

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)1674/08-09
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/PL/SE

Panel on Security

Minutes of meeting
held on Tuesday, 7 April 2009, at 2:30 pm
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building

- Members present** : Hon LAU Kong-wah, JP (Chairman)
Dr Hon Margaret NG
Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong, GBS
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, SBS, JP
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP
Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, SBS, JP
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Hon CHAN Hak-kan
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, BBS
Hon WONG Yuk-man
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP
- Members attending** : Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun
- Members absent** : Hon James TO Kun-sun (Deputy Chairman)
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan
Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong
Hon WONG Yung-kan, SBS, JP
Hon CHIM Pui-chung
- Public Officers attending** : Item IV
Mr NGAI Wing-chit
Deputy Secretary for Security (3)

Mr CHAN Kwok-ki
Assistant Director of Immigration (Visa and Policies)

Mr Edward YU
Assistant Secretary for Security (D3)

Item V

Mr Alan LO
Principal Assistant Secretary for Security (C)

Mrs CHUNG LAM Wai
Assistant Director of Immigration (Management and Support)

Mr CHOW Chi-ping
Project Director 2
Architectural Services Department

**Attendance
by invitation** : Item IV

Member of the Legislative Assembly of the Macao Special
Administrative Region

Mr António NG Kuok-cheong

**Clerk in
attendance** : Mr Raymond LAM
Chief Council Secretary (2) 1

**Staff in
attendance** : Mr LEE Yu-sung
Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 1

Mr YICK Wing-kin
Assistant Legal Adviser 8

Miss Josephine SO
Senior Council Secretary (2) 1

Miss Helen DIN
Legislative Assistant (2) 1

Action

I. Confirmation of minutes of previous meeting
(LC Paper No. CB(2)1208/08-09)

The minutes of the special meeting held on 16 February 2009 were confirmed.

Action

II. Information papers issued since the last meeting

(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1052/08-09(01), CB(2)1117/08-09(01), CB(2)1123/08-09(01), CB(2)1201/08-09(01) & (02), CB(2)1234/08-09(01) and CB(2)1240/08-09(01))

2. Members noted that the following papers had been issued since the last meeting -

- (a) Submission from the Law Society of Hong Kong on the Annual Report 2007 of the Commissioner on Interception of Communications and Surveillance;
- (b) Administration's paper on its efforts in respect of public education on the control of indoor pyrotechnic effects;
- (c) Administration's paper on the service provided by the Immigration Department's in-house Clinical Psychologist;
- (d) Letter dated 30 March 2009 from Yau Tsim Mong District Office providing details of the closed-circuit television system to be installed in the Mong Kok Pedestrian Precinct;
- (e) Letter dated 26 March 2009 from the Transport and Housing Bureau providing information on the effectiveness and impact on privacy of installation of closed-circuit television in public rental housing estates;
- (f) Joint position paper from the Law Society of Hong Kong and the Hong Kong Bar Association on the legislative framework for torture claimants and asylum seekers; and
- (g) Referral from Duty Roster Members on the smuggling of cigarettes.

III. Date of next meeting and items for discussion

(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1207/08-09(01) & (02))

Regular meeting in May 2009

3. Members agreed to discuss the following items proposed by the Administration at the next regular meeting scheduled for 5 May 2009 -

- (a) Progress on implementation of recommendations of the Task Force on Youth Drug Abuse;

Action

- (b) Replacement of fixed-wing aircraft of the Government Flying Service;
- (c) Construction of a Secondary Boundary Fence and new sections of the Primary Boundary Fence and the Boundary Patrol Road arising from the reduced coverage of the Frontier Closed Area; and
- (d) Redevelopment of departmental quarters for the Customs and Excise Department at Hung Hom, Kowloon.

4. Dr Margaret NG referred to the joint position paper from the Law Society of Hong Kong and the Hong Kong Bar Association in paragraph 2(f). She recalled that at the Panel meeting on 3 February 2009, the Administration had indicated its intention to study the implementation of a legislative regime with comprehensive and effective procedures for determining refugee status and assessing torture claims made under the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The Administration had undertaken to provide a framework on the subject matter for consideration by the Legislative Council (LegCo) by the end of 2009. Dr NG said that the Administration should consult the legal profession and LegCo at the earliest possible opportunity before taking forward any proposals. She suggested that the Administration be requested to update members on the progress of its review of the torture claim screening mechanism at the next regular meeting.

5. Ms Cyd HO referred to an open fire incident in Hung Hom on 17 March 2009 which caused the death of a Nepalese. She said that the incident had aroused wide public concern about the Police's handling of ethnic minorities. She hoped that the Administration could brief members on the Police guidelines and training for frontline officers when dealing with matters related to ethnic minorities, and the current arrangement for Police officers in performing beat patrol duty. Ms Emily LAU said that as the discussion might touch on issues relating to integration of ethnic minorities into the community and promotion of racial equality, representatives from the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau should be invited to attend the meeting on 5 May 2009.

6. Noting from media reports that the Police was conducting an investigation into the open fire incident in Hung Hom, Ms Audrey EU suggested that the Administration should be requested to provide the Panel with a copy of the Police's investigation report, once it was available.

Admin

7. Members agreed that in addition to the items referred to in paragraph 3 above, the items "Police's handling of ethnic minorities and beat patrol arrangement" and "Review of the torture claim screening mechanism" would be discussed at the next regular meeting.

Action

8. In view of the number of items to be discussed, the Chairman proposed and members agreed that the next regular meeting to be held on 5 May 2009 be extended to start at 2:00 pm and end at 6:00 pm.

(Post-meeting note: At the request of the Administration and with the agreement of the Chairman, the item "Review of the torture claim screening mechanism" was deferred to the regular meeting in June 2009.)

Regular meeting in June 2009

9. Ms Emily LAU said that despite the additional information and assurance provided by the Administration, she remained concerned about the closed-circuit television (CCTV) system to be installed in the Mong Kok Pedestrian Precinct (MKPP), especially the privacy implications of such installation. She suggested that the Panel should discuss the issue at a future meeting. Members agreed that the matter should be included in the agenda for the regular meeting in June 2009. They also agreed that a site visit should be made to assist them to have a better understanding of the operation of the CCTV system in MKPP.

IV. Immigration convenience measures for Hong Kong and Macao residents travelling between the two places

(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1207/08-09(03) & (04))

10. The Chairman welcomed Mr António NG, Member of the Legislative Assembly of the Macao Special Administrative Region (MSAR), for attending the meeting. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr NG presented his views as detailed in his submission tabled at the meeting. Mr NG advised that between January 2008 and March 2009, about 2 100 Macao residents had been denied entry to Hong Kong. Most of them were refused entry by the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) Government for the reason that they had forgotten to bring the Declaration Forms for Holders of MSAR Permanent Resident Identity Card to HKSAR (the Declaration Forms).

(Post-meeting note: The submission from Mr António NG was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. CB(2)1294/08-09(01) on 8 April 2009.)

11. Deputy Secretary for Security (3) (DS(S)3) briefed Members on the progress of the implementation of the immigration convenience measures for Hong Kong and Macao residents travelling between the two places, as announced in the Policy Address 2008, the details of which were set out in the Administration's paper.

Action

12. Noting that about 2 100 Macao residents had been denied entry into Hong Kong between January 2008 and March 2009, Mr WONG Yuk-man and Mr IP Kwok-him asked about the reasons for refusal of the entry of these people.

13. DS(S)3 responded that in exercising immigration control, each case was considered by the Immigration Department (ImmD) on its own merits. Regarding those 2 100 Macao residents who had been refused entry in 2008, the majority of them were refused on the ground of failing to produce the Declaration Forms. To eliminate the situation whereby Macao visitors had to return to Macao merely because of not in possession of a Declaration Form, the Administration had recently assisted the Macao authorities to make arrangements for the installation of self-service kiosks at the Macao Ferry Terminal (MFT) and the China Ferry Terminal (CFT) to provide printing service on the spot for those Macao visitors who had not brought along the Declaration Forms.

14. Referring to the two refusal cases mentioned in Mr António NG's submission, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung asked whether the HKSAR Government had provided the persons concerned with reasons for refusal of entry.

15. Mr António NG replied in the negative and informed Members that those two persons whose applications were rejected had doubt on whether they were refused entry for political reasons.

16. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung questioned how the Administration had come to the decision that those two persons should not be permitted to enter Hong Kong. He noticed that the HKSAR Government had in the past prohibited members of certain groups or individuals with background associated with the democratic movement in China from entering Hong Kong. He queried whether a person's political inclination and religious belief had any impact on his/her application for entry.

17. DS(S)3 stressed that during immigration examination on arrival, ImmD would consider whether the visitor met normal immigration requirements, such as whether he possessed a valid travel document, sufficient re-entry facilities to his place of residence and sufficient funds for the proposed stay; whether he had any known adverse records; as well as his purpose of visit. ImmD would also consider whether his entry would not be conducive to the public interest. ImmD's procedures in processing entry applications were in line with the practices of the immigration authorities in many other places. In considering an entry application, ImmD would act in accordance with the law and prevailing policy, and take into account all relevant circumstances and factors on a case-by-case basis.

18. In response to Mr WONG Yuk-man's and Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung's enquiry whether the Administration had a "black-list" of Macao residents

Action

visiting Hong Kong, DS(S)3 replied in the negative, but advised that there was a "watch-list" of persons such as terrorists and wanted persons.

19. Mr Frederick FUNG asked when and how the "watch-list" was first established. He also asked about the criteria for the inclusion of names in the "watch-list".

20. DS(S)3 responded that the "watch-list" had been established for a long time. In order to uphold effective immigration control, ImmD maintained a "watch-list". When intelligence indicated that a person's presence in Hong Kong might not be conducive to the public good of Hong Kong, his/her name might be put on the "watch-list". A person whose name was on the "watch-list" did not mean that he/she would necessarily or automatically be refused entry. The "watch-list" was by no means a list of persons not allowed to enter Hong Kong; and was not a so-called "black-list". There were occasions where persons on the "watch-list" were allowed entry into Hong Kong after immigration examination. Each case was considered by ImmD on its own merits.

21. Mr WONG Yuk-man and Ms Emily LAU expressed concern about the recent cases of Hong Kong residents being refused entry into Macao. They asked whether the Administration had taken the matter up with the Macao authorities.

22. DS(S)3 responded that the Administration understood that the MSAR Government had its own immigration control. Nevertheless, in view of the wide public concern over the cases of Hong Kong residents being refused entry into Macao, the HKSAR Government had, through ImmD, approached the Macao authorities to understand the situation and to express its concern about the matter. In early March 2009, the Chief Executive himself had also expressed the concern of the HKSAR Government about the ways in which the MSAR Government handled the matter with the Chief Executive of Macao. The HKSAR Government would continue to monitor the situation.

23. Responding to Ms Emily LAU's enquiry whether there was a formal communication mechanism between the HKSAR and MSAR Governments, DS(S)3 advised that under a high-level co-operation meeting co-chaired by the Financial Secretary and the Secretary for Economy and Finance of Macao to discuss the latest progress and future direction of co-operation between the two places, the HKSAR and MSAR Governments established a co-ordinator system under which representatives from the relevant government bureaux or departments would serve as co-ordinators in a number of co-operation areas. Following the establishment of the co-ordinator system, various bureaux and departments in both Hong Kong and Macao took forward co-operation projects through different channels. It was noteworthy that the Security Bureau and ImmD had engaged in active discussions with the Identification Department of MSAR, the Office of the Secretary for Security and the Immigration

Action

Department of the Macao Security Police on measures to further facilitate the flow of residents between the two places. It was the consensus of the HKSAR and MSAR Governments to introduce measures, as set out in the Administration's paper, to enhance immigration convenience for residents of the two places.

24. Ms Audrey EU said that notwithstanding the enhanced immigration convenience measures proposed by the Administration, unequal treatment continued to exist between Hong Kong and Macao. For instance, although the HKSAR Government had extended with effect from 16 February 2009 the limit of stay for MSAR permanent residents as visitors in Hong Kong from 14 days to 180 days, such a length of stay was much shorter than that enjoyed by HKSAR permanent residents as visitors in Macao who could enjoy a limit of stay of one year. She enquired about the rationale for the difference. Regarding the existing requirement for MSAR permanent residents to furnish the Declaration Forms on their arrival at Hong Kong, Ms EU asked about the purpose of imposing such a requirement and the possibility of waiving the production of Declaration Forms in the long run.

25. In response, DS(S)3 and Assistant Director of Immigration (Visa and Policies) (AD of Imm) made the following points -

- (a) Hong Kong residents as visitors in Macao had enjoyed the one-year-stay period for a long time;
- (b) in considering measures to facilitate the visit of Macao residents to Hong Kong, the HKSAR Government had made an attempt to narrow the difference between Hong Kong and Macao in respect of the limit of stay. The HKSAR Government had extended with effect from 16 February 2009 the limit of stay for MSAR permanent residents as visitors in Hong Kong from 14 days to 180 days. This was at present the longest period allowed for any visitors to stay in Hong Kong on each landing;
- (c) every visitor to Hong Kong was required to have a valid travel document. As the Administration did not accept Macao Smart Permanent Identity Card as a valid travel document, MSAR permanent residents had to furnish the Declaration Forms for visits to Hong Kong. The Declaration Forms would serve as a travel document and thus chops were stamped on the document at the immigration checkpoints and offices to indicate the limit and conditions of stay. In the long run, the Administration aimed to waive the requirement for Macao residents visiting Hong Kong to produce the Declaration Forms. Reciprocally, the Macao side would dispense with the existing requirement for HKSAR permanent residents to fill out arrival/departure cards. In other words, HKSAR and MSAR permanent residents travelling

Action

between the two places would be able to go through immigration clearance solely on the strength of their permanent identity cards; and

- (d) the measure of allowing MSAR permanent residents to visit Hong Kong solely with their Macao Smart Permanent Identity Cards without the need to complete and furnish the Declaration Forms had to be complemented by the exercise of the Director of Immigration's discretionary power under the Immigration Ordinance (Cap. 115) to accept Macao Smart Permanent Identity Cards as a valid travel document, and the issuance of some form of document, such as printed notice, stating the limit of stay and such other conditions of stay imposed on a Macao resident if permission was given for him/her to land in Hong Kong.

26. Ms Audrey EU and Ms Cyd HO held the view that the Administration should make arrangements to facilitate MSAR permanent residents' retrieval and production of the Declaration Forms on their arrival or landing in Hong Kong. They suggested that readily obtainable blank forms should be made available at immigration counters at MFT and CFT. Consideration should also be given to installing more kiosks to provide printing service on the spot for those Macao visitors who had not brought along the Declaration Forms. The Chairman echoed Ms EU's and Ms HO's view, and asked whether the Administration had any plans to install kiosks at other control points, e.g. the Lo Wu Control Point.

27. DS(S)3 and AD of Imm said that the Administration would closely monitor the utilization of the self-service kiosks newly installed at MFT and CFT and take appropriate actions where necessary.

28. Responding to Ms Cyd HO's enquiry, DS(S)3 and AD of Imm advised that under section 7 of Cap. 115, all visitors required landing permission to be granted upon their arrival in Hong Kong. Where such permission was given, an immigration officer might impose on visitors a limit of stay and such other conditions of stay through making a visitor endorsement on their travel documents. As previously explained, the HKSAR Government did not accept Macao Smart Permanent Identity Card as a valid travel document, MSAR permanent residents were therefore required to furnish the Declaration Forms for visits to Hong Kong. The Declaration Forms would serve as a travel document and thus chops were stamped on the document at the immigration checkpoints and offices to indicate the limit of stay and any other conditions of stay imposed. Upon such persons' departure from Hong Kong, an immigration officer would examine the Declaration Forms to ascertain whether the visitors had breached the conditions of stay or had overstayed their limit of stay before allowing them to leave. If the requirement for MSAR permanent residents visiting Hong Kong to furnish the Declaration Forms was waived, ImmD needed to make alternative arrangement to indicate the limit and conditions of

Action

stay imposed on them. As mentioned in paragraph 25(d) above, the Administration was considering the issuance of printed notice, just similar to the visa label in a passport, to all Macao visitors on their arrival in Hong Kong, regardless of whether they used e-channels or traditional counters for immigration clearance.

29. Ms Cyd HO said that she had received complaints from some Macao residents who visited Hong Kong frequently for family reunion. These people complained that they had been refused entry to Hong Kong for doubtful purpose of visit and had been badly treated by immigration officers when going through immigration clearance at traditional counters. Ms HO hoped that the ImmD management could look into the matter.

30. AD of Imm responded that there was a possibility that passengers would be subjected to detailed examination upon their arrival if they visited Hong Kong frequently. Immigration officers were, however, not allowed to adopt a bad attitude towards any visitor. AD of Imm suggested Ms Cyd HO to provide him with details of the cases for follow-up.

31. Mr WONG Kwok-kin welcomed the proposed enhancement measure to waive the completion and production of arrival/departure documents. He hoped that the HKSAR and the MSAR Governments would implement the new measure as early as possible.

32. Dr Margaret NG and Mr Paul TSE expressed reservations about the exercise of the Director of Immigration's discretionary power under the Immigration Ordinance to accept Macao Smart Permanent Identity Card as a valid travel document. They considered it more appropriate for the Administration to introduce amendments to the law which mirrored such a decision. Mr TSE held the view that the Administration should be more flexible and should do away with unnecessary formalities to enhance the travel convenience for Macao Smart Permanent Identity Card holders. His view was echoed by Mr IP Kwok-him.

33. Mr Paul TSE and Mr Frederick FUNG considered that the Administration should make further efforts to streamline the immigration arrangements for Macao residents visiting Hong Kong. Mr TSE questioned the need for providing Macao visitors with printed notice stating the limit of stay and such other conditions of stay imposed on them upon their arrival. He also asked about the possibility of extending the 180-day stay period for visit to Hong Kong.

34. In response, DS(S)3 explained that -

- (a) section 61(1) of Cap. 115 provided that a travel document should not be valid for the purposes of the Ordinance unless it bore a visa which was issued by or on behalf of the Director of Immigration and was in force on the date on which the person to

Action

whom the travel document related arrived in Hong Kong. While section 61(2) of the Ordinance empowered the Director to exempt any person or any class or description of person from section 61(1), the Director of Immigration exercising his discretionary power to grant exemption to holders of Macao Smart Permanent Identity Card was the simplest and easiest way to make Macao Smart Permanent Identity Card a valid travel document under this provision. Besides, the Macao Smart Permanent Identity Card had to fulfill other provisions of Cap. 115 as a valid travel document;

- (b) the Administration was contemplating the issuance of printed notice to Macao visitors stating the limit of stay and such other conditions of stay imposed on them, in order to facilitate the subsequent verification of the identity and immigration status of Macao visitors by law enforcement officers; and
- (c) under the Registration of Persons Ordinance (Cap. 177), if a person was required to be present in Hong Kong in excess of 180 days, he/she had to apply for a Hong Kong Identity Card. Given the far-reaching implication, the Administration had no plan to further extend the 180-day stay period for any visitors to Hong Kong.

35. Dr Margaret NG expressed grave concern about the recent incident where a legal scholar of the University of Hong Kong, Professor Johannes CHAN Man-mun, was refused entry by the MSAR Government. She noted that Professor CHAN was invited to attend an academic function. She considered it difficult to imagine the MSAR Government would have refused his entry when Professor CHAN visited Macao for the purpose of academic exchanges. She enquired whether the MSAR Government had provided reasons for his refusal of entry.

36. Ms Emily LAU reiterated her concern about the repeated cases of Hong Kong residents being refused entry into Macao. She was concerned whether the Macao authorities had refused the entry of Hong Kong residents because of their political views. She hoped that the MSAR Government would not make any decisions detrimental to the normal exchanges between Hong Kong and Macao. Mr Frederick FUNG added that according to his own experience of being refused entry into Macao, there seemed to be a "black-list" of visitors in the computer system of immigration control points in Macao.

37. Mr António NG said that he had made enquiries with the MSAR Government, which had replied that -

- (a) there was no "black-list" of visitors;

Action

- (b) the refusal of entry of a visitor was determined by frontline officers having regard to the circumstances of each case; and
- (c) owing to the need to protect privacy, it was not appropriate to disclose information relating to specific individuals.

38. Regarding the refusal of entry of Professor Johannes CHAN, Mr António NG said that he was personally of the view that the refusal might have resulted from misunderstanding. He considered that after 15 March 2009, with the Central Authorities having expressed concern over the issue and the MSAR Government having examined the issue, he did not envisage similar misunderstanding to arise again in the future.

39. Mr António NG said that even with the implementation of the proposed immigration convenience measures, the problems associated with the production of Declaration Forms would still exist for MSAR permanent residents entering Hong Kong from the Mainland. The Chairman asked whether the Administration had any plans to install self-service kiosks at control points other than MFT and CFT for printing of Declaration Forms. DS(S)3 responded that similar self-service kiosks could be installed at other controls points.

V. Construction of rank and file quarters for Immigration Department at Wo Yi Hop Road, Kwai Chung
(LC Paper No. CB(2)1207/08-09(05))

40. Ms Emily LAU expressed support for the proposed project for rank and file staff of ImmD. She asked about the reasons for and merits of using the "Design-and-Build" (D&B) method for the project.

41. In response, Project Director 2/Architectural Services Department (PD2/ASD) said that the D&B procurement method was widely adopted within the Government for construction of departmental quarters. He explained that the traditional approach to implement a new project was for the client to employ an architect to produce the design to suit the client's needs and then to find a contractor to build according to that design. Under the traditional approach, the contractor was to provide a satisfactory standard of workmanship, but carried no responsibility for the design. However, if the D&B method was adopted, the contractor would be responsible for both the design and construction of the project. The selection of consultants and the detailed design work could therefore overlap with the construction stage, thereby shortening the total time required.

42. Responding to Ms Emily LAU's enquiry regarding public consultation on the proposed project, Principal Assistant Secretary for Security (C) (PAS(S)C) advised that the Administration had consulted the relevant parties in

Action

January 2009, including six members of the Kwai Tsing District Council (K&TDC), one member of the Tsuen Wan District Council, the Chairman of the Kwai Chung (North East) Area Committee and the centre-in-charge of the Tang Shiu Kin Scout and Guide Centre. All of them had raised no objection to the project.

43. Ms Emily LAU expressed dissatisfaction that the Administration had only consulted some but not all members of K&TDC or the residents of the nearby developments. She requested the Administration to conduct a comprehensive and extensive consultation with K&TDC to make sure its members had no objection to the proposed construction of the rank and file quarters in question.

44. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung echoed the need for a more thorough and extensive consultation with K&TDC to ensure the construction of rank and file quarters at Wo Yi Hop Road would not affect the neighbouring community.

45. PAS(S)C noted the suggestion and undertook to discuss with the District Officer on how to proceed with a wider consultation with K&TDC.

46. Mr IP Kwok-him said that he was in support of the proposed project. He expressed concern about the substantial shortfall in the provision of departmental quarters for staff of ImmD, and enquired whether the Administration had any plans to increase the provision in future.

47. In response, Assistant Director of Immigration (Management and Support) and PD2/ASD made the following points -

- (a) as at 1 March 2009, there were a total of 1 695 rank and file disciplined staff in ImmD who were eligible for departmental quarters. As only 940 units were available, there was a shortfall of 755 units;
- (b) the strength of rank and file staff of ImmD grew from 2 727 as at 1 April 2004 to 3 257 as at 1 March 2009. In the coming years, ImmD would continue to recruit staff to fill vacancies and posts created under new initiatives, such as taking over of the Castle Peak Bay Immigration Centre. Furthermore, there were some 1 300 single rank and file staff, which formed potential demand for departmental quarter units. If the supply remained unchanged, the shortfall would aggravate. It was estimated that ImmD would be short of 851 units for rank and file staff in 2012. This was detrimental to the morale and retention of staff;
- (c) the project in question involved the construction of two blocks of 8 and 13-storey buildings, which would provide a total of 144 H-grade units. It would help ease the long-standing shortage of rank and file quarters in ImmD; and

Action

- (d) ImmD would continue to explore with the Government Property Agency the feasibility of identifying more quarter units vacated by other government departments for use by ImmD staff.

48. Ms Audrey EU asked whether it was due to the difficulties in obtaining land that dragged down the construction of quarters for disciplined service.

49. PAS(S)C responded in the affirmative and advised that to address the problem, the Administration was conducting a study on development of Government quarters/complexes jointly used by staff of the Correctional Services Department, the Customs and Excise Department and ImmD.

50. In reply to Ms Audrey EU's enquiry, PD2/ASD confirmed that the proposed project would put into practice green and sustainable building features, such as the provision of green roofs. In addition, energy efficient features would be incorporated into the lighting systems, lifts, air conditioning systems and power supply systems.

51. Members noted that the Administration planned to seek funding from the Public Works Subcommittee and the Finance Committee in May and June 2009 respectively, with a view to commissioning the construction works in April 2010 for completion by July 2012.

VI. Latest development in the provision of rehabilitative services by the Correctional Services Department
(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1207/08-09(06) & (07))

52. Due to time constraint, members agreed to defer the discussion of this item to the next regular meeting on 5 May 2009.

53. The meeting ended at 4:30 pm.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
26 May 2009