

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)1894/15-16
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/PL/SE

Panel on Security

Minutes of meeting
held on Tuesday, 3 May 2016, at 2:30 pm
in Conference Room 3 of the Legislative Council Complex

Members present : Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan, JP
Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Hon WONG Yuk-man
Hon Claudia MO
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon NG Leung-sing, SBS, JP
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, JP
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Kenneth LEUNG
Hon KWOK Wai-keung
Hon Dennis KWOK
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung

Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS
Hon Alvin YEUNG Ngok-kiu

Members attending : Hon LEE Cheuk-yan
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, SBS, JP

Member absent : Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan (Deputy Chairman)

Public Officers attending : Item III

Mr John LEE Ka-chiu, PDSM, PMSM, JP
Under Secretary for Security

Mr Billy WOO
Principal Assistant Secretary for Security D

Mr CHOI Yue-ning, IMSM
Assistant Director of Immigration (Control)

Mr Raymond LOK
Assistant Director of Immigration
(Information Systems)

Miss Caroline FAN
Chief Systems Manager (Technology Services)
Immigration Department

Item IV

Mr LAI Tung-kwok, SBS, IDSM, JP
Secretary for Security

Mr Vic YAU Cheuk-hang
Deputy Secretary for Security 2

Mr Simon LI Tin-chui, JP
Acting Director General of Civil Aviation

Mr Victor LIU Chi-yung, JP
Assistant Director General of Civil Aviation
(Airport Standards)

Mr C K NG
Executive Director, Airport Operations
Airport Authority Hong Kong

Mr Raymond LAU
Executive Director
Aviation Security Company Limited

Item V

Ms Manda CHAN Wing-man
Commissioner for Narcotics

Miss Rosalind CHEUNG Man-yee
Principal Assistant Secretary for Security
(Narcotics)¹

Ms Josephine TSE Shuk-yee
Senior Statistician (Security)
Security Bureau

Clerk in attendance : Miss Betty MA
Chief Council Secretary (2) 1

Staff in attendance : Mr Timothy TSO
Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 1

Mr Raymond LAM
Senior Council Secretary (2) 7

Miss Lulu YEUNG
Clerical Assistant (2) 1

Action

I. Information papers issued since the last meeting

(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1303/15-16(01), CB(2)1354/15-16(01) and CB(2)1390/15-16(01))

Members noted that the following papers had been issued since the last meeting and the Administration had been requested to provide a response to the issues raised in these letters :

- (a) letter dated 12 April 2016 from Dr KWOK Ka-ki regarding arrangements for feeding infants of persons in custody;
- (b) letter dated 21 April 2016 from Dr CHIANG Lai-wan regarding issues related to a No. 3 Alarm Fire in Wan Chai on 19 April 2016; and
- (c) letter dated 27 April 2016 from Dr CHIANG Lai-wan regarding issues related to blackmailing by display of bills which smeared the victims.

II. Date of next meeting and items for discussion

(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1381/15-16(01) and (02))

2. Members agreed that the following items would be discussed at the next regular meeting on 7 June 2016 at 2:30 pm :

- (a) Hearing of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region's third report under the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment; and
- (b) Report on the Public Consultation on the Establishment of a Reporting System on the Physical Cross-Boundary Transportation of Large Quantities of Currency and Bearer Negotiable Instruments.

III. Computer systems for the Immigration Department at the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge Hong Kong boundary crossing facilities

(LC Paper No. CB(2)1381/15-16(03))

3. The Chairman drew Members' attention to Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure concerning the requirement of disclosing personal pecuniary interest.

Action

4. Under Secretary for Security ("US for S") briefed Members on the Administration's proposal to install computer systems for supporting its operations at the new control point at Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge ("HZMB") Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities ("HKBCF").

Facilities for immigration clearance

5. Mr YIU Si-wing expressed support for the Administration's proposal. Noting that there would be 73 e-Channels, 96 traditional counters for passenger clearance and 72 vehicle kiosks for clearance of vehicles under the proposed system, he asked whether such numbers had been determined having regard to projected peak passenger and vehicular traffic flow. US for S responded that the number of e-Channels, counters and kiosks had been determined having regard to passenger and vehicular projections in the consultancy report on HZMB. Sufficient buffer had been included to cater for the increase in passenger and vehicular traffic during peak periods. As projected, there would be a daily average of about 9 000 to 14 000 vehicles and 55 000 to 70 000 passengers upon the commissioning of HZMB. Assistant Director of Immigration (Control) added that the performance pledge of the Immigration Department was the immigration clearance of 98% of Hong Kong residents within 15 minutes and 95% of visitors within 30 minutes.

Updated estimated cost for the construction of HZMB HKBCF

6. Noting from the Administration's paper that the Finance Committee ("FC") had approved funding of \$30,433.9 million in money-of-the-day prices for the construction of HZMB HKBCF in November 2011, Mr WONG Yuk-man sought information on the updated estimate for the project cost. US for S responded that on 30 January 2016, FC had approved an increase of the approved project estimate to \$35,895 million in money-of-the-day prices.

7. Mr WONG Yuk-man considered that the information provided in the Administration's paper was too brief. He added that as the HZMB project would experience delay, the Administration should constantly update the project estimate for Members' information. US for S responded that the Administration had sought to provide all relevant information in its paper, which was based on Highways Department's latest assessment that the HZMB local projects (including the HKBCF project) would be completed by the end of 2017. He said that the latest development of HZMB would be provided to the Panel in due course.

Action

Possibility of expandability of the proposed computer systems

8. The Chairman asked whether provision had been made for possible expandability of the proposed computer systems to cope with future needs. US for S responded that provision had been made for possible expandability of the proposed computer systems to cope with the projected passenger and vehicular traffic in the future.

9. The Chairman concluded that members in general supported in principle the Administration's submission of its proposal to FC.

IV. Security arrangement for passengers and baggage at the Hong Kong International Airport

(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1381/15-16(04) and (05))

10. Secretary for Security ("S for S") briefed Members on the regulatory framework on aviation security in Hong Kong and the security arrangement for passengers and baggage at the Hong Kong International Airport ("HKIA"). With the aid of powerpoint presentation, Executive Director, Airport Operations, Airport Authority Hong Kong ("ED(AO)/AAHK") briefed Members on the handling of a bag which had been left behind by the younger daughter of the Chief Executive ("CE") before her entry into the Enhanced Security Restricted Area ("ESRA") of HKIA ("the incident").

11. Members noted an information note entitled "Security arrangement for passengers and baggage at the Hong Kong International Airport" prepared by the Legislative Council ("LegCo") Secretariat.

Circumstances under which security screening of a baggage at HKIA required the presence of the baggage owner

12. Mr WONG Yuk-man expressed concern that the Administration's paper contained limited information about the incident and had not supplied the information that the owner of the lost bag in the incident was the younger daughter of CE.

13. Dr LAM Tai-fai expressed concern about whether the security screening of a cabin baggage was required to be conducted in the presence of the baggage owner.

Action

14. Mr Alvin YEUNG expressed concern about whether cabin baggage was not required to undergo security screening in the presence of the baggage owner.

15. Mr LEE Cheuk-yan said that the X-ray screening and secondary screening, if required, of a baggage was carried out almost consecutively in practice. He queried why the requirement for presence of a baggage owner was only applicable to secondary screening of the baggage.

16. Mr YIU Si-wing said that with hundreds of thousands of passengers using HKIA each day, it was not possible in practice for airport security staff responsible for screening baggage to know the respective ownership of different baggage. He said that there were situations in which there was a need to bring an item left over by a passenger on the landside, such as the travel document of a visitor or the medication of a senior, into ESRA. As the airports of other places were also providing such assistance to passengers in need, such arrangement should not be abolished merely because of public pressure. He considered that the issue in question was whether security screening was carried out on all persons and baggage entering ESRA.

17. Mr MA Fung-kwok said that according to his experience in undergoing security screening at HKIA prior to entering ESRA, passengers would not be asked to confirm the ownership of a cabin baggage unless there was a need for secondary screening.

18. Mr KWOK Wai-keung considered that although the incident was a case of delivery of a lost baggage to an airline passenger in ESRA, it had been turned into an issue of whether all screening of baggage at HKIA required the presence of the baggage owner. He noted from the Administration's paper that the screening of baggage prior to entry into ESRA was in general conducted in the presence of the baggage owner. However, the return of 517 lost items handled by the staff of Airport Authority Hong Kong ("AAHK") or its contractors to their respective owners in ESRA between March 2015 and March 2016 reflected that there were exceptions and discretion was exercised by airlines. He considered that requiring the presence of baggage owner for all security screening of baggage would only result in inconvenience to passengers who left over a baggage at HKIA prior to entering ESRA.

Action

19. Dr Priscilla LEUNG said that she had a friend in the business sector who had left behind an article outside ESRA and staff of the airline concerned had brought the article into ESRA for her friend.

20. S for S responded that the screening of passengers and cabin baggage was conducted in the interest of effective security and passenger facilitation. If the X-ray screening of a baggage revealed the need for a secondary screening, the latter would be conducted in the presence of the baggage owner. Referring to paragraph 3.5 of the report of AAHK, ED(AO)/AAHK said that the security screening of a cabin baggage was in general conducted in the presence of the passenger. It was however possible for other parties to convey items belonging to passengers through security controls for the purpose of returning such items to the owners. He stressed that all persons and baggage were required to undergo standard security screening at HKIA before entering ESRA.

21. Mr CHAN Kam-lam asked whether a passenger could bring the luggage of his/her spouse for security screening. ED(AO)/AAHK responded that a passenger could bring the luggage of his/her spouse for security screening, provided that all persons and baggage received standard security screening before entering ESRA. Any secondary screening on a cabin baggage, if needed, would normally be conducted by means of hand search. Such search must be conducted in the presence of the baggage owner, who would be asked to open the baggage in order for its contents to be examined.

Guidelines and requirements relating to security screening and search of baggage

22. Referring to the Administration's presentation materials, Ms Claudia MO said that according to a document of the International Air Transport Association, baggage must be matched with the correct owner and positioned on the search table so that the owner could open the bag but not interfere with the conduct of the search. Paragraph 6.2.10 of the Hong Kong Aviation Security Programme ("HKASP") also stated that "all screening of cabin baggage shall be conducted in the presence of the passenger". She asked whether security screening of the cabin baggage of a passenger must be conducted in the presence of the baggage owner.

23. Mr James TO said that paragraphs 6.2.8 to 6.2.11 of HKASP indicated that there were three types of screening, namely X-ray screening, secondary screening and random screening. He considered that there was no indication in paragraph 6.2.10 of HKASP that the

Action

requirement in the paragraph applied to secondary screening only. He recalled that when his baggage was screened at HKIA, the security staff would ask whether the baggage contained any notebook computer or mobile phone. He asked whether security screening would be conducted on a baggage, if the person who carried the baggage could not give an answer to such a question.

24. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen considered that paragraph 6.2.10 applied to all screening of baggage. He considered that if no special treatment was involved in the incident, the matter should have been resolved by frontline airline staff.

25. Mr Kenneth LEUNG said that paragraph 6.2.10 of HKASP should be interpreted as being applicable to all security screening. If the paragraph was applicable to secondary screening only, it should be amended to reflect this point.

26. Noting that paragraph 6.2.9 of HKASP required secondary screening to be conducted on the cabin baggage of a passenger who displayed undue nervousness, Mr Alan LEONG said that such a requirement would become meaningless, if the cabin baggage of a passenger was allowed to be brought by another person into ESRA.

27. S for S said that paragraphs 6.2.8 to 6.2.11 of HKASP stipulated the requirements on secondary screening. Paragraph 6.2.10 of HKASP had to be read in conjunction with paragraphs 6.2.8 and 6.2.9. His view was shared by ED(AO)/AAHK.

28. Mr James TO said that paragraphs 6.2.8 to 6.2.11 of HKASP indicated that there was random screening in addition to X-ray screening and secondary screening. He queried how random screening could be conducted, if only secondary screening was conducted in the presence of the baggage owner. Executive Director, Aviation Security Company Limited ("ED/AVSECO") responded that random screening, which was conducted on a prescribed percentage of passengers, was a type of secondary screening conducted in the presence of the baggage owner.

Delivery of lost and found baggage to passengers in ESRA

29. Dr Elizabeth QUAT sought information on the discretion given to airlines for arranging the lost and found baggage of a passenger to be brought into ESRA.

Action

30. Mr Alvin YEUNG asked whether an airline staff was allowed to bring the lost and found baggage of a passenger into ESRA, if no secondary screening of the baggage was required.

31. ED(AO)/AAHK responded that an airline staff was allowed to bring the lost and found baggage of a passenger into ESRA, provided that :

- (a) the identity of the baggage owner had been confirmed and the baggage was delivered at the request of the baggage owner;
- (b) the airline staff who brought the baggage possessed the necessary permit for entry into ESRA; and
- (c) the airline staff and the baggage had undergone security screening.

32. Dr Elizabeth QUAT asked whether airline staff could refuse to bring the lost and found baggage of a passenger into ESRA. ED(AO)/AAHK responded that airlines had the discretion to provide such service to their passengers.

33. Dr Kenneth CHAN expressed concern about whether Cathay Pacific Airways Limited ("Cathay Pacific"), the airline involved in the incident, had provided special treatment to the younger daughter of CE, who was the owner of the lost bag, and whether Cathay Pacific should bear the responsibility for providing such special treatment.

34. Dr Fernando CHEUNG referred to the report of Cathay Pacific on the incident and said that there were inconsistencies between some of the procedures mentioned in the report and AAHK's report. He expressed concern about whether any person had been given special treatment in the incident.

35. Mr Alan LEONG said that if the courtesy delivery of items for passengers was an established practice, it would not have taken 50 minutes in the incident to resolve the problem.

36. Ms Cyd HO queried why the staff of Cathay Pacific had initially explained the proper procedures to the passenger concerned but later arranged to bring the bag to ESRA for the passenger.

Action

37. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung queried why a staff of Aviation Security Company Limited ("AVSECO") had arrived when staff of the airline concerned had informed the passenger concerned of the proper procedures for retrieving the lost bag.

38. ED/AVSECO responded that in the incident, the unattended baggage concerned was first discovered by AVSECO staff in the landside area. In accordance with established procedures, explosive trace detection was conducted on the baggage. As there was no indication of explosive trace in the baggage, AVSECO staff notified AAHK in accordance with the procedures for handling lost property. ED(AO)/AAHK added that after the identity of the owner of the lost bag had been confirmed, the bag was passed by a AVSECO staff to the staff of the airline concerned for return to the owner of the bag in ESRA. He said that there were established procedures for the delivery of a lost and found item from a non-restricted area to ESRA. The investigation of AAHK into the incident revealed that there was no violation of aviation or airport security requirements laid down by the International Civil Aviation Organization ("ICAO") as well as those under HKASP, HKIA Airport Security Programme and the Aviation Security Ordinance (Cap. 494) ("ASO").

39. S for S said that the Administration agreed with AAHK's finding that there was no violation of international aviation standards or local requirements. Acting Director General of Civil Aviation added that ICAO did not prohibit airline staff from bringing cabin baggage of passengers into ESRA. The key requirement was that such baggage had to undergo security screening.

40. Mr Christopher CHUNG asked whether there were cases in which the staff of airlines other than Cathay Pacific had brought the lost baggage into ESRA for baggage owners. ED(AO)/AAHK responded that as airlines had the discretion to do so without the need to seek approval from AAHK, there was no record on such cases.

41. Referring to the sentence "CX staff explained the proper procedures were to cancel departure and return to landside to retrieve her bag" in Attachment C to the report of AAHK, Mr Alvin YEUNG asked whether the airline staff concerned had misinterpreted the proper procedures.

Action

42. ED(AO)/AAHK responded that AAHK considered it important to provide good customer services. Subject to the availability of manpower, staff of AAHK or the relevant contractor for the lost and found service would deliver lost and found items to passengers, provided that all persons and baggage entering ESRA had undergone security screening. If the identity of a lost baggage owner had been confirmed, staff of airlines as well as AAHK and its lost property service contractor were allowed to bring the lost and found item upon request to the passenger in ESRA. He added that the internal guidelines on the handling of lost and found baggage might differ from one airline to another.

43. Mr CHAN Kam-lam expressed concern about whether such discretion of airlines had been set out in writing and whether airline staff was aware of such discretion.

44. Ms Cyd HO said that it would be difficult for frontline airline staff to perform their duties, as it would be difficult to exercise the discretion given to airlines. She expressed concern that if such discretion was given, some passengers might ask airline staff to bring baggage containing restricted articles into ESRA.

45. Mr CHAN Kin-por said that a large number of cases similar to the incident might have been handled by airlines but not brought to the knowledge of AAHK. He expressed concern that the views expressed by some airline staff and some labour unions regarding the return of lost and found items to passengers reflected that there was misunderstanding about the procedures concerned and the discretion given to airlines.

46. Mr Michael TIEN said that the report of AAHK revealed that there was no loophole in the security of HKIA. However, the Administration or AAHK should clarify the meaning of courtesy deliveries of items and review the discretion given to airlines for bringing baggage of passengers into ESRA. He added that the reasons for granting discretion in each case should be recorded and AAHK should carry out a review on the circumstances under which airlines could exercise such discretion.

47. Mr Paul TSE shared the views of Mr Michael TIEN. He considered that the issue in question was not whether the presence of baggage owner was required for all types of security screening of baggage, but the circumstances under which airlines could exercise discretion to bring the cabin baggage of a passenger into ESRA. He

Action

added that although CE was empowered under section 24 of ASO to give directions in writing to AAHK in relation to any particular case, he noted that CE had not done so.

48. ED(AO)/AAHK responded that AAHK was committed to providing good customer services to passengers, without compromising safety and security. In delivering the found property to its established owners, all persons and baggage entering ESRA had to undergo security screening. Although there was no specific restrictions to prevent the airlines from providing courtesy delivery of found property to passengers in the airside, AAHK was aware of the concerns of frontline airline staff regarding such discretion. It would, together with other stakeholders, review and refine the existing handling procedures for lost and found items, having regard to the practices of other international airports. Consideration was being given to requiring the owner of a found baggage to sign an undertaking or declaration before the found baggage was brought into ESRA for the passenger.

49. Ms Claudia MO asked whether persons who attempted to rush into ESRA would be given warning or arrested. Dr Kenneth CHAN asked whether CE's wife had attempted to rush into ESRA in the incident.

50. Mr Christopher CHUNG asked whether the closed-circuit television ("CCTV") record of HKIA indicated any person attempting to rush into ESRA in the incident. Mr Christopher CHEUNG said that the CCTV record concerned should be made public.

51. ED(AO)/AAHK said that the sequence of events in the incident had been set out in detail in Annex B to the report of AAHK, which had been drawn up on the basis of the CCTV record of AAHK. It should be noted that no one had attempted to rush into ESRA in the incident. For security reasons, the CCTV record would not be made public.

Statistics on the return of lost and found items to their owners in the airport restricted area

52. Referring to the report of AAHK, Dr Elizabeth QUAT asked whether all the 517 lost items had been returned to their respective owners in the airport restricted area between March 2015 and March 2016.

Action

53. Ms Claudia MO said that although 517 items lost in HKIA had been returned to their respective owners between March 2015 and March 2016, the cases were different in nature from the incident. Some of the lost items were not returned to the owners within the same day. Mr Kenneth LEUNG expressed concern about whether there was any cabin baggage among the 517 lost items.

54. ED(AO)/AAHK explained that during the period, 517 lost items handled by the staff of AAHK or its contractors had been returned to the respective owners in the airport restricted area. Among these items, 40 were hand baggage of which 23 had been returned immediately to the respective owners in ESRA on the same day and 17 had been returned to the owners upon their return to Hong Kong for transit to other cities. He said that subject to the availability of manpower, staff of AAHK or relevant contractor for the lost and found service would deliver lost and found items to their established owners in ESRA.

55. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung asked whether there were any LegCo Members among the 517 cases. ED(AO)/AAHK responded that there was no record about the identity of the passengers involved in the 517 cases.

56. Mr Alan LEONG asked whether any of the 23 cases had taken 50 minutes or more for the lost item to be delivered to the owner in ESRA. ED(AO)/AAHK replied that the time taken varied from one case to another.

57. Mr YIU Si-wing sought information on the number of lost items found by airline staff and returned to their respective owners in the airport restricted area. ED(AO)/AAHK responded that as airlines had the discretion to do so and there was no need for them to seek approval from AAHK, such statistics were not available.

58. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung asked whether the reasons for exercising discretion had been recorded by airlines. ED(AO)/AAHK responded that airlines had their respective procedures on the handling of such incidents.

59. Mr NG Leung-sing said that the return of 517 lost items found by the staff of AAHK or its contractors to the respective owners in the airport restricted area within about a year reflected that there were many incidents of a similar nature at HKIA.

Action

[To allow sufficient time for discussion, the Chairman proposed that the meeting be extended by 30 minutes. Mr Paul TSE, Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung and Mr CHAN Chi-chuen objected to the proposal. The Chairman said that he would exercise his power under Rule 24A(a) of the House Rules to extend the meeting by 15 minutes.]

Other issues

60. Mr Christopher CHUNG said that there were media reports about representatives of the Transportation Security Administration ("TSA") of the United States of America ("USA") coming to Hong Kong to study whether there was any violation of the security requirements in the flight to USA in the incident. He expressed concern about whether such activities amounted to law enforcement in Hong Kong by officers of other jurisdictions.

61. ED(AO)/AAHK responded that the visit of TSA representatives was part of TSA's routine visits to different cities to inspect the security arrangements for flights to USA and the visit had been scheduled before the incident.

62. Referring to a sit-in by demonstrators at HKIA on 17 April 2016, Dr Priscilla LEUNG asked whether AAHK had assessed the impact on travellers and safety in HKIA. She also asked whether arrangements had been made for the sit-in to be held at a designated zone in HKIA to minimize impact on other airport users.

63. ED(AO)/AAHK responded that AAHK attached great importance to safety at HKIA. It had communicated with the organizers concerned and participants had been required to conduct the sit-in at designated zones. He said that the sit-in had been held in an orderly manner, although it had caused some inconvenience to travellers.

V. Drug Situation in Hong Kong in 2015

(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1381/15-16(06) and (07))

64. Commissioner for Narcotics ("C for N") briefed Members on the drug situation in 2015 and the Administration's anti-drug efforts in response to the latest drug situation.

Action

65. Members noted an updated background brief entitled "Anti-drug efforts in Hong Kong" prepared by the LegCo Secretariat.

Anti-drug Community Awareness Building Programme ("ACABP")

66. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen sought information on ACABP. He asked whether cyber patrol was conducted by the Police to combat online sale of drugs. He also expressed concern about the drug abuse situation of upper primary students and the increase in the number of female drug abusers.

67. C for N responded that ACABP was a programme promoting awareness on drug abuse among members of the community and stakeholders (e.g. parents), and enabling a broader cross-section of the community to play a more active role in drug prevention, early identification and intervention at district level. It was funded by the Beat Drugs Fund ("BDF"). The first round of ACABP had been implemented with favourable feedback and the second round had commenced. She added that the Police had conducted cyber patrols to combat online sale of drugs and such activities had subsided recently.

Healthy School Programme with a Drug Testing Component ("HSP(DT)")

68. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung sought information on the way forward regarding HSP(DT). C for N responded that more than 90 schools had participated in HSP(DT) in the 2015-2016 school year and over 120 schools would participate in the programme in the coming school year. She said that HSP(DT) comprised two parts, namely preventive anti-drug activities and voluntary drug testing.

RESCUE Drug Testing Scheme ("RDT")

69. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung sought information on the way forward regarding RDT. C for N responded that the Administration had conducted the first stage public consultation on RDT and noted that there were divergent views on the issue. The Administration did not have any timetable for the second stage consultation at present. Mr LEUNG considered that RDT should not be implemented.

Action

Hidden drug abuse

70. Mr KWOK Wai-keung said that drug-abuse information should be read in conjunction with statistics on drug-related offences to give a more complete picture of the latest drug situation. Noting that the drug history of newly reported drug abuse cases had continued to rise, with half of the newly reported abusers having abused drugs for at least 5.2 years in 2014 and 5.8 years in 2015, he expressed concern about how the Administration would tackle the problem of hidden drug abuse.

71. Dr Elizabeth QUAT expressed concern that the number of newly reported drug abusers and methamphetamine abusers had increased and the drug history of newly reported cases had continued to rise. She sought information on the measures adopted by the Administration to combat the problem.

72. C for N responded that at a recent meeting conducted by the Administration, and attended by the Chairman of the Action Committee Against Narcotics ("ACAN"), Chairpersons of the ACAN Sub-committees, the Convener of the Research Advisory Group which provided advice on the conduct of research projects in drug-related areas to the Administration, and representatives of non-governmental organizations ("NGOs"), there were discussions on the difficulties in identifying hidden drug abusers, and some NGOs were adopting novel means to reach hidden drug abusers (e.g. through online platforms, mobile phone applications as well as outreach work). NGOs were also encouraged to make funding applications to BDF for launching new programmes to identify hidden drug abusers. Intelligence-led operations were conducted by the Police as well as the Customs and Excise Department to combat drug-related offences. She added that information related to enforcement against drug-related offences was set out in paragraph 17 of the Administration's paper.

VI. Construction of staff quarters for Correctional Services Department at Tin Wan, Aberdeen
(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1381/15-16(08) and (09))

73. Owing to time constraint, members agreed that the item would be deferred to a future meeting.

Action

(Post-meeting note: On the instruction of the Chairman, the item "Construction of staff quarters for Correctional Services Department at Tin Wan, Aberdeen" was included in the agenda for the meeting on 7 June 2016.)

74. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 5:15 pm.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
11 July 2016