

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. FC133/18-19
(These minutes have been
seen by the Administration)

Ref : FC/1/1(21)

Finance Committee of the Legislative Council

Minutes of the 22nd meeting
held at Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Friday, 13 April 2018, at 4:00 pm

Members present:

Hon CHAN Kin-por, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, GBS, JP
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee, GBS, JP
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon Claudia MO
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP

Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki
Hon KWOK Wai-keung, JP
Hon Dennis KWOK Wing-hang
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Hon IP Kin-yuen
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, BBS, JP
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, SBS, JP
Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-ki, SBS, MH, JP
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan
Hon Alvin YEUNG
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin
Hon CHU Hoi-dick
Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, JP
Hon HO Kai-ming
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding
Hon SHIU Ka-fai
Hon SHIU Ka-chun
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH
Hon YUNG Hoi-yan
Dr Hon Pierre CHAN
Hon CHAN Chun-ying
Hon Tanya CHAN
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP
Hon HUI Chi-fung
Hon LUK Chung-hung
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH
Hon Kenneth LAU Ip-keung, BBS, MH, JP
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai
Hon KWONG Chun-yu
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Hon AU Nok-hin
Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

Members absent:

Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP
Hon Kenneth LEUNG
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP

Public officers attending:

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Ms Alice LAU Yim, JP | Permanent Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) |
| Ms Carol YUEN, JP | Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) 1 |
| Mr Mike CHENG Wai-man | Principal Executive Officer (General), Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau (The Treasury Branch) |
| Ms Rebecca Pun Ting-ting, JP | Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport) 1 |
| Mr Peter Mak Chi-kwong | Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport) 7 |
| Mr Daniel Chung Kum-wah, JP | Director of Highways |
| Mr Kelvin LO Kwok-wah, JP | Project Manager (Major Works), Highways Department |
| Mr TANG Wai-leung | Deputy Commissioner for Transport (Planning and Technical Services) |
| Mr Kelvin SIU Kin-man | Acting Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Planning) |
| Mr SHEA Tin-cheung | Chief Engineer (Transport Planning), Transport Department |
| Dr CHUI Tak-yi, JP | Under Secretary for Food and Health |
| Miss Diane WONG Shuk-han | Principal Assistant Secretary for Food and Health (Food) 2 |
| Ms Medy SHUM Ka-po | Chief Executive Officer (Private Columbaria Appeal Board), Food and Health Bureau |
| Ms Judy CHUNG Sui-kei | Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport) 5 |

Clerk in attendance:

| | |
|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Ms Anita SIT | Assistant Secretary General 1 |
|--------------|-------------------------------|

Staff in attendance:

| | |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Mr Derek LO | Chief Council Secretary (1)5 |
| Ms Ada LAU | Senior Council Secretary (1)7 |
| Mr Raymond SZETO | Council Secretary (1)5 |
| Miss Queenie LAM | Senior Legislative Assistant (1)2 |
| Mr Frankie WOO | Senior Legislative Assistant (1)3 |
| Ms Michelle NIEN | Legislative Assistant (1)5 |

Action

The Chairman reminded members of the requirements under Rule 83A and 84 of the Rules of Procedure.

**Item 1 — FCR(2017-18)65
RECOMMENDATION OF THE PUBLIC WORKS
SUBCOMMITTEE MADE ON 17 JANUARY 2018**

**PWSC(2017-18)23
HEAD 706 — HIGHWAYS
Transport — Roads
870TH — Feasibility Study on Route 11 (between North Lantau
and Yuen Long)**

2. The Chairman advised that this item sought the approval of the Finance Committee ("FC") for the recommendation made by the Public Works Subcommittee at its meeting held on 17 January 2018 on PWSC(2017-18)23 regarding the upgrading of 870TH to Category A at an estimated cost of \$87.7 million in money-of-the-day prices for carrying out a feasibility study on Route 11 (between North Lantau and Yuen Long) ("proposed study").

3. The Chairman declared that he was an independent non-executive director of The Bank of East Asia.

Motion to adjourn discussion on the agenda item

4. The Chairman said that at the meeting held on 6 April 2018, Dr KWOK Ka-ki moved under paragraph 39 of the Finance Committee Procedure that discussion on the agenda item be adjourned. FC would now resume dealing with this motion.

5. Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Ms Tanya CHAN spoke in support of the motion. They pointed out that many members were gravely concerned about whether the Administration had sought to pave the way for linking Route 11 with the proposed artificial islands in the central waters and further with Hong Kong Island West for the purpose of supporting the implementation of the proposed East Lantau Metropolis. They considered that the Administration had spoken equivocally about the objectives of constructing Route 11 and the alignment options of the Route and, hence, the concerns of members could not be addressed. Therefore, the Administration should provide more detailed information and data to explain the justifications for conducting the proposed study. Mr AU Nok-hin also shared similar views.

6. Mr Andrew WAN, Ms Alice MAK, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr LEUNG Che-cheung and Mr YIU Si-wing expressed objection to the motion. Mr WAN and Mr WU said that the Democratic Party supported the proposed study, which could complement the future development of the Northwest New Territories ("NWNT") and cope with the traffic demand there. They were of the view that the Administration had responded positively to their questions raised at the previous meeting. Ms MAK, Mr LUK and Mr LEUNG opined that there was an imminent need to proceed with the Route 11 construction project in order to alleviate the traffic congestion problem in NWNT, and members should not adjourn discussion on this agenda item on the ground that they opposed the development of artificial islands in the central waters. Mr YIU considered that Route 11 would enable residents in NWNT to commute to and from Lantau more conveniently in future, thereby supporting economic development in Hong Kong. Dr Helena WONG was in support of the proposed study, while expressing concerns about whether the study on the construction of the Tsing Yi-Lantau Link would be conducted in parallel with the proposed study, and whether the toll of Route 11 would affect its effectiveness in diverting traffic flows.

7. Dr KWOK Ka-ki, the motion mover, spoke in reply. He was of the view that the Administration had not explained clearly how it would prevent the aggravation of the traffic congestion problem in north Lantau upon the construction of Route 11. However, the Chairman did not provide sufficient time for members to raise their questions.

8. The Chairman put the motion to vote. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. The Chairman then declared that the motion was negatived. The votes of individual members were set out in the **Annex**.

Continued discussion on FCR(2017-18)65

9. The Chairman advised that as per his direction made at the meeting held on 6 April 2018, he would put item FCR(2017-18)65 to vote after Mr Andrew WAN and Dr Fernando CHEUNG (who were on the list of members waiting to speak) had spoken.

10. Mr Andrew WAN urged that the Administration should give due regard to the concerns raised by members when conducting the proposed study.

11. Dr Fernando CHEUNG noted that as mentioned in the supplementary information (LC Paper No. FC221/17-18(02)) provided by the Administration to FC on 11 April 2018, provisions were included in the tender document for the proposed study requiring that the consultant should study the option of connecting Route 11 with the Tsing Yi-Lantau Link. He requested the Administration to provide further information on other major contents in the tender document in relation to the connection arrangements for Route 11. Project Manager (Major Works), Highways Department said that the Administration would provide the information after the meeting.

[*Post-meeting note:* The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. FC268/17-18(01) on 24 May 2018.]

Voting on FCR(2017-18)65

12. The Chairman put item FCR(2017-18)65 to vote. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. The Chairman declared that 38 members voted in favour of and 10 members voted against the item. Two members abstained from voting. The votes of individual members were as follows:

For:

Mr James TO Kun-sun
Mr WONG Ting-kwong
Mr CHAN Hak-kan
Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee
Mr Steven HO Chun-yin
Mr WU Chi-wai
Mr MA Fung-kwok
Mr CHAN Han-pan

Prof Joseph LEE Kok-long
Ms Starry LEE Wai-king
Mr WONG Kwok-kin
Mr Michael TIEN Puk-sun
Mr Frankie YICK Chi-ming
Mr YIU Si-wing
Mr Charles Peter MOK
Mr LEUNG Che-cheung

| | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Ms Alice MAK Mei-kuen | Mr KWOK Wai-keung |
| Mr Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung | Dr Helena WONG Pik-wan |
| Mr IP Kin-yuen | Mr POON Siu-ping |
| Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok | Mr Andrew WAN Siu-kin |
| Mr Jimmy NG Wing-ka | Mr HO Kai-ming |
| Mr LAM Cheuk-ting | Mr Holden CHOW Ho-ding |
| Mr SHIU Ka-fai | Mr Wilson OR Chong-shing |
| Ms YUNG Hoi-yan | Mr CHAN Chun-ying |
| Mr LUK Chung-hung | Mr LAU Kwok-fan |
| Mr Kenneth LAU Ip-keung | Mr KWONG Chun-yu |
| Mr Vincent CHENG Wing-shun | Mr Tony TSE Wai-chuen |

(38 members)

Against:

| | |
|--------------------|------------------------------|
| Ms Claudia MO | Mr CHAN Chi-chuen |
| Dr KWOK Ka-ki | Dr Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung |
| Mr Alvin YEUNG | Mr CHU Hoi-dick |
| Mr SHIU Ka-chun | Ms Tanya CHAN |
| Dr CHENG Chung-tai | Mr Jeremy TAM Man-ho |

(10 members)

Abstained:

| | |
|----------------|---------------|
| Dr Pierre CHAN | Mr AU Nok-hin |
|----------------|---------------|

(2 members)

13. The Chairman declared that the item was approved.

14. At 4:51 pm, the Chairman left the conference room, and the Deputy Chairman took the chair for the remainder of the meeting.

Item 2 — FCR(2017-18)66

HEAD 139 — GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT: FOOD AND HEALTH BUREAU (FOOD BRANCH)

Subhead 000 — Operational expenses

15. The Deputy Chairman advised that this agenda item sought the approval of FC for a remuneration package for the Chairperson, Deputy Chairpersons, presiding officers and non-official members of the Private Columbaria Appeal Board ("PCAB") appointed under the Private Columbaria Ordinance (Cap. 630) ("the Ordinance"). The Food and Health Bureau ("FHB") sought the views of the Panel on Food Safety and

Environmental Hygiene ("FSEH Panel") on the proposals on 12 December 2017.

16. At the invitation of the Deputy Chairman, Under Secretary for Food and Health ("USFH") briefed members on the proposed remuneration package. He said that imposing regulation on private columbaria, which was an important livelihood-related issue, involved very complicated and sensitive issues. The work in respect of the handling of appeals was not simple because other relevant legislation, such as that on planning, land, building and fire safety, environmental protection and traffic impact, should be taken into account in the process. Decisions being appealed might involve matters relating to licensing, licence renewal, licensing conditions, enforcement notices and ash disposal plans. PCAB was a quasi-judicial body responsible for dealing with complicated legal issues. To avoid conflict of interests, panel members must not undertake any tasks or activities that might in any way limit their ability to discharge their duties at PCAB to the full. The proposed remuneration package for panel members (especially the annual retainer fees for the Chairperson and Deputy Chairpersons) was intended to, besides serving as recognition of their service and contribution of expertise and experience to PCAB, compensate partially for their earnings forgone as a result of the above constraints.

Work of Private Columbaria Appeal Board

17. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired about the work that had been undertaken by the Chairperson and Deputy Chairpersons of PCAB since their appointment in September 2017.

18. Principal Assistant Secretary for Food and Health (Food) 2 ("PAS(F)2/FHB") replied that PCAB Chairperson and Deputy Chairpersons had formulated PCAB's internal guidelines on the declaration of interest requirements and Rules on Practice and Procedure since their appointment. When handling appeal cases, they would act as the presiding officers who would be responsible for conducting the appeal hearings and writing the decisions.

19. Mr AU Nok-hin quoted paragraph 23 of FCR(2017-18)66 that according to the estimation of the Administration, the number of appeals that could be lined up within a year would be 40 appeals, but PCAB would only hold approximately 26 hearings per year (one hearing every two weeks). He queried whether PCAB could handle all appeal cases in a timely manner.

20. PAS(F)2/FHB said that it was necessary for PCAB to handle every case fairly, impartially, objectively and equitably, and to determine appeals reasonably and in observance of procedural justice and legal requirements. The Rules on Practice and Procedure of PCAB specified the timeframes for individual appeal proceedings (such as submission of the Notice of Appeal and making response by the respondent). The time required for handling an appeal case was generally expected to be about six months, and the actual time needed would be dependent on the complexity of the case. If many appeal cases were pending, PCAB would arrange for more Appeal Boards to hear and determine appeals in order to expedite the processing of appeals.

21. Mr CHAN Hak-kan said that as the Chairman of the Bills Committee on the Private Columbaria Bill in the Sixth Legislative Council ("LegCo"), he understood very well that regulating private columbaria was a complex issue. He commended the Administration's prompt action to establish the Private Columbaria Licensing Board ("PCLB") and PCAB for implementing the regulatory system soon after the passage of the Bill.

Level of remuneration

22. Ms Tanya CHAN said that the Civic Party supported the proposed remuneration package. Dr Helena WONG and Mr WU Chi-wai said that the Democratic Party was in support of the Administration's proposal, taking into account that the proposed remuneration package was similar to those of other government boards and committees with comparable functions.

23. Mr AU Nok-hin noted that the attendance fee for a non-official member not serving as the presiding officer of an appeal hearing was \$975 per attendance. Such an amount reached the ceiling of allowance which could be offered by the Government to a non-official member of a government board and committee ("maximum allowance"). However, according to the information provided by the Administration at another occasion, the remuneration offered to non-official members of some advisory and statutory organizations was lower than the maximum allowance. Mr AU, Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired how the remuneration was arrived at and whether it was sufficient to compensate for the contribution of PCAB members. They also asked about the effective period of and review mechanism for the proposed remuneration package.

24. Mr CHAN Hak-kan said that the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong supported the proposed

remuneration package. He considered that the proposed remuneration might be insignificant to PCAB members who were professionals, and would mainly serve the purpose of recognizing their selfless contribution.

25. Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired about the current remuneration package for PCLB, as well as the similarities and differences between the proposed remuneration packages for PCLB and for PCAB.

26. USFH, PAS(F)2/FHB and Permanent Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) ("PS(Tsy)/FSTB") said that:

- (a) the boards and committees established by the Government had different functions, workload and remuneration packages. The remuneration ceiling generally applicable to members on government boards and committees was approved by FC, which had subsequently delegated the authority to approve future revisions of the ceiling by reference to the movement in the Consumer Price Index to the then Secretary for the Treasury (currently the Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury). The prevailing ceiling was \$975 per member per attendance;
- (b) the main purpose of offering remuneration to the Chairperson, Deputy Chairpersons, presiding officers and members of PCAB was to recognize their service and compensate partially for the earnings forgone as a result of their participation in the work of PCAB. In relation to the remuneration for the Chairperson, Deputy Chairpersons and presiding officers, the prevailing ceiling mentioned in paragraph (a) was not sufficient. When preparing the remuneration package, the Administration had made reference to other government boards and committees with similar workload and work complexity. The proposed remuneration in question was similar to that offered to members of the Administrative Appeals Board, the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) and the Board of Review (Inland Revenue Ordinance); and
- (c) the proposed attendance fee for a non-official member not serving as the presiding officer of an appeal hearing was \$975 per attendance, which was equivalent to the remuneration ceiling mentioned in paragraph (a). The remuneration of these non-official members would be adjusted in future according to the established mechanism. The Chairperson

and Deputy Chairpersons of PCLB had not raised any objections to this arrangement.

27. Mr CHU Hoi-dick further asked whether the approval of FC was required if the proposed remuneration for members on government boards and committees would exceed the maximum allowance.

28. PS(Tsy)/FSTB explained that generally speaking, approval of FC was not required if the remuneration for members of government boards and committees did not exceed the maximum allowance. Moreover, FC's approval was also not required if the Government was authorized by statute to set the remuneration for members of a particular board and committee, even if the remuneration level specified in the remuneration package would exceed the prevailing maximum allowance. As the proposed remuneration for the Chairperson, Deputy Chairpersons and presiding officers of PCAB exceeded the maximum allowance, and the Government was not authorized by the Ordinance to set the relevant remuneration, the Administration was required to submit the current proposal to FC for approval. She added that the last time when a similar proposal was submitted by the Administration and approved by FC was in 2001. The proposal then involved the remuneration package for the Chairman of the Environmental Impact Assessment Appeal Board appointed to hear the appeal case on the Sheung Shui to Lok Ma Chau Spur Line project.

29. Mr AU Nok-hin enquired about the justifications for the much higher remuneration received by PCAB presiding officers for an attendance at an appeal hearing compared with that received by other non-official members. In response, PAS(F)2/FHB pointed out that the presiding officer would need to preside at appeal hearings and write decisions, and these tasks would be demanding and involve a heavy workload. Besides legally qualified, the presiding officer had to spend additional time and effort. Given the above, the Administration considered it reasonable to offer a higher remuneration for presiding officers.

Membership and declaration of interests mechanism of the Private Columbaria Appeal Board

30. Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Ms Tanya CHAN concurred with the Administration's arrangement of appointing senior professionals in the legal field to be members of PCAB. In particular, they remarked that the appointment of senior counsels to take up three out of the four positions of PCAB Chairperson and Deputy Chairpersons was conducive to the performance of duties by PCAB. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen said that he

supported the appointment of Mr Ambrose HO, who was impartial when serving other public offices in the past, as the Chairperson of PCAB.

31. Mr AU Nok-hin noted from the PCAB membership list issued on 29 September 2017 that Mr CHAN Hak-kan was one of the PCAB members. However, his name was not on the membership list in Enclosure 1 to FCR(2017-18)66. He enquired about the reasons for the discrepancy in the two membership lists.

32. Mr CHAN Hak-kan explained that he had been appointed as a member of PCAB. However, as he was serving, in the capacity of a LegCo Member, as an ex-officio member of the Advisory Board of Tung Wah Group of Hospitals, which managed service units operating columbaria, he resigned from the PCAB membership subsequently in order to avoid potential conflict of interests.

33. Dr KWOK Ka-ki was concerned about the mechanism put in place by PCAB to avoid conflict of interests or prevent members from seeking personal gains.

34. USFH replied that according to PCAB's mechanism for declaration of interests, panel members should register their personal interests upon their appointment to PCAB, and annually thereafter, and should also declare their interests when handling individual appeals. PAS(F)2/FHB supplemented that according to the internal guidelines on the declaration of interest requirements, members of PCAB should comply with stringent restrictions, e.g. panel members were not allowed to engage in any business relating to private columbaria during their term of office. The Chairperson and Deputy Chairpersons should abide by these restrictions for another six months after expiry of appointment.

35. Mr CHAN Hak-kan considered that PCAB's mechanism for declaration of interests was stringent enough to effectively avoid conflict of interests.

Issues relating to specified instruments

36. Dr Helena WONG and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired about the progress of PCLB in processing applications for specified instruments, including the expected timings of issuing the first batch of specified instruments and completing the processing of applications submitted by all 144 columbaria. Dr WONG was worried that inconvenience would be caused to the public if it took too long for PCLB to vet and approve such applications. Mr WU Chi-wai opined that the Administration should put

in place a timeframe for implementing the regulatory regime for private columbaria, and should issue licences to qualified operators as soon as possible so as to address the problem of varying standards among private columbaria.

37. Mr CHAN Hak-kan also hoped that PCLB could expedite the vetting and approval of relevant applications and issue the first batch of licences as soon as possible, so as to alleviate the shortage of niches and safeguard the livelihood of people who were engaged in the relevant trades.

38. PAS(F)2/FHB said that PCLB was an independent entity established under the Ordinance, and it was difficult for the Administration to accurately predict when PCLB would complete the processing of applications for specified instruments. To the understanding of the Administration, as the information provided by many applicants was incomplete, PCLB would need more time to follow up those cases.

39. PAS(F)2/FHB also pointed out that the initial effective period of a temporary suspension of liability ("TSOL") was less than three years and, normally, a TSOL could not be extended more than once. Therefore, the existing private columbaria must obtain licences or exemptions eventually in order to continue their operation.

40. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired:

- (a) why the number of applications on the List of Applications for Specified Instruments (i.e. the total number of applications which had gone through preliminary checking process and those which had not) published on the website of PCLB was more than the total number of columbaria (i.e. 144 columbaria) having submitted the applications;
- (b) why most of the application summaries were not published on the website of PCLB for public inspection; and
- (c) whether the applications that had been returned to the applicants were included in the above List of Applications for Specified Instruments.

41. PAS(F)2/FHB explained that some columbaria submitted applications for either licences or exemptions while some submitted applications for both. Therefore, the number of applications for specified instruments was more than that of columbaria. As most pre-cut-off columbaria submitted their applications for specified instruments only a

few days before the deadline, their applications were still under processing. Moreover, as the information submitted by some applicants was incomplete, PCLB could not, for the time being, publish their application summaries on its website. The List of Applications for Specified Instruments on the website did not include the applications that had been returned to the applicants.

42. Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired whether it was provided in the Ordinance that the applicants for specified instruments should provide missing documents within a specified period of time, or else their applications would be cancelled. PAS(F)2/FHB replied that the Ordinance did not provide a timeframe for submission of missing documents.

43. Regarding the case in which a member of the public had, before the cut-off time (i.e. 8:00 am on 18 June 2014), purchased or rented a niche for a relative who died after the enactment date of the Ordinance (i.e. 30 June 2017), Dr Helena WONG asked whether the person would be prohibited from interring the ashes in the niche concerned because the operator had yet to obtain any specified instruments.

44. PAS(F)2/FHB replied that:

- (a) a grace period was given to the columbaria which had been in operation before the enactment date of the Ordinance, and if these columbaria applied for TSOLs, the grace period could be extended to the time when their applications were concluded or withdrawn;
- (b) the Ordinance did not prohibit the above columbaria from interment of "new sets of ashes" (i.e. the ashes which had not been interred in the columbaria before the enactment date) during the grace period. However, if a columbarium applied for TSOL and a licence at the same time, PCLB would only issue TSOL to it if the ash interment capacity had remained unchanged since the cut-off time. In other words, ashes interred in that columbarium after the enactment date might have to be removed; and
- (c) the Administration suggested that members of the public who were in need of storage service for cremains could apply to keep the cremains of their ancestors in the temporary storage facilities at Kwai Chung Crematorium and Wo Hop Shek Crematorium managed by the Food and Environmental

Hygiene Department, and they could pay respect to their ancestors at the neighbouring facilities.

45. Dr Helena WONG asked whether a columbarium operator would breach the law if the effective period of the agreement for sale of interment rights signed with a consumer exceeded the licence period of the columbarium.

46. PAS(F)2/FHB replied that the licence period of a columbarium would not impose a constraint on the effective period an agreement for sale of interment rights, which was mutually agreed upon by the buyer and the seller. If the agreement period was longer than the licence period of the columbarium, the columbarium operator should explain the situation to the consumer, including the arrangement to be made in case of non-renewal of licences.

Other issues

Exemption from paying land premium

47. Ms Tanya CHAN criticized that the decision of the Administration to extend the scope of land premium exemption to cover all pre-cut-off columbaria eligible to apply for licences (i.e. the columbaria that were in operation immediately before the cut-off time) was unfair to other operators who had already paid the land premium. Dr KWOK Ka-ki also expressed concern about the decision to extend the scope of exemption.

48. Ms Tanya CHAN requested the Administration to provide the following supplementary information: justifications for the measures (including those relating to the payment of land premium and traffic impact assessment) for eligible private columbaria and the relevant statistics (including the number of private columbaria and niches exempted from paying land premium, the floor area of these private columbaria, and the land premium forgone as a result of such exemption). PAS(F)2/FHB said that a written reply would be provided. She added that a special meeting would be held by FSEH Panel on 30 April 2018, and members of the public would be invited to express their views on the above measures. The Administration would provide the relevant information to the Panel by that time.

[*Post-meeting note:* The Chinese and English versions of the supplementary information provided by the Administration were circulated to members on 23 and 24 April 2018 respectively vide LC Paper No. FC240/17-18(01).]

Time limit for use of public niches

49. Dr Helena WONG and Mr WU Chi-wai expressed concerns about the Administration's proposal to introduce a time limit for use of new public niches. They considered that the Administration should conduct an extensive public consultation exercise on the proposed plan, and the Administration and/or FSEH Panel should hold a public hearing to invite public views. Mr WU suggested that the proposed plan should be put forward in a progressive manner by, for instance, launching a trial scheme first in a particular public columbarium. PAS(F)2/FHB said that the Administration would consult 18 District Councils on the proposed plan, and would study in detail the views received from different channels.

Deputy Chairperson of Private Columbaria Licensing Board

50. Given that Mr IP Kwok-him was a non-official member of the Executive Council, and was also appointed as a member of the Advisory Board of Tung Wah Group of Hospitals, Mr AU Nok-hin queried whether it was appropriate to appoint Mr IP as the Deputy Chairperson of PCLB. He was of the view that the Administration should review the criteria for appointing members of PCLB. Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired whether the Administration would make it a mandatory requirement that persons with political affiliation would not assume the positions of Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson(s) of boards and committees in order to avoid potential conflict of interests.

51. PAS(F)2/FHB said that the Administration was willing to follow up with Members on issues relating to PCLB at FSEH Panel. She also pointed out that the mechanism for declaration of interests adopted by PCLB and PCAB was more rigorous than those generally adopted by other government boards and committees. Mr CHAN Hak-kan said that to his understanding, he was appointed as a member of PCAB mainly because he was the Chairman of the Bills Committee on the Private Columbaria Bill in the Sixth LegCo. Mr IP Kwok-him was the Chairman of the Bills Committee on the Private Columbaria Bill in the Fifth LegCo, and as such, his appointment as Deputy Chairperson of PCLB might have nothing to do with his political affiliation.

Voting on FCR(2017-18)66

52. There being no further questions from members, the Deputy Chairman put item FCR(2017-18)66 to vote. At the request of members, the Deputy Chairman ordered a division. The Deputy Chairman declared

that 40 members voted in favour of the item and 1 member abstained from voting. The votes of individual members were as follows:

For:

| | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Mr James TO Kun-sun | Prof Joseph LEE Kok-long |
| Mr WONG Ting-kwong | Ms Starry LEE Wai-king |
| Mr CHAN Hak-kan | Mr WONG Kwok-kin |
| Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee | Mr Steven HO Chun-yin |
| Mr Frankie YICK Chi-ming | Mr WU Chi-wai |
| Mr YIU Si-wing | Mr MA Fung-kwok |
| Mr CHAN Chi-chuen | Mr CHAN Han-pan |
| Mr LEUNG Che-cheung | Ms Alice MAK Mei-kuen |
| Mr Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung | Mr POON Siu-ping |
| Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok | Mr Andrew WAN Siu-kin |
| Mr CHU Hoi-dick | Mr HO Kai-ming |
| Mr LAM Cheuk-ting | Mr Holden CHOW Ho-ding |
| Mr SHIU Ka-fai | Mr SHIU Ka-chun |
| Mr Wilson OR Chong-shing | Ms YUNG Hoi-yan |
| Mr CHAN Chun-ying | Ms Tanya CHAN |
| Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan | Mr LUK Chung-hung |
| Mr LAU Kwok-fan | Mr Kenneth LAU Ip-keung |
| Mr KWONG Chun-yu | Mr Jeremy TAM Man-ho |
| Mr Gary FAN Kwok-wai | Mr AU Nok-hin |
| Mr Vincent CHENG Wing-shun | Mr Tony TSE Wai-chuen |

(40 members)

Abstained:

Dr CHENG Chung-tai
(1 member)

53. The Deputy Chairman declared that the item was approved.

Item 3 — FCR(2017-18)67
RECOMMENDATION OF THE ESTABLISHMENT
SUBCOMMITTEE MADE ON 5 FEBRUARY 2018

EC(2017-18)15
HEAD 60 — HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT
Subhead 000 — Operational Expenses

54. The Deputy Chairman advised that this item sought the approval of FC for the recommendation in relation to EC(2017-18)15 made by the Establishment Subcommittee at its meeting held on 5 February 2018,

i.e. retaining three supernumerary posts and extending the redeployment of one permanent post in the Highways Department ("HyD") in order to continue to provide dedicated staffing support by directorate officers, who were tasked to take forward the Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link ("TM-CLKL") project and the Tuen Mun Western Bypass ("TMWB") project and to complete the remaining works of the Hong Kong Section of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge ("HZMB"). Some members had requested that the item be voted on separately at an FC meeting.

55. At the invitation of the Deputy Chairman, Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport) 1 ("DS(T)1/THB") briefed members on this staffing proposal. She said that subject to the approval of FC, these three supernumerary posts and one redeployed permanent post would expire in 2019 or 2020. The Administration would, by that time, review the necessity for retaining/extending these four posts.

Renaming of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge Hong Kong Project Management Office as Major Works Project Management Office (Special Duties)

56. Mr WU Chi-wai said that the Democratic Party opposed the Administration's proposal. He opined that the HZMB Hong Kong Project Management Office should be dissolved with the completion of the Hong Kong Section of HZMB. Its duties and name should not be altered substantially in the course of the project. If the Administration intended to set up a new office (such as the Major Works Project Management Office (Special Duties) ("MWPMO(SD)")) under HyD, a separate funding proposal should be submitted to FC.

57. Director of Highways ("DHy") explained that upon the commissioning of HZMB, workload in relation to the Hong Kong Section of HZMB would be reduced, whereas the tasks to take forward the TM-CLKL and TMWB projects would carry a larger share of the overall workload of the HZMB Hong Kong Project Management Office. Therefore, the renaming of the said office as MWPMO(SD) could more accurately reflect the nature of its work. There was no plan at present to retain MWPMO(SD) permanently, and all four proposed directorate posts under the office were time-limited posts.

Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link and Tuen Mun Western Bypass (duties of Chief Engineer 1/Special Duties and Chief Engineer 2/Special Duties)

Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link

58. Mr LUK Chung-hung expressed concern about the repeated delays of the TM-CLKL project. He also enquired whether the said project was experiencing cost overruns, and whether the officers responsible for taking forward the project had reviewed the causes of project delay and identified room for improvement in order to prevent further delay.

59. DHy explained that in the TM-CLKL project, the submarine tunnel connecting Tuen Mun with the artificial island of the Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities ("HKBCF") of HZMB would be the longest submarine tunnel in Hong Kong. Its construction involved very complicated technical issues, including how to ensure the safe operation of the tunnel boring machines at the Southern Landfall (i.e. the tunnel alignment below the seawall). HyD had discussed the project design closely with the consulting engineers and contractors for some time, and the technical difficulties had basically been addressed. So far, there was no information indicating that the project would experience cost overruns. As in other major projects, HyD would review the process of taking forward the TM-CLKL project upon its completion.

60. Mr AU Nok-hin enquired about the measures to be taken by the Administration to divert traffic flows near Airport South Interchange and Airport Road after the commissioning of HZMB but before the opening of TM-CLKL, so as to prevent traffic congestion that might be caused by the additional vehicular flow brought by the commissioning of HZMB.

61. DS(T)1/THB and DHy responded that when seeking funding support from LegCo on the TM-CLKL project, the Administration expected that the Northern Connection of TM-CLKL would be completed about two years after the commissioning of HZMB. According to the relevant traffic impact assessment, it was expected that during the period between the commissioning of HZMB and the opening of the entire TM-CLKL, traffic congestion would not appear on Lantau Link, at Airport South Interchange and on Airport Road.

Tuen Mun Western Bypass

62. Mr CHAN Han-pan said that he supported the proposed retention/extension of the three posts of Chief Engineers, with a view to facilitating the early completion of the relevant projects. He urged the

Administration to implement the TMWB project as soon as possible in order to avoid serious impact on the traffic in Tuen Mun after the commissioning of TM-CLKL. DHy said that the investigation study on the latest alignment proposal for TMWB was in progress and would require about two years to complete. When the study was completed, the Administration would consult the relevant District Councils and residents on the proposed alignment. If the proposed alignment received general support from the public, the Administration would take forward the project according to the established procedure.

Hong Kong Section of Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge (duties of Chief Engineer 3/Special Duties)

Supply of parking spaces

63. Mr Holden CHOW and Mr CHAN Han-pan were worried that 650 private car parking spaces at HKBCF were not sufficient to meet the demand and, as a result, travellers who drove to HKBCF would need to use the parking spaces in the neighbouring areas (such as Tung Chung). This would cause inconvenience to the residents there. They asked whether consideration would be given to increasing the number of private car parking spaces at HKBCF.

64. DS(T)1/THB said that most travellers going to HKBCF would be expected to use public transport, and the provision of 650 private car parking spaces at HKBCF would be sufficient to meet the demand during the initial period after the commissioning of HZMB. The Administration noted the views of members, and would keep a close watch on the use of parking spaces upon the opening of HZMB. The Planning Department and the Civil Engineering and Development Department launched a planning, engineering and architectural study for the topside development at HKBCF in January 2015. Subject to the study results and land use reviews, the Government would consider positively the provision of parking spaces when planning for the topside development at HKBCF.

65. Mr Holden CHOW enquired when the above study would be completed. Mr CHAN Han-pan urged the Administration to complete the study as soon as possible. DS(T)1/THB said that she would follow up with the relevant departments and provide a written reply after the meeting.

[*Post-meeting note:* The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members on 26 April 2018 vide LC Paper No. FC245/17-18(01).]

66. Mr YIU Si-wing was concerned about whether parking spaces would be provided at HKBCF for coaches, and whether the facilities at HKBCF would be modified according to the actual operational needs after the commissioning of HZMB. Moreover, referring to the undertaking made by the Administration that a site visit to HKBCF would be arranged for the tourism sector, he enquired about the progress in this respect.

67. DHy responded that HyD would continue to discuss with the Transport Department the need to provide parking spaces for coaches at HKBCF. After the opening of HZMB, the Administration would consider introducing modifications to the facilities at HKBCF according to the operational needs, if necessary. DS(T)1/THB said that the Transport and Housing Bureau would report to the Panel on Transport of LegCo on the operational arrangements after the commissioning of HZMB, and the Transport Department would arrange for the relevant sectors to conduct trial runs at HKBCF.

Legal matters and claims

68. Dr CHENG Chung-tai was concerned about whether the financing agreement for HZMB signed by the three governments of Guangdong, Hong Kong and Macao would impose constraints on Chief Engineer 3/Special Duties ("CE3/SD") in performing his/her tasks (especially those relating to legal matters and claims). Dr CHENG also asked about the major counterparts of CE3/SD in the Mainland and in the Macao Special Administrative Region; whether the members of the project team headed by him/her had received legal professional training; and whether such team members were fully capable of assisting him/her in handling legal matters and claims.

69. DHy said that as far as the HZMB project was concerned, the major counterparts of CE3/SD outside Hong Kong was the HZMB Authority ("HZMBA"). The Administration had been maintaining close communication with HZMBA at various levels, and one of the Deputy Directors of HZMBA was a Senior Engineer seconded from HyD. The HZMB agreement signed by the three governments of Guangdong, Hong Kong and Macao did not impose any constraints on CE3/SD's work, and the Administration did not think that such a situation would arise in future. In the non-directorate establishment of MWPMO(SD), some staff members had profound experience in project management, and some had received legal professional training. They were fully capable of assisting CE3/SD in performing his/her duties.

70. Mr AU Nok-hin enquired about the progress and outlook of CE3/SD's work in handling the claims of contractors. DHy said that the information on the total amount of claims filed by contractors was provided in EC(2017-18)15. After receiving the claims submitted by contractors, the consulting engineers engaged by HyD would review the reasonableness of the claims in the light of the contracts, the grounds of the claims and related documents, etc., and would then give advice to HyD. HyD would examine the assessment review submitted by the consulting engineers, and offer professional comments in respect of the analysis of claim assessments. The above tasks would be handled by MWPMO(SD) and the team led by CE3/SD.

71. Dr CHENG Chung-tai and Mr AU Nok-hin were concerned about whether the scope of duties of CE3/SD included the handling of compensation claims in relation to industrial accidents at the Hong Kong Section of HZMB. DHy replied that persons who were affected by industrial accidents should file their claims to the relevant contractors. The project team of MWPMO(SD) would monitor the contractors to ensure that the claims were processed properly. As contractors were required to purchase insurance for their workers, the Administration would not handle these claims directly in normal circumstances, but would step in when such claims were handled improperly by contractors.

The second phase of the Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities project of Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge

72. Mr WU Chi-wai enquired about the conditions under which the Administration would decide to launch the second phase of the HKBCF project. DHy replied that the Administration would consider the timetable for launching the second phase project with reference to the passenger and vehicle flows after the commissioning of HKBCF.

73. Mr YIU Si-wing supported the proposed retention of the supernumerary post of CE3/SD. Under the current proposal, the said supernumerary post would be retained only until the end of 2019. He asked whether the Administration would consider retaining the post for a longer period of time for handling the remaining construction works of the Hong Kong Section of HZMB (including the second phase project). DS(T)1/THB reiterated that the Administration would review the necessity for retaining the post before its expiry.

Issues relating to the seawalls of an artificial island of Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge

74. Given that as mentioned by HyD, the construction of seawalls of the artificial islands of HZMB was based on the approved working drawings in 2014, but according to media reports, the website of HZMBA indicated that tetrapods were placed along the edge of seawalls in August 2013, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen queried whether the above works were conducted in the absence of approved working drawings.

75. DHy explained that regarding the works which commenced in 2013, the working drawings concerned were approved at an earlier time. The seawall segment which aroused the recent concern of the media was not located there, but on the other side of the artificial island, which was connected by the tunnel. The working drawings of the reported seawall segment were, indeed, approved in 2014. In fact, the tunnel connecting the artificial island was constructed in 2016, and the tetrapods along the edge of the seawall must be placed after the completion of the tunnel. Therefore, the tetrapods in that area must have been installed in or after 2016.

76. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired whether a request could be made by Project Manager/Major Works (Special Duties) to HZMBA for information to be provided by the consultancy firm Tunnel Engineering Consultants from the Netherlands (which was a member of the design consulting coordination mechanism set up for the HZMB project), in order to ascertain the authenticity of the press release (pertaining to the construction method of seawalls) issued by HZMBA on 6 April 2018. DHy undertook that the Administration would convey Mr CHAN's request to HZMBA.

[Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members on 26 April 2018 vide LC Paper No. FC245/17-18(01).]

77. Mr CHAN Han-pan requested the Administration to provide the working drawings of the seawalls of HZMB, so that members could review whether the construction of seawalls was conducted in accordance with the working drawings. Stressing that the working drawings of the eastern and western artificial islands of the HZMB project should both be provided, Mr CHU Hoi-dick queried why the Administration had not disclosed the information to the public earlier.

78. DHy explained that the above project was delivered under a design-and-build contract, whereby the contractor was responsible for the design of the project. The suggested disclosure of the working drawings to the public might involve intellectual property rights issues. Hence, after the Administration conveyed the request to HZMBA, HZMBA should first obtain the consent of the contractor before it could provide the relevant information to members. The seawalls which aroused the concern of the media earlier were located on the eastern artificial island. Two working drawings of the seawalls had been obtained from HZMBA subsequently, and they could be provided to FC after the meeting. Moreover, upon the request of members, the Administration would follow up with HZMBA and try to obtain the working drawings of the seawalls on the western artificial island for public inspection. The Deputy Chairman requested the Administration to provide the above information to the Panel on Transport as well. DHy noted the request of the Deputy Chairman.

[Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members on 26 April 2018 vide LC Paper No. FC245/17-18(01).]

79. Mr Christopher CHEUNG supported this staffing proposal in principle. He was of the view that the Administration was rather passive in disseminating information about HZMB. Often, the public was only informed of the latest progress of the HZMB project after the Administration responded to the reports of/enquiries from the media. In this connection, he asked about the major channels that were used by the Administration in the past to disseminate the relevant information to the public, and whether there was room for improvement in this respect.

80. DS(T)1/THB and DHy said that MWPMO(SD) had assigned some staff members to disseminate information to the public, and they attached great importance to concerns raised by the public on the Hong Kong Section of HZMB. The eastern artificial island of HZMB Main Bridge, which was located within the Mainland waters, was outside the Hong Kong territory, and HZMBA was the body responsible for taking forward the construction works concerned. Having said that, the Administration liaised with HZMBA to know more about the conditions of the seawalls in question immediately after the media in Hong Kong reported the issue. HZMBA, besides making a statement on the issue shortly afterwards, arranged a site visit for and meet with the officers of HyD at the earliest possible time. The Administration would make efforts to enhance the transparency of the HZMB Hong Kong Section project, so as to enable the

public to access information on the latest progress of the project more easily.

Toll levels of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge Main Bridge

81. Dr Fernando CHEUNG requested the Administration to provide supplementary information specifying the criteria for determining the toll levels of the HZMB Main Bridge and the approval mechanism for the tolls. Given that the interests on loans for financing the HZMB project would be partially borne by Hong Kong, and the above tolls would be used to, among other things, repay the interests on loans, he considered that the Administration should consult the public on the proposed toll levels, and the three governments should take into account the views of Hong Kong people when discussing the proposed toll levels. Moreover, Dr CHEUNG and Mr CHU Hoi-dick noted that the Guangdong Provincial Development and Reform Commission had held a public hearing on the toll levels of the HZMB Main Bridge, and the hearing was attended by Hong Kong residents. They sought information on the above Hong Kong residents, including whether they were recommended by the Administration to attend the hearing. DS(T)1/THB said that she would provide the information after the meeting.

[Post-meeting note: The supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members on 26 April 2018 vide LC Paper No. FC245/17-18(01).]

82. Mr CHU Hoi-dick enquired about the financing arrangement for the HZMB Main Bridge, and the consequences if the income from HZMB was not sufficient to repay the capital and interests on loans as a result of the lower-than-expected vehicular flows. Moreover, he requested the Administration to provide the full report of the study on the projected vehicular flows of HZMB.

83. DS(T)1/THB said that the Administration had explained the financing arrangement for the HZMB Main Bridge in 2009 when seeking funding approval from LegCo. The three governments would monitor closely the income of the HZMB Main Bridge and, if necessary, HZMBA would adopt income generation and cost-saving measures in order to maintain a sound financial status of the Main Bridge. As the study on the projected vehicular flows of HZMB was conducted by the consultant jointly commissioned by the three governments, the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region could not release the study report unilaterally.

84. The Deputy Chairman said that FC would continue to discuss this item at the meeting on 27 April 2018.

85. The meeting ended at 7:15 pm.

Legislative Council Secretariat

7 March 2019

點名表決 DIVISION: 1
日期 DATE: 13/04/2018
時間 TIME: 04:40:54 下午 PM

動議 MOTION: 動議中止議程文件 FCR(2017-18)65 的討論
Motion that discussion on FCR(2017-18)65 be now adjourned

動議人 MOVED BY:

出席 Present : 50
投票 Vote : 49
贊成 Yes : 12
反對 No : 37
棄權 Abstain : 0
結果 Result : 否決 Negatived

個別表決如下 THE INDIVIDUAL VOTES WERE AS FOLLOWS:

| 議員 | MEMBER | 投票 | VOTE | 議員 | MEMBER | 投票 | VOTE |
|------|--------------------|----|---------|-----|--------------------|----|------|
| 陳健波 | CHAN Kin-por | 出席 | PRESENT | 葛珮帆 | Dr Elizabeth QUAT | | |
| 涂謹申 | James TO | 反對 | NO | 廖長江 | Martin LIAO | | |
| 梁耀忠 | LEUNG Yiu-chung | | | 潘兆平 | POON Siu-ping | 反對 | NO |
| 石禮謙 | Abraham SHEK | | | 蔣麗芸 | Dr CHIANG Lai-wan | | |
| 張宇人 | Tommy CHEUNG | | | 盧偉國 | Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok | 反對 | NO |
| 李國麟 | Prof Joseph LEE | 反對 | NO | 鍾國斌 | CHUNG Kwok-pan | | |
| 林健鋒 | Jeffrey LAM | | | 楊岳橋 | Alvin YEUNG | 贊成 | YES |
| 黃定光 | WONG Ting-kwong | 反對 | NO | 尹兆堅 | Andrew WAN | 反對 | NO |
| 李慧琼 | Starry LEE | 反對 | NO | 朱凱迪 | CHU Hoi-dick | 贊成 | YES |
| 陳克勤 | CHAN Hak-kan | 反對 | NO | 吳永嘉 | Jimmy NG | 反對 | NO |
| 梁美芬 | Dr Priscilla LEUNG | | | 何君堯 | Dr Junius HO | | |
| 黃國健 | WONG Kwok-kin | 反對 | NO | 何啟明 | HO Kai-ming | 反對 | NO |
| 葉劉淑儀 | Mrs Regina IP | 反對 | NO | 林卓廷 | LAM Cheuk-ting | 反對 | NO |
| 謝偉俊 | Paul TSE | | | 周浩鼎 | Holden CHOW | 反對 | NO |
| 毛孟靜 | Claudia MO | 贊成 | YES | 邵家輝 | SHIU Ka-fai | 反對 | NO |
| 田北辰 | Michael TIEN | 反對 | NO | 邵家臻 | SHIU Ka-chun | 贊成 | YES |
| 何俊賢 | Steven HO | 反對 | NO | 柯創盛 | Wilson OR | 反對 | NO |
| 易志明 | Frankie YICK | 反對 | NO | 容海恩 | YUNG Hoi-yan | 反對 | NO |
| 胡志偉 | WU Chi-wai | 反對 | NO | 陳沛然 | Dr Pierre CHAN | | |
| 姚思榮 | YIU Si-wing | 反對 | NO | 陳振英 | CHAN Chun-ying | 反對 | NO |
| 馬逢國 | MA Fung-kwok | 反對 | NO | 陳淑莊 | Tanya CHAN | 贊成 | YES |
| 莫乃光 | Charles Peter MOK | 反對 | NO | 張國鈞 | CHEUNG Kwok-kwan | | |
| 陳志全 | CHAN Chi-chuen | 贊成 | YES | 許智峯 | HUI Chi-fung | | |
| 陳恒鎮 | CHAN Han-pan | 反對 | NO | 陸頌雄 | LUK Chung-hung | 反對 | NO |
| 梁志祥 | LEUNG Che-cheung | 反對 | NO | 劉國勳 | LAU Kwok-fan | 反對 | NO |
| 梁繼昌 | Kenneth LEUNG | | | 劉業強 | Kenneth LAU | 反對 | NO |
| 麥美娟 | Alice MAK | 反對 | NO | 鄭松泰 | Dr CHENG Chung-tai | 贊成 | YES |
| 郭家麒 | Dr KWOK Ka-ki | 贊成 | YES | 鄭俊宇 | KWONG Chun-yu | 反對 | NO |
| 郭偉强 | KWOK Wai-keung | 反對 | NO | 譚文豪 | Jeremy TAM | 贊成 | YES |
| 郭榮鏗 | Dennis KWOK | | | 范國威 | Gary FAN | | |
| 張華峰 | Christopher CHEUNG | 反對 | NO | 區諾軒 | AU Nok-hin | 贊成 | YES |
| 張超雄 | Dr Fernando CHEUNG | 贊成 | YES | 鄭泳舜 | Vincent CHENG | 反對 | NO |
| 黃碧雲 | Dr Helena WONG | 反對 | NO | 謝偉銓 | Tony TSE | 反對 | NO |
| 葉建源 | IP Kin-yuen | 贊成 | YES | | | | |