

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(4)870/19-20
*(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)*

Ref : CB4/PL/TP/1

Panel on Transport

Minutes of meeting
held on Friday, 19 June 2020, at 10:45 am
in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex

Members present : Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon CHAN Han-pan, BBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon Claudia MO
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP
Hon Alvin YEUNG
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin
Hon CHU Hoi-dick
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting
Hon SHIU Ka-fai, JP
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH
Hon Tanya CHAN
Hon LUK Chung-hung, JP

Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

Members attending : Hon WU Chi-wai, MH

Members absent : Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Hon Kenneth LAU Ip-keung, BBS, MH, JP

Public officers attending : **Agenda item II**

Mr Kevin CHOI, JP
Deputy Secretary for
Transport and Housing (Transport) 2

Ms Jerry JI
Principal Assistant Secretary for
Transport and Housing (Transport) 1

Mr Patrick WONG
Assistant Commissioner /
Bus and Railway
Transport Department

Miss Amy TSE
Principal Transport Officer /
Bus and Railway 1
Transport Department

Mr William SHUM
Chief Electrical and Mechanical Engineer / Vehicle
Safety and Standards
Transport Department

Agenda item III

Dr Raymond SO, BBS, JP
Under Secretary for Transport and Housing
Transport and Housing Bureau

Miss Winnie TSE
Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing
(Transport) 3
Transport and Housing Bureau

Mr Eddie LEUNG
Assistant Commissioner for Transport / Special
Tasks
Transport Department

Mr Benedict CHEUNG
Senior Engineer/Walkability 2
Transport Department

Clerk in attendance : Ms Sophie LAU
Chief Council Secretary (4)2

Staff in attendance : Ms Angela CHU
Senior Council Secretary (4)2

Miss Mandy LAM
Legislative Assistant (4)2

I. Information paper(s) issued since the last meeting

- | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| LC Paper No. CB(4)551/19-20(01) | - Administration's response to the item "6875TH - Noise enclosures at Gascoigne Road Flyover" raised at the meeting on 17 January 2020 |
| LC Paper No. CB(4)571/19-20(01) | - Administration's response to the item "6853TH - |

Widening of Castle Peak Road - Castle Peak Bay" raised at the meeting on 20 March 2020

- LC Paper No. CB(4)632/19-20(01) - Administration's response to the item "MTR Fare Adjustment for 2020" raised at the meeting on 24 April 2020
- LC Paper No. CB(4)642/19-20(01) - Administration's response to the letter from Hon Alvin YEUNG proposing to discuss the provision of public transport subsidy under the Anti-epidemic Fund
- LC Paper No. CB(4)687/19-20(01) - Administration's response to the item "Comprehensive review of Private Driving Instructors' licences" raised at meeting on 24 April 2020
- LC Paper No. CB(4)694/19-20(01) - Administration's response to the letter from Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing requesting to extend the coverage of Universal Accessibility Programme in Kowloon East

Members noted the above papers issued since the last meeting.

II. Review on the standing capacity and service level of franchised buses

- LC Paper No. CB(4)698/19-20(01) - Administration's paper on

review on the standing capacity and service level of franchised buses

Briefing by the Administration

2. At the invitation of the Chairman, Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport) 2 (“DS/T2”) briefed members on the outcome of the review conducted by the Transport Department (“TD”) in 2019 on the standing capacity of franchised buses (“FB”). Details of the briefing were set out in the Administration’s paper. DS/T2 said that according to the Road Traffic (Construction and Maintenance of Vehicles) Regulations (Cap. 374A) (“the Regulation”), the number of standing passengers allowed on a FB was generally calculated on the basis that each standing passenger would occupy 0.17 square metre, i.e. about six persons per square metre (“ppsm”). Having regard to the safety standards on the number of standing passengers allowed on public buses in overseas jurisdiction as well as FB safety concerns, the Administration would not propose any amendments to the above statutory requirement regarding the number of standing passengers on FB. However, to cater for passengers’ increasing demand for a more comfortable journey, the Administration would revise the quantitative indicators relevant to bus service frequency set out under the Guidelines on Service Improvement and Reduction in Bus Route Planning Programme (“the Guidelines”) by adopting 4 ppsm as the service benchmark for calculating occupancy rate for increasing bus deployment and service frequency. In effect, the thresholds for increasing bus deployment during peak hours would be reduced subsequently so as to provide better FB services to passengers.

Discussion

3. Mr Jeremy TAM expressed support to the Administration’s proposal to revise the relevant indicators in the Guidelines for adjusting FB service frequency. He recalled that he had raised similar concern in 2019 and submitted a legislative proposal to amend the Regulation regarding the number of standing passengers allowed on FB. The revised Guidelines proposed by the Administration would obliterate the need to amend existing legislation and would enhance bus deployment for improving standing space inside FB compartments during busy periods.

4. Mr LUK Chung-hung also welcomed the proposal and expressed that local communities including the District Councils had called for increasing FB service frequency during peak hours as passengers often

needed to wait for a long time to board a bus. Mr LUK enquired about the additional resources required if service frequency of FB were to be enhanced during peak hours.

5. Assistant Commissioner/Bus and Railway of TD (“AC/TD”) replied that TD had discussed with FB operators about the relevant implementation arrangement. It was estimated that FB operators would need to procure about 50 additional buses and recruit about 120 more bus captains to cater for the service adjustment. On Mr POON Siu ping’s further enquiry, DS/T2 expressed that the above estimate was projected under normal operating situation before the COVID-19 pandemic. At present, service demand for FB was about 70% - 80% of the normal level and hence the need for additional bus deployment would be less than the estimate.

6. Dr Helena WONG supported enhancing service frequency for FB during peak hours. As the Guidelines were administrative in nature only, she asked how the Administration could ensure operators’ compliance. DS/T2 explained that on ensuring compliance, TD and FB operators would discuss bus route planning and rationalization regularly and FB operators were required to submit proposals to TD on service level adjustment. TD would monitor FB operators’ compliance with relevant Guidelines during the discussions. AC/TD added that TD could also monitor FB operators’ performance through conducting surveys and reviewing passengers’ complaints and feedback and would actively follow-up with FB operators on service irregularities.

7. Mr Michael TIEN opined that the proposed thresholds under the Guidelines were not conducive to service improvement. Additional bus would only be deployed when the average occupancy rate of a bus reached 90% during the busiest half hour and 75% or above during the busiest one hour. However, peak period seldom sustained for an hour and he recommended that bus deployment should be triggered when the occupancy rate of a bus reached 75% or above during the busiest half-hour instead.

8. DS/T2 replied that the threshold proposed by Mr TIEN above would be roughly equivalent to a ppsm of 2 persons, and it was estimated that about 180 additional buses and about 430 more bus captains would be needed for meeting the service level adjustment. The requirement might impose a heavy burden to FB operators. DS/T2 advised that the Administration would keep in view the actual implementation of the revised thresholds and ask FB operators to suitably adjust bus deployment and service frequency for service enhancement according to actual circumstances.

9. Mr POON Siu-ping expressed concern that it might be difficult for bus captains to implement the relevant Guidelines. There might be confrontations if passengers were refused to board a bus after the maximum standing capacity had been reached. DS/T2 clarified that the Guidelines set out relevant indicators for FB operators to adjust service frequency according to changes in passenger demand. Bus captains would not be required to ensure that the occupancy of a bus is under the guiding threshold.

10. On Ms Claudia MO's enquiry, DS/T2 said that TD would revise the Guidelines soon and subject to the progress of bus procurement and bus captain recruitment, the revised Guidelines could start to be implemented in mid-2021 the earliest.

11. Mr LAU Kwok-fan pointed out that under the revised Guidelines, for a normal FB model of 12 metres long, the triggering thresholds for additional bus deployment would be 34 standing passengers in the busiest half-hour and 13 standing passengers during that busiest one hour respectively. As most of the serving long-haul bus routes would easily meet the above triggering thresholds during peak hours, Mr LAU was skeptical whether 50 additional buses and 120 more bus captains would be adequate for the increased service frequency. Also, additional bus deployment might require bus captains to work longer hours, which was contrary to the longstanding call for reducing the working hours of bus captains for the sake of FB safety.

12. AC/TD explained that during peak hours when there was keen passenger demand for FB service, FB operators would deploy additional departures or mobilize short-haul departures to pick up passengers at the busiest bus stops. As passenger demand normally reached a peak within a short period of time and dropped significant shortly afterwards, resources required for additional bus deployment would not be as significant as expected. DS/T2 added that FB operators would endeavour to recruit more bus captains to meet the increase in service frequency and as a matter of fact, bus captain recruitment had been going well during these few months owing to the present gloomy employment market. If bus captain recruitment were satisfactory, it was envisaged that the adjustment in service level would not affect the working hours of bus captains.

13. The Chairman, Mr YIU Si-wing and Mr SHIU Ka-fai expressed that the Administration had not taken into account the social cost of the proposal, such as impact on road traffic and road safety, pollution caused by more buses on the road and so forth. Mr YIU and Mr SHIU opined that

additional resources required in increasing bus service frequency would eventually be borne by passengers through fare increases. Also, additional bus deployment during peak hours would aggravate traffic congestion. They said that the Administration should strike an appropriate balance in evaluating the benefits brought about by the proposal vis-a-vis its adverse impact on road traffic and bus fare.

14. DS/T2 explained that FB operators would need to procure about 50 additional buses to meet the requirement on bus service frequency as stipulated under the revised Guidelines, and the number only accounted for about 1% of the FB fleet. Besides, fare adjustment would be hinged on many factors including labour cost and fuel cost, etc., and the increase in service frequency would not have a significant impact on the operating cost of a FB company. TD would review with FB operators the implementation of the revised Guidelines on individual bus routes having regard to passenger demand, operating efficiency as well as its impact on road traffic, and would allow flexibility for FB operators to adjust service frequency during implementation.

15. The Chairman expressed that the Administration had not provided any scientific data or analysis to explain how they come up with the proposed thresholds for increasing bus deployment. He opined that the setting of the thresholds was quite arbitrary. For instance, when a bus with a carrying capacity of 137 passengers “was 75% or more occupied during the busiest one hour”, FB operators would need to increase vehicle allocation when there were in effect only 13 standing passengers or more on the bus. He opined that the threshold was not well justified and suggested TD using a more scientific approach to project passenger demand, such as making use of the big data, say collecting information on the time the passengers were required to wait in the queue, when determining the deployment of buses. Mr WU Chi-wai also enquired about the criterion for determining the proposed thresholds and whether the Administration had considered other external factors such as road traffic.

16. DS/T2 replied that the Administration had considered relevant statistics and data as well as passenger feedback when determining the thresholds. Also, as passenger demand and the peak periods of individual routes would differ, TD would seek the views of passengers and local communities including District Councils when implementing the revised Guidelines for adjusting service frequency. AC/TD added that apart from frequency enhancement, TD would work with FB operators on bus route rationalization on a regular basis for improving service efficiency.

17. Mr Jeremy TAM noted that for bus models of 10.3 metres long, bus deployment would be triggered under the revised thresholds even when there were vacant seats available on the bus. DS/T2 said that such models were not commonly used and they were not deployed for long-haul routes. Special arrangements would be made for these bus models when adjusting service frequency. To cater for the above bus models, Mr TAM suggested that the Administration could add a condition to the indicators that no vacant seats should be available on a bus when considering to increase bus deployment. DS/T2 took note of the suggestion.

18. Ms Claudia MO opined that passengers taking long-haul routes generally wished to have a more comfortable bus journey on board. On the other hand, passengers taking short-haul routes would not mind boarding a crowded bus as they would be getting off the bus very soon. She therefore opined that the revised Guidelines should be mainly applicable to long-haul routes. Mr YIU Si-wing also enquired whether the Administration would consider setting different thresholds for adjusting the service frequency for long-haul and short-haul bus routes.

19. DS/T2 replied that the Administration would give priority to long-haul routes for adjusting service frequency, but short-haul routes with keen passenger demand would also be considered. Apart from making reference to the thresholds set out in the Guidelines, TD and FB operators would exercise flexibility in taking into account other relevant factors such as comfortable level of bus journey, passengers' waiting time and passengers' feedback when reviewing the frequency of bus routes.

20. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen noted that some bus routes' real-time information on the number of seats available on the upper deck of the bus would be shown on mobile application to offer convenience for passengers. He enquired whether the Administration could also provide real-time information on the number of standing passengers on a bus through mobile applications to allow passengers decide whether they need to switch to other public transport services. DS/T2 replied that the Administration welcomed the use of technology to improve bus service efficiency, but there were technical limitations that needed to be tackled including the methods in collecting the real-time information and means to ensure accuracy. TD would discuss with FB operators on how to enhance the dissemination of more real-time information.

Motion

21. The Chairman said that he had received a motion on the discussion item. He decided that the motion was directly related to the item under discussion. Members agreed to deal with the motion at the meeting. The Chairman ordered a division and directed that the voting bell be rung for five minutes.

22. The Chairman referred to the following motion moved by Mr Michael TIEN:

鑑於本港巴士擠逼問題主要於上、下班等最繁忙的半小時出現，本委員會促請政府，研究修改指引，要求長途綫巴士，在最繁忙的半小時，總乘客人數不能多於75%，否則便要加車，盡量讓乘客旅途舒適。

(Translation)

As the problem of bus crowdedness mainly occurs during the busiest half-hours of the morning and evening peak periods in Hong Kong, this Panel urges the Government to study revising the Guidelines to require that the occupancy rate of long-haul bus routes must not exceed 75% during the busiest half-hour, otherwise additional buses will have to be deployed to make the passenger journey as comfortable as possible.

23. The Chairman put the motion to vote. Seventeen members voted for the motion, two members voted against the motion and no member abstained from voting. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

24. Details of the voting result were in **Annex I**.

(Post-meeting note: The wordings of the motions passed were issued to members vide LC Paper No.CB(4)746/19-20(01) on 23 June 2020.)

III. Review of the use of Electric Mobility Devices in Hong Kong

- LC Paper No. CB(4)698/19-20(02) - Administration's paper on review of the use of electric mobility devices in Hong Kong
- LC Paper No. CB(4)698/19-20(03) - Information note on the use of electric mobility devices in Hong Kong prepared by the Legislative Council Secretariat

Briefing by the Administration

25. At the invitation of the Chairman, Under Secretary for Transport and Housing ("USTH") briefed members on the Administration's proposal to introduce a regulatory framework for electric mobility devices ("EMDs") in Hong Kong. Details of the briefings were set out in the Administration's paper. USTH said that there was no statutory definition of EMDs in Hong Kong at present and its use on roads violated the law. The Administration saw the need to provide a proper regulatory framework for EMDs. Having regard to the practices of 12 jurisdictions/cities, the Administration proposed that Motorized Personal Mobility Devices ("PMD") and Power Assisted Pedal Cycles ("PAPC") could be used on cycle tracks but not on carriageways and footpaths. On the other hand, Motorized Personal Mobility Aids could be used on footpaths but not on cycle tracks or carriageways. TD would conduct site trials on the use of motorized PMDs and PAPCs on cycle tracks in the Science Park and Tseung Kwan O in the second half of 2020 with a view to formulating technical and safety requirements of the regulatory framework.

Discussion

26. Mr Andrew WAN commented that the Administration was too conservative in its proposed regulatory framework for EMDs. He said that many overseas cities like Singapore allowed EMDs to be used on carriageways subject to speed control requirements, and yet EMDs would be prohibited on Hong Kong carriageways under the proposal. Pointing out that bicycles were allowed on Hong Kong roads subject to a speed limit and that the speed of bicycles could be as fast as EMDs, Mr WAN sought reasons

why EMDs could not have similar arrangement.

27. USTH replied that Hong Kong was a densely populated city with heavy traffic on road networks. Being different from bicycles, EMDs were mechanically propelled and could travel at a high speed. It was therefore necessary to restrict its use on carriageways in order to ensure road safety. Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Special Tasks of TD (“AC/TD”) added that an inter-departmental working group (“working group”) comprising different government departments had been set up to study the technical, safety and licensing requirements under the new regulatory framework. While the working group would look into the practices and experiences of the jurisdictions and cities concerned, the Administration was mindful that different regulatory frameworks had their own circumstantial context. TD would consult the views of the public and relevant stakeholders when formulating details of the regulatory framework for Hong Kong.

28. Pointing out that EMDs were commonly adopted overseas as a tool for short-distance commuting, Mr Charles Peter MOK expressed that the Administration should keep abreast of the times and be open-minded in the regulation of EMDs in Hong Kong. Instead of adopting one single set of standards, Mr MOK suggested the Administration consider adopting customized approaches in regulating the use of EMDs on different road settings in Hong Kong. For instance, in rural places where the traffic was less congested, the Administration could allow EMDs to be used on roads and carriageways subject to a speed limit. Mr CHU Hoi-dick shared a similar view and recommended the Administration conducting trials in rural areas and outlying islands where residents mostly used bicycles for short-distance travelling, in addition to planned trials on cycle tracks. On outlying islands such as Cheung Chau where village vehicles were allowed to be used, Mr CHU proposed that the Administration should conduct trials on these sites to test the compatibility of different modes of mechanically propelled vehicles on roads.

29. USTH explained that whilst the Administration welcomed the adoption of new technologies and innovations for personal mobility, a proper balance had to be struck taking into account a host of factors including road and pedestrian safety, traffic environment, road design and so forth. Even though rural areas were less congested than urban areas, there were still a lot of traffic and kerbside activities which could pose safety risks to both road and EMD users. AC/TD supplemented that the coverage of cycle track networks in the New Territories was quite extensive and was continuously being enhanced. Allowing the use of motorized PMDs and PAPCs on cycle

tracks could offer convenience for residents for short-distance commuting. As regards the suggestion of conducting trials on outlying islands, AC/TD said that he would relay the suggestion to the working group for review.

30. Mr POON Siu-ping enquired about the details of the site trials to be conducted in the Science Park and Tseung Kwan O, including participants, timeline of the trial and resources involved. Mr Andrew WAN also asked whether the Administration would review enforcement issues and the appropriate penalty level for EMD users violating the law.

31. AC/TD advised that the objective of the site trials was to evaluate public acceptance of the use of motorized PMDs and PAPCs on cycle tracks, the interactions between motorized PMDs, PAPCs and bicycles as well as the effectiveness of various safety requirements to be imposed on users of motorized PMDs and PAPCs. TD would invite EMD users to participate in the trials and collect relevant information and data for formulating technical requirements such as speed limit, safety gears requirements and age restrictions on EMD users. The trial was tentatively planned to commence by the end of 2020 after the consultation with the District Councils concerned and subject to the findings, the Administration planned to commence the legislative exercise in 2021. On penalties and enforcement issues, AC/TD said that the working group would consider issues relating to the feasibility and enforceability of the regulatory framework.

32. Mr Michael TIEN expressed concern about the enforceability of road safety legislation on cycle tracks. Even though there was a speed limit of 50 kilometers per hour for cycle tracks, there were seldom any enforcement actions taken against cyclists' speeding. As bicycles and EMDs had different speed capacity, Mr TIEN was worried that there would be an upsurge of accidents on cycle tracks. He also cast doubt on the enforceability of relevant regulatory control on the use of EMDs on cycle tracks in future.

33. On enforcement, AC/TD advised that the Hong Kong Police Force ("HKPF") would be responsible for taking relevant law enforcement actions against malpractices of cyclists and EMD users. TD would communicate closely with HKPF on law enforcement matters relating to the use of EMDs. Besides, safety facilities and improvement works on cycle tracks would be enhanced or carried out if needed to ensure road safety. Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport) 3 added that the site trials would test out the regulatory and technical requirements for EMDs such as speed control, technical specifications as well as enforceability of relevant legislation taking into account the interactions of different users on the cycle

track. The working group would also consult relevant stakeholders including District Councils and different user groups on the proposed regulatory framework before implementation. The Administration took note of Mr TIEN's concerns and would accord highest priority to road and pedestrian safety.

34. The Chairman commented that existing cycle tracks in Hong Kong were designed for use by cyclists only and they might not be able to accommodate additional use of EMDs. He considered it appropriate to restrict the use of EMDs on roads and carriageways. Nevertheless, he agreed that in some rural areas where traffic was not heavy, the Administration could explore the feasibility of allowing EMDs as a short-distance commuting tool. USTH took note of the Chairman's suggestion.

35. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen sought details on the prosecution figures on illegal use of EMDs. He also asked about registration/licensing of EMDs and whether there was any restriction imposed on the import and sale of EMDs.

36. USTH replied that during the period between July 2019 and May 2020, 90 arrests were made by HKPF against the illegal use of EMDs, of which four involved careless driving and one involved dangerous driving. On registration/licensing of EMDs, AC/TD advised that there was no such mechanism in place in Hong Kong at present, but the working group would look into the desirability and feasibility of doing so. In addition, there was no restriction on the import and sale of EMDs at present.

37. Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok expressed that the Administration should mandate the wearing of protective gear including helmets for cyclists and EMD users. He opined that many fatal accidents had involved the lack of protective gear for cyclists. As the speed of EMDs was even faster, it was imperative that EMD users should be required to wear protective gears. AC/TD took note of the suggestion and advised that the working group would prudently review the regulatory requirements on the use of EMDs. As regards mandating the wearing of protective gear by cyclists, AC/TD advised that having regard to public acceptance level and the enforceability issue, the Administration considered that public education should be a more preferred option than legislation. The Administration would continue its efforts in promoting cycling safety.

Motion

38. The Chairman said that he had received a motion and ruled that it was related to the item under discussion. Members agreed to deal with the motion at the meeting. The Chairman ordered a division and directed that the voting bell be rung for five minutes.

39. The Chairman referred to the following motion moved by Mr Michael TIEN:

避免電動可移動工具於行人路及其他道路上發生意外，原則上值得支持。不過，電動可移動工具日後若能於單車徑上行駛，速度不低，同樣容易發生意外。

本委員會促請政府，加強在單車徑上一切可移動代步工具的規管，包括重新檢視限制速度，以及提出確切可行的執法途徑，以免日後有法不執，法例淪為「無牙老虎」。

(Translation)

Any effort to prevent accidents involving electric mobility devices ("EMDs") on footpaths and other roads is, in principle, worth supporting. However, if EMDs are allowed to travel on cycle tracks in future, accidents are likely to happen as their speed is not slow.

This Panel urges the Government to strengthen the regulation of all mobility devices on cycle tracks, including reviewing afresh the speed limit and putting forward practicable ways for law enforcement, so as to avoid the situation where the law exists but unenforceable, thereby turning the law into a "toothless tiger" in future.

40. The Chairman put the motion to vote. Four members voted for the motion, three members voted against and two members abstained from voting. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

41. Details of the division of the voting results were in **Annex II**.

(Post-meeting note: The wordings of the motion passed were issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(4)746/19-20(02) on 23 June 2020. Bilingual versions of the Administration's response to the above motion were issued to members on 15 July 2020 vide LC Paper No.CB(4)816/19-20(01).)

IV Any other business

42. The Chairman said that this would be the last Panel meeting in the current legislative session. He expressed his appreciation and thanks to members for their active participation and contribution to the work of the Panel.

43. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:44 pm.

Council Business Division 4
Legislative Council Secretariat
20 August 2020