

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. FC5/09-10  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/1/2

**Finance Committee of the Legislative Council**

**Minutes of the 17th meeting  
held at the Legislative Council Chamber  
on Friday, 12 June 2009, at 3:00 pm**

**Members present:**

Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP (Chairman)  
Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan  
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, SBS, S.B.St.J., JP  
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan  
Dr Hon David LI Kwok-po, GBM, GBS, JP  
Hon Fred LI Wah-ming, JP  
Dr Hon Margaret NG  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong  
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP  
Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, GBS, JP  
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung  
Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong, GBS  
Hon WONG Yung-kan, SBS, JP  
Hon LAU Kong-wah, JP  
Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP  
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yee, GBS, JP  
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo  
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP  
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP  
Hon LI Fung-ying, BBS, JP  
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, SBS, JP  
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip  
Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP  
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP  
Hon Vincent FANG Kang, SBS, JP  
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH

Hon LEE Wing-tat  
Dr Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, JP  
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, SBS, JP  
Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, SBS, JP  
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC  
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung  
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP  
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, BBS  
Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC  
Hon KAM Nai-wai, MH  
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan  
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king  
Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai, BBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Hak-kan  
Hon Paul CHAN Mo-po, MH, JP  
Hon CHAN Kin-por, JP  
Hon Tanya CHAN  
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun  
Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau  
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che  
Hon WONG Sing-chi  
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, BBS  
Hon WONG Yuk-man  
Hon IP Wai-ming, MH  
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP  
Dr Hon PAN Pey-chyou  
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun  
Dr Hon Samson TAM Wai-ho, JP

**Members absent:**

Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, SBS, JP  
Hon CHIM Pui-chung

**Public officers attending:**

Ms Julia LEUNG Fung-ye, JP	Acting Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury
Mr Stanley YING, JP	Permanent Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)
Ms Bernadette LINN, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) <sup>1</sup>

Ms Elsie YUEN	Principal Executive Officer (General), Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau (The Treasury Branch)
Mrs Carrie LAM CHENG Yuet-ngor, JP	Secretary for Development
Ms Gracie FOO Siu-wai, JP	Deputy Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) <sup>1</sup>
Mr Robin IP Man-fai, JP	Deputy Head, Central Policy Unit
Mr Raymond FAN Wai-ming, JP	Secretary to the Commission on Strategic Development, Central Policy Unit
Mr Stephen SUI	Commissioner for Rehabilitation, Labour and Welfare Bureau
Mrs Cecilia YUEN	Assistant Director of Social Welfare (Rehabilitation and Medical Social Services)

**Clerk in attendance:**

Mrs Constance LI	Assistant Secretary General 1
------------------	-------------------------------

**Staff in attendance:**

Ms Anita SIT	Chief Council Secretary (1) <sup>4</sup>
Mr Simon CHEUNG	Senior Council Secretary (1) <sup>5</sup>
Ms Alice CHEUNG	Senior Legislative Assistant (1) <sup>1</sup>
Mr Frankie WOO	Legislative Assistant (1) <sup>2</sup>

---

**Item No. 1 - FCR(2009-10)23**

**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ESTABLISHMENT SUBCOMMITTEE  
MADE ON 27 MAY 2009**

The Chairman said that as suggested by the Establishment Subcommittee, EC(2009-10)6 and EC(2009-10)7 would be voted on separately from other items of FCR(2009-10)23.

2. The Chairman put the remaining items of FCR(2009-10)23 to vote. The Committee approved all these items.

**EC(2009-10)6 Proposed creation of a supernumerary post of Administrative Officer Staff Grade B (D3) in the office of the Secretary for Development to head the new Development Opportunities Office**

3. Mr LEE Wing-tat said that Members belonging to the Democratic Party (DP) were worried that the Development Opportunities Office (DOO) would only facilitate collusion between the Administration and the business sector. Mr LEE

considered that the fundamental problem was the cumbersome land development procedures, hence the Administration should streamline the existing procedures or revamp the system rather than bring in a new office. The Administration's current proposal of setting up the DOO would only have the effect of "personalizing" the mechanism in that it would rely heavily on the Secretary for Development (SDEV) to coordinate among bureaux and departments and to resolve any difficulties arising. Mr LEE said that DP Members would not support such a proposal.

4. SDEV advised that the Administration had discussed the proposal with members on different occasions and provided written response to various concerns raised prior to this meeting. As she had stated in her response to Ir Dr Raymond HO's motion on promoting infrastructure development at the Legislative Council (LegCo) meeting on 11 December 2008, while the Administration would press ahead with the public sector infrastructure development, it was obvious that public sector investment alone could not sustain the entire construction industry. In order to boost the economy and create employment opportunities in the construction sector, DOO would be a means to encourage private development projects. While she was aware that the DOO might arouse suspicion of collusion between Government and certain business sectors, she believed that with the appropriate safeguards to be put in place, Government officials should have the courage to take forward the proposal which aimed at providing a one-stop office to facilitate the processing of land development proposals under the adverse economic climate. She assured members that the DOO would only deal with development projects from proponents with land in hand, and these projects would not be exclusively residential but should contain components of wider economic value. She stressed that the DOO would be an advisory body providing one-stop co-ordinated advice and support to the private sector as well as non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and would not have any statutory power for approving development proposals. Meanwhile, the DOO would be monitored by the Land and Development Advisory Committee (LDAC) which comprised mainly non-official members. DOO would promulgate details of the development projects it had processed from time to time in order to enhance its transparency.

5. Whilst appreciating that the DOO aimed to offer a fast-track option for land development projects, Mr KAM Nai-wai considered that the DOO would set a bad precedent and more similar offices might be set up for say, education, food catering and other areas. This would undermine the existing land development procedures. He also did not understand why the DOO had to be positioned within the Office of SDEV, instead of the Office of the Permanent Secretary. He was worried that instead of managing policy issues, SDEV might focus her attention on individual cases. He had serious doubt that the bureaux and departments involved in land development would have the courage to decline land proposals recommended by the DOO. The public might also be suspicious about secret deals between the DOO and the business sector.

6. SDEV said that she had discussed the proposal with the relevant policy secretaries and department heads and they also considered the DOO a feasible measure to facilitate land development and boost the economy. Since the work of the DOO did not fall within the schedule of either the Planning and Lands Branch or the Works Branch of the Development Bureau, it was therefore placed under the Office of SDEV for the sake of efficiency, so that the DOO could seek directions from SDEV directly in coordinating with other bureaux and departments. While the DOO would assess the social benefits of the projects in accordance with the established procedures, the bureaux concerned would be expected to provide input according to their respective policy areas and on the six economic areas identified by the Task Force on Economic Challenges, i.e. testing and certification, medical services, innovation and technology, cultural and creative industries, environmental industry and educational services.

7. Ms Audrey EU said that the Civic Party (CP) had examined the DOO proposal carefully. As a matter of principle, she queried the need to set up the DOO to address the problems given rise by the bureaucratic procedures, and the proper way should be to revise the procedures or the system. It was undesirable to create a special set-up to deal with certain proposals on a selective basis, as this would have adverse impact on the existing system. If there would only be a small number of proponents meeting the DOO criteria, it would not be justifiable to set up the DOO. Given these considerations, Members from the CP would not support the proposal.

8. SDEV advised that the DOO would operate according to a set of objective criteria instead of on a selective basis. DOO would be subject to public scrutiny and would operate with a high degree of transparency. While it was an ongoing task of the Administration to review and revise the procedures related to land development, it would be unwise not to implement timely measures to address existing problems. It was also too early to say that the DOO would only be dealing with a small number of cases.

9. Mr Frederick FUNG said that the Hong Kong Association for Democracy and People's Livelihood supported the creation of the DOO to provide one-stop support to land developers as an attempt to address the existing problem. However, he commented that providing one-stop office was not always effective in resolving bureaucratic problems. Nevertheless, he did not consider that the DOO would necessarily lead to collusion between Government and the business sectors, as the most effective way to guard against malpractice would be to enhance the transparency of the DOO. Mr FUNG also requested the Administration to consider extending the scope of the DOO's service to cases where the project proponent did not possess land.

10. In response, SDEV advised that the criteria confining the service of the DOO to development proponents in possession of land was an effective measure to counter any perceived collusion between Government and the business sector. The Administration would review the work of the DOO in due course to see whether its service scope could be extended to other areas.

11. Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung opined that since the DOO would only be a facilitator and there was no plan to tackle the fundamental problems, there was little the new office could achieve.

12. SDEV responded that the Administration had actually started to implement a number of measures to reduce the pre-construction processing of land development projects, as prompted by the Pre-construction Task Force of the Business Facilitation Advisory Committee. The effectiveness of these measures would have to be tested through implementation. With the experiences gained by the DOO, the Administration would be able to identify other practical measures to expedite the land development process, and the DOO might not need to be a permanent establishment.

13. Ms Miriam LAU commented that the DOO proposal was innovative and worth supporting. As the posts for the DOO would be created on a supernumerary basis for three years, Ms LAU enquired about the timeframe for the review of the land development procedures. Ms LAU also asked what actual benefits would be brought by the DOO, say, in terms of time saving in taking forward land development proposals.

14. SDEV advised that it would be difficult to quantify the actual time savings in pursuing land development projects following the establishment of the DOO. However, it was envisaged that a considerable amount of time would be saved, as non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the private sector with creative and visionary land development proposals would be able to approach the DOO, a one-stop service point, for advice and support, without having to route through different bureaux and departments. As regards the overall review of land development procedures, SDEV said that it would be a broad and complex exercise involving a number of policy bureaux and departments. As far as the Development Bureau was concerned, in a bid to improve land development process, the Bureau would work on different programmes including Urban Renewal Strategy Review and an review on the Outline Zoning Plans. Ms Miriam LAU urged the Development Bureau to take the lead in coordinating the review on Hong Kong's land development procedure in order to achieve efficiency.

15. Mr Paul TSE expressed strong support for the DOO proposal. He believed that in the face of the global financial tsunami, the time-limited and highly innovative DOO proposal deserved a try. Given the proposed scope of the DOO and the fact that the existing procedures and regulation would need to be followed, he was not worried that the DOO would give rise to collusion between the Government and the business sector. He considered that members' worries could be addressed through enhanced transparency of the operation of the DOO.

16. Mr LAU Kong-wah said that Members belonging to the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong (DAB) supported the DOO proposal. He hoped that by adopting the "one-stop service", the DOO could reduce

the delays caused by the cumbersome procedures for taking forward land development projects. He also hoped that the DOO could identify solutions to improve the land development process. He was of the view that close collaboration among Government, business sector and the community was essential to enhance the competitiveness of Hong Kong. He supported giving the DOO a try and reviewing its operation in two years' time.

17. Ir Dr Raymond HO said that Members belonging to the Professionals Forum supported the staffing requests for setting up the DOO. Ir Dr HO commented that private land development projects used to account for 50 to 70% of the development projects, providing large number of jobs for construction workers. Nonetheless, due to long processing time, lengthy public consultation and time-consuming procedures straddling bureaux and departments, the number of private development projects had been on the decline, aggravating the unemployment problem in the construction sector. While the Public Works Subcommittee had in 2008-2009 endorsed public works projects amounting to \$120 billion, the active participation of private sector would still be necessary in boosting local economy and creating jobs for the construction industry. He added that public-private collaboration was widely practised in western countries and it was disappointing that such collaboration efforts in Hong Kong were viewed negatively. He stressed that private development projects were of paramount importance to Hong Kong's overall economy, and many public projects could not materialize without the participation of the private sector. He considered the innovative proposal of setting up a DOO to provide one-stop advisory and co-ordinating support to project proponents feasible and worth supporting.

18. Mr Albert CHAN said that the proposed DOO was similar to his earlier proposal of setting up a creative development committee to boost local economy and create job opportunities. While Members belonging to the League of Social Democrats (LSD) supported the proposal, it was important that the DOO should operate in a fair, open and transparent manner. The Administration should also undertake not to turn worthwhile development projects into residential projects, as in the case of the Cyberport development. In this connection, he asked whether it was possible to limit the size of real estate development in projects coordinated by the DOO.

19. SDEV responded that the DOO and the LDAC would operate with high transparency and utmost prudence, and the DOO's scope of service would mainly focus on worthwhile and creative development projects meeting the criteria. While the DOO would not provide service to those purely residential projects, there might be varying extent of residential development in projects coordinated by the DOO, and it would be unrealistic to set a limit or percentage on residential development in these projects.

20. Mrs Sophie LEUNG expressed support for the Administration's innovative proposal and hoped there would be greater collaboration between the public and

private sectors. Referring to the shortfall of sports facilities in Hong Kong, she considered that the DOO should also examine proposals for bringing in privately-run sports centres. She also requested the Administration to document details of development projects accepted as well as rejected by the DOO to facilitate future reviews. SDEV said that the DOO would keep records on both accepted and rejected cases for future review. As for the inclusion of sports facilities, she advised that as stated in paragraph 9(b) of the Administration's paper, the DOO would consider development proposals which contained components of wider economic value, and these included sports facilities.

21. Noting that the proposed DOO would provide one-stop advisory and co-ordinating support for land development proposals beneficial to the community at large, Ms Starry LEE said that she would support the proposal as other DAB members. She asked whether the Administration could act more proactively in attracting prospective proponents and whether the DOO could also consider applications for opening sports centres from proponents who might not possess any land.

22. SDEV advised that the DOO would provide assistance to development project proponents who approached the DOO with proposals meeting the criteria. Other development proposals not meeting such criteria would be assisted by other sections of the Development Bureau in accordance with normal procedures. For NGO proponents without any land in hand, certain flexibility would be allowed as stipulated in paragraph 9(a) of the Administration's paper.

23. Dr PAN Pey-chyou expressed appreciation of SDEV's courage in taking forward such a bold and innovative project. He said that Members from the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions (HKFTU) would support the proposal which would help promote employment.

24. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung warned that it was important to put in place an effective control and monitoring mechanism to oversee the work of the DOO, to avoid repeating the experience of the Cyberport and Bel-Air residential development project. He urged the Administration to adhere to the principles and criteria for selecting development proposals, and not to use the DOO for exercising favouritism for pro-Administration groups. He said that he would abstain from voting on this proposal.

25. Mr WONG Kwok-kin said that the construction industry was concerned about the slow progress in implementing the major infrastructure projects and hoped that the proposed DOO could speed up the delivery of these projects. He said that the DOO should not be deterred by the criticisms about possible collusion with the business sector. SDEV clarified that the DOO would not deal with the major infrastructure projects implemented by the Administration.

26. The Chairman put EC(2009-10)6 to vote. The Committee approved the staffing proposal with 27 members voting for it, 13 members against it and one

member abstaining from voting. Voting results in respect of individual members were as follows --

*For:*

Ir Dr Raymond HO Chung-tai	Mr CHAN Kam-lam
Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fan	Dr Philip WONG Yu-hong
Mr WONG Yung-kan	Mr LAU Kong-wah
Mr LAU Wong-fat	Ms Miriam LAU Kin-ye
Mr TAM Yiu-chung	Mr Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan
Mr Albert CHAN Wai-yip	Dr Joseph LEE Kok-long
Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming	Mr WONG Ting-kwong
Prof Patrick LAU Sau-shing	Ms Starry LEE Wai-king
Mr CHAN Hak-kan	Mr Paul CHAN Mo-po
Mr CHAN Kin-por	Dr Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun
Dr LEUNG Ka-lau	Mr WONG Kwok-kin
Mr WONG Yuk-man	Mr IP Kwok-him
Dr PAN Pey-chyou	Mr Paul TSE Wai-chun
Dr Samson TAM Wai-ho	

(27 members)

*Against:*

Mr Albert HO Chun-yan	Dr Margaret NG
Mr James TO Kun-sun	Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong
Mr LEUNG Yiu-chung	Mr Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
Ms Audrey EU Yuet-mee	Mr LEE Wing-tat
Mr Ronny TONG Ka-wah	Mr KAM Nai-wai
Ms Cyd HO Sau-lan	Miss Tanya CHAN
Mr WONG Sing-chi	

(13 members)

*Abstention:*

Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye

(1 member)

**EC(2009-10)7 Retention of a supernumerary post of one Administrative Officer Staff Grade C in the Secretariat to the Commission on Strategic Development within the Central Policy Unit**

27. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said that Members belonging to DP objected to the staffing proposal as they considered that the work of the Secretariat of the Commission on Strategic Development (CSD Secretariat) did not justify the continuation of the existing establishment and the retention of the supernumerary post of Administrative Officer Staff Grade C (AOSGC). DP was of the view that CSD's advisory role on key policy issues pertinent to the long-term development of Hong Kong was inappropriate since this would undermine the role of LegCo which was elected by the people of Hong Kong to carry out functions including monitoring the

work of the Government and giving views on policy matters. He considered that the Chief Executive had deliberately set up CSD to undermine the roles and functions of LegCo.

28. Deputy Head, Central Policy Unit (Dep Head, CPU) explained that the CSD was an important high-level advisory body established to help the Administration gauge public opinions on issues of concerns in the early stage of policy formulation. The CSD met regularly to discuss important cross-departmental issues relevant to the long-term development of Hong Kong. Following the established procedures, the Administration would consult LegCo in the process of policy formulation which included submission of funding and legislative proposals for scrutiny and approval by LegCo. Looking ahead, he believed that the CSD would be heavily engaged in examining issues relating to regional cooperation, the National 12th Five-Year Plan, development of Pearl River Delta Region, and cooperation between Hong Kong and Guangdong in the next three years. The Secretary to the Commission on Strategic Development supplemented that in view of the adverse impact of the global financial tsunami on the economy, the CSD would undertake research studies on Hong Kong's role in regional development and cooperation. In addition, the CSD would continue to maintain a high degree of transparency by uploading all of its discussion papers on its website and keeping LegCo informed of its discussions.

29. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong said that he was unconvinced and pointed out that many Principal Officials and their deputies were unwilling to come to LegCo's meetings. He disagreed that constitutional issues should be discussed at CSD rather than LegCo, as this reflected that the Administration had not attached importance to the role of LegCo in gauging public views on various policy matters.

30. Dep Head, CPU stressed that the CSD operated in a highly transparent manner and all of its discussion papers and views expressed by CSD Members were made public through uploading them on their website. Besides, all its discussion papers were circulated to the LegCo Members before each meeting. A gist of discussion was also provided after each meeting. Dep Head, CPU reiterated that the Administration attached great importance to soliciting views and support from LegCo on policy issues, and LegCo's approval was required for financial and legislative proposals. As the CSD was only an advisory platform for gauging views on long-term cross-departmental issues in a relatively early stage of the policy formulation process, it would in no way undermine the statutory roles and functions of LegCo.

31. Ms Audrey EU declared that she was a member of CSD. She said that she did not find it justifiable for CSD to continue its operation, and members from the CP would not support the staffing proposal.

32. Ir Dr Raymond HO said that he had been a member of CSD for nearly two years and had found CSD a useful platform for the Administration to collect views

and opinions from a wide spectrum of the society. Such practice was common among governments of other countries. Given that CSD was only an advisory body with no decision-making power, it should not be compared with the Legislature. In view of the increase of long-term development issues including those relating to Taiwan and the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), he found it reasonable to retain the supernumerary AOSGC post for CSD for a period of three years. He said that Members belonging to the Professionals Forum supported the staffing proposal.

33. Mr LAU Kong-wah said that he supported the Administration's proposal. He believed that CSD operated mainly as a think tank to collect views and suggestions on the future development of Hong Kong, including identifying new economic stimulus and directions to re-position Hong Kong in a fast-changing global economy. He considered that LegCo had its own constitutional status and would not be affected by the work of the CSD. He suggested that the Administration should incorporate the views of CSD in its funding and policy proposals for LegCo, and also set up an effective mechanism to implement the long-term policies on Hong Kong development. He also requested the Administration to review the role and functions of the Central Policy Unit in the light of the global economic development.

34. Dep Head, CPU noted Mr LAU's views and agreed that it was necessary for Hong Kong to address long-term development issues such as regional cooperation and ways to improve Hong Kong's competitiveness.

35. Ms Miriam LAU expressed support for the staffing proposal. She opined that there was hardly any other body that could conduct policy consultation as widely as CSD. Commenting that the research scope of CSD might be too broad, she suggested that CSD should focus on key issues relating to Hong Kong's development, such as Hong Kong's participation in the National 12<sup>th</sup> Five-Year Plan. Dep Head, CPU advised that CSD would initiate policy researches and might engage experts to assist in the research work. Visits would also be conducted to collect views and information for discussion by CSD.

36. Mr Albert HO said that Members belonging to DP were concerned that the Administration intended to undermine the role of an elected Legislature by creating another body which appeared to have community backing. He did not believe that the Administration would succeed in such a move as CSD did not have the same level of representation from the community as LegCo in formulating views on policy matters. Mr HO considered that the continued operation of CSD would waste time and taxpayers' money, as policy matters could be discussed at the relevant Panels of LegCo. Dep Head, CPU clarified that CSD was only an advisory body to assist the Administration to collect public views on long-term, complex issues at the early stage of policy formulation. The Administration would continue to work closely with LegCo to solicit its support for policy proposals prior to their implementation.

37. Mr WONG Kwok-kin declared that he was a member of CSD. He considered it unrealistic to compare CSD with LegCo given their different roles and functions. He said that CSD could serve to collect views from experts who were not elected to LegCo. He suggested the effectiveness of CSD could be enhanced by meeting more frequently and following up on its recommendations. Dep Head, CPU took note of Mr WONG's views and said that records of CSD meetings were forwarded to the relevant policy bureaux for follow-up.

38. The Chairman put item EC(2009-10)7 to vote. The Committee approved the staffing proposal with 27 members voting for it and 14 members voting against it. The voting results were as follows --

*For:*

Ir Dr Raymond HO Chung-tai  
Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fan  
Mr WONG Yung-kan  
Mr LAU Wong-fat  
Mr Timothy FOK Tsun-ting  
Mr Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan  
Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming  
Prof Patrick LAU Sau-shing  
Mr CHAN Hak-kan  
Mr CHAN Kin-por  
Dr LEUNG Ka-lau  
Mr IP Kwok-him  
Dr PAN Pey-chyou  
Dr Samson TAM Wai-ho  
(27 members)

Mr CHAN Kam-lam  
Dr Philip WONG Yu-hong  
Mr LAU Kong-wah  
Ms Miriam LAU Kin-ye  
Mr TAM Yiu-chung  
Dr Joseph LEE Kok-long  
Mr WONG Ting-kwong  
Ms Starry LEE Wai-king  
Mr Paul CHAN Mo-po  
Dr Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun  
Mr WONG Kwok-kin  
Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye  
Mr Paul TSE Wai-chun

*Against:*

Mr Albert HO Chun-yan  
Mr Fred LI Wah-ming  
Mr James TO Kun-sun  
Mr Andrew CHENG Kar-foo  
Mr LEE Wing-tat  
Mr KAM Nai-wai  
Ms Cyd HO Sau-lan  
(14 members)

Mr LEE Cheuk-yan  
Dr Margaret NG  
Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong  
Ms Audrey EU Yuet-mee  
Mr Ronny TONG Ka-wah  
Miss Tanya CHAN  
Mr WONG Sing-chi

**Item No. 2 - FCR(2009-10)20**

**LOTTERIES FUND**

**Head 341 – NON-RECURRENT GRANTS**

39. Mr WONG Sing-chi expressed grave concern about the long waiting list of persons with disabilities (PWDs), as Enclosure 1 to the Administration's paper revealed that more than 5 500 PWDs were currently waiting for hostel places with the longest waiting time at 106.8 months. He urged the Administration to provide more residential places for PWDs and draw up a service pledge, say three years as the target waiting time for such places.

40. The Commissioner for Rehabilitation (C for R) advised that the Administration was mindful of the demand for day and residential services for PWDs, and had been making continuous efforts to increase the number of residential and day services places over the years. The Administration had increased 439 residential places in 2008 and would continue to provide 490 and 181 additional places respectively in 2009 and 2010. The Administration would continue to identify suitable venues and resources, and to solicit support from the District Councils and local communities for setting up new service units in their respective districts. As regards setting a service pledge for the waiting time of residential places for PWDs, C for R explained that due to the presence of a number of uncertainties both in terms of service demand and supply of new service units, it would be difficult for a realistic service pledge to be set. Nonetheless, the Administration would make continuous efforts to identify additional resources and suitable premises to increase the service places.

41. Dr PAN Pey-chyou said that Members belonging to HKFTU supported the Administration's proposal. Nevertheless, as a mental health physician, he shared other members' concern that the number of hostel places for PWDs fell short of demand, and the waiting list for residential places was incredibly long. Noting that there were difficulties in identifying sites for residential hostels, he enquired about what measures the Administration would take to address the problem.

42. C for R advised that the Social Welfare Department (SWD) would continue to closely liaise with the Government Property Agency, the Lands Department, the Housing Department, the Education Bureau and other departments to identify suitable sites and premises for setting up residential hostels. The Administration would also work through the District Social Welfare Officers and the District Councils to identify suitable sites. Meanwhile, the Administration was in the course of drafting a bill and formulating suitable complementary measures to implement a licensing scheme on the residential homes for PWDs so as to ensure their service quality on one hand and help the market develop more service options for PWDs on the other.

43. Ms Cyd HO expressed concern that the two integrated rehabilitation centres in Kwai Chung and Ho Man Tin were converted from vacated premises which originally served different purposes. She enquired whether the refurbishment of the two centres had fully taken care of the needs of the PWDs who might have movement problems. She also expressed grave concern about the long waiting time, i.e. 27.3 months, for day activity centres, especially in view of the recent change of policy under which mentally handicapped students at mild and moderate level had to leave special schools after reaching 18. As the new policy would add considerable pressure on the demand for day activity centres, she urged the Administration to step up actions to turn vacated school premises into day activity centres. She also requested C for R to bring the matter up with the Education Bureau with a view to eliminating or shortening the waiting time as far as possible.

44. C for R responded that the design of all residential hostels, including those converted from vacated Government premises, would be in line with the design manual on Barrier Free Access 2008. Regarding the demand for day activity centres for mildly and moderately mentally handicapped students, he would discuss with the Education Bureau to see what could be done to improve the present situation. He advised that apart from day activity centres run by SWD, children leaving special schools could apply to enrol for skill training provided by the Skills Centres of the Vocational Training Council. The Chairman asked the Administration to report the matter to the Finance Committee.

*(Posting-meeting note: The Administration's written reply has been forwarded to members vide FC144/08-09 on 16 July 2009.)*

45. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan considered the excessively long waiting time for residential hostels unacceptable, and enquired whether the Administration could draw up a service pledge on waiting time or commit to increase the number of residential places. Mr Albert HO expressed similar views and urged for a reasonable waiting time for services for PWDs. C for R reiterated that it was not possible to draw up a realistic service pledge as there were a host of factors and variables both in terms of the service demand and supply of new service units. While the broad policy direction of the Administration was to integrate PWDs with the community as far as possible, the Administration would strive to obtain more resources to cope with the rising demand for residential services for those in need. Mr Albert HO expressed strong dissatisfaction with the Administration's response.

46. Mr Alan LEONG said that families of over 300 mentally handicapped children who were forced to leave the special schools had much hardship in taking care of these children at home. He criticised the Administration for not having a clear target to provide service in this particular area. Ms Cyd HO criticized that the Administration's move to integrate mentally handicapped children with the community was only to ask the individual families to take up the burden. In effect, over 5 000 women were forced to stay at home to take care of their children, and this in turn had worsened the poverty problem. She urged the Administration to start

work to convert vacated schools and Government premises such as the former Hollywood Road Police Quarters for immediate use as day activity centres.

47. The Assistant Director of Social Welfare (Rehabilitation and Medical Social Services) informed members that SWD had been able to convert the vacated Government premises into service units for PWDs. The latest example was the former Shatin Boys' Home which had been fit out to provide rehabilitation services in March 2009. The two new Integrated Rehabilitation Services Centres in Kwai Chung and Ho Man Tin as proposed by the Administration to this meeting were once the South Kwai Chung Jockey Club Polyclinic and Ma Tau Wai Girls' Home respectively. The Administration would continue its effort in this regard. As for community support for PWDs, she said that SWD would endeavour to provide necessary support services for the families/carers of these children.

48. While supporting the funding proposal, Dr Priscilla LEUNG stated that she was disappointed that the Administration had not come up with a clear policy direction for its residential and day services for PWDs.

49. The Chairman put the proposal to vote. The Committee approved the proposal.

50. The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 pm.