagreed to deal with the motion, the Chairman announced that the motion would not be proceeded with.

47. The Chairman concluded that members had no objection to the Administration's proposal to seek approval of FC on the proposed 2019-2020 civil service pay adjustment.

(At 10:45 am, the Chairman extended the meeting for 15 minutes beyond the appointed ending time to allow sufficient time for discussion.)

IV. Employment of persons with disabilities in the civil service

(LC Paper No. CB(4)1006/18-19(04) -- Administration's paper on employment of persons with disabilities in the civil service

LC Paper No. CB(4)1006/18-19(05) Paper on employment of persons with disabilities in the civil service (updated background brief))

48. In view of time constraint, members agreed to carry over this item to the next regular meeting.

(Post-meeting note: As the LegCo Complex would not be opened for meetings due to safety reasons after the incident on 1 July 2019, the meeting originally scheduled for 15 July 2019 was cancelled. Notice on the cancellation of meeting was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)1095/18-19 on 8 July 2019.)

V. Any other business

49. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 10:50 am.