

立法會
Legislative Council

Ref : CB2/PL/HA

LC Paper No. CB(2)977/16-17
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Panel on Home Affairs

Minutes of meeting
held on Wednesday, 21 December 2016, at 10:30 am
in Conference Room 3 of the Legislative Council Complex

Members present : Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung
Hon Claudia MO
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen
Hon CHAN Han-pan, JP
Hon KWOK Wai-keung
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Hon IP Kin-yuen
Hon Alvin YEUNG
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin
Hon CHU Hoi-dick
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP
Hon HO Kai-ming
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding
Hon SHIU Ka-fai
Hon SHIU Ka-chun
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH
Hon YUNG Hoi-yan

Hon CHAN Chun-ying
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP
Hon LUK Chung-hung
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH
Hon KWONG Chun-yu
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho
Hon Nathan LAW Kwun-chung
Dr Hon LAU Siu-lai

Member attending : Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP

Members absent : Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, SBS, JP
Hon Tanya CHAN
Hon HUI Chi-fung
Hon Kenneth LAU Ip-keung, MH, JP

Public Officers attending

Item III

Mr Nick AU YEUNG
Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs
(Community Care Fund)
Home Affairs Bureau

Mrs Angelina CHEUNG, JP
Deputy Secretary for Education (6)
Education Bureau

Mr FUNG Man-chung
Assistant Director (Family and Child Welfare)
Social Welfare Department

Community Care Fund Task Force under the
Commission on Poverty

Dr LAW Chi-kwong, GBS, JP
Chairperson

Item IV

Mr LAU Kong-wah, JP
Secretary for Home Affairs
Home Affairs Bureau

Mr Nick AU YEUNG
Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs
(Community Care Fund)
Home Affairs Bureau

Item V

Mr LAU Kong-wah, JP
Secretary for Home Affairs
Home Affairs Bureau

Miss Janice TSE
Director of Home Affairs
Home Affairs Department

Mr Howard YAM
Assistant Director of Home Affairs (3)
Home Affairs Department

Mr Damian LEE
District Officer (Sham Shui Po)
Home Affairs Department

Mr Edward MAK
District Officer (Yuen Long)
Home Affairs Department

Clerk in attendance : Ms Joanne MAK
Chief Council Secretary (2) 3

Staff in attendance : Mr Richard WONG
Senior Council Secretary (2) 6

Mr Dennis HO
Council Secretary (2) 3

Mrs Fonny TSANG
Legislative Assistant (2) 3

Action

I. Information papers issued since the last meeting

[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)230/16-17(01), CB(2)246/16-17(01) to (02), CB(2)356/16-17(01), CB(2)433/16-17(01), CB(2)461/16-17(01), CB(2)462/16-17(01) and CB(2)470/16-17(01)]

Members noted that eight papers had been issued after the last meeting as follows:

- (a) letter dated 14 November 2016 from Hon HUI Chi-fung;
- (b) joint letter dated 21 November 2016 from 25 Members;
- (c) letter dated 21 November 2016 from Hon Claudia MO;
- (d) Chinese version of the Administration's response to the joint letter from 25 Members dated 21 November 2016 and the letter from Hon Claudia MO dated 21 November 2016;
- (e) letter dated 15 December 2016 from Hon Charles Peter MOK;
- (f) submission from inmediahk.net;
- (g) letter dated 19 December 2016 from Hon CHAN Han-pan; and
- (h) Chinese version of the Administration's response to the letter dated 28 October 2016 from Hon Tanya CHAN.

2. In response to Mr Charles MOK's enquiry, the Chairman said he noted that two questions on the subject of arrangements for online media to cover Government events and activities would be raised at the Council meeting of 11 January 2017. The Chairman suggested that the Panel might consider the need to discuss the subject after that Council meeting. Members agreed.

II. Items for discussion at the next meeting

[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)401/16-17(01) and (02)]

3. The Panel agreed to discuss the following items proposed by the Administration at the next regular meeting on 20 January 2017 at 8:30 am:

- (a) briefing by the Secretary for Home Affairs ("SHA") on the Chief Executive's 2017 Policy Address; and

Action

- (b) revamping of the Permanent Exhibition of the Hong Kong Railway Museum.

III. Community Care Fund

[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)401/16-17(03) and (04)]

4. At the invitation of the Chairman, the Chairperson of the Community Care Fund ("CCF") Task Force under the Commission on Poverty ("C of CCF Task Force") briefed members on the salient points of the Administration's paper.

Discussion

"One-off living subsidy for low-income households not living in public housing and not receiving Comprehensive Social Security Assistance ("CSSA")" ("One-off Living Subsidy Programme")

5. Members in general expressed dissatisfaction with the decision of CCF not to re-launch the One-off Living Subsidy Programme for the fourth time in 2017. Mr LAU Kwok-fan, Mr LUK Chung-hung and Dr LAU Siu-lai expressed grave concern that in the face of high rental and hiking commodity prices, the "N have-nots" households encountered great hardship in livelihood. They urged the Administration to continue to disburse the One-off Living Subsidy or launch alternative assistance measures to relieve the financial burden of the "N have-nots", given that the rents of sub-divided units were rising incessantly and the waiting time for allocation of public rental housing ("PRH") still remained long. Dr LAU said that many "N have-nots" households who had not been allocated public housing were, in fact, living in unfit dwellings and facing high rental as well as overcharge of utility bills by landlords.

6. C of CCF Task Force said that CCF was established in 2011 to plug the gaps in the existing system and implement pilot schemes. CCF launched the One-off Living Subsidy Programme for trice in December 2013, January 2015 and January 2016 to provide a one-off cash subsidy for the "N have-nots" who could not benefit from the short-term relief measures introduced by the Budget released in the respective financial years. C of CCF Task Force explained that as fewer short-term relief measures were announced in the 2016-2017 Budget (e.g. no longer paying rent for PRH tenants), there was insufficient justification for CCF to re-launch the One-off Living Subsidy Programme.

Action

7. Mr Andrew WAN and Mr WU Chi-wai did not subscribe to the view of C of CCF Task Force. Mr WAN said that while the 2016-2017 Budget no longer paid one month's rent for PRH tenants, PRH tenants were still better than the "N have-nots" as PRH was a form of housing assistance. However, the "N have-nots" received no assistance from the Government except the One-off Living Subsidy Programme. Mr WU added that PRH tenants who were in financial hardship could also apply for assistance under the Rent Assistance Scheme of the Housing Authority. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that given that the 2016-2017 Budget provided relief measures for other needy groups, such as providing an extra allowance to social security recipients (equal to one month of the standard rate CSSA payments, Old Age Allowance, Old Age Living Allowance or Disability Allowance), there was still a need for CCF to plug the gap by disbursing the One-off Living Subsidy to the "N have-nots". He took the view that CCF should only consider whether the "N have-nots" had a genuine need for financial subsidies in deciding whether the One-off Living Subsidy should continue to be disbursed to them.

8. C of CCF Task Force reiterated that there was a lack of justification for re-launching the One-off Living Subsidy Programme, given that the nature of the One-off Living Subsidy Programme was to provide cash subsidy to "N have-nots" who could not benefit from the relief measures introduced by the relevant Budgets. He explained that if the One-off Living Subsidy was re-launched for the "N have-nots" on the ground that the 2016-2017 Budget provided an extra allowance equal to one month of the standard rate CSSA payment, it might invite criticism of unfairness from PRH tenants as they could not benefit from any short-term relief measures under the 2016-2017 Budget. C of CCF Task Force said that CCF understood the financial hardship of the "N have-nots" and would continue to explore ways to provide appropriate assistance to them.

9. Mr KWONG Chun-yu said that CCF had generated a total investment return of about \$2.4 billion and the balance of CCF stood at around \$19.4 billion. He considered that given the stable financial position of CCF, CCF should re-launch the One-off Living Subsidy Programme to help relieve the financial burden of the "N have-nots". C of CCF Task Force said that the financial position of CCF was not relevant to the Commission on Poverty and the CCF Task Force's decision of not re-launching the One-off Living Subsidy Programme. He added that CCF had been deploying its seed capital, as the total amount of money disbursed to various implementing agencies (i.e. around \$5 billion) had already exceeded the investment return.

Action

10. Mr Nathan LAW said that the "N have-nots" were amongst the most needy groups. He expressed a strong view that unless the Administration launched alternative assistance programmes for the "N have-nots", it was unacceptable for CCF to discontinue the One-off Living Subsidy Programme as there was no objective data reflecting that the poverty of the "N have-nots" had any improvements. C of CCF Task Force reiterated that the reason of not re-launching the One-off Living Subsidy Programme was that the 2016-2017 Budget had fewer short-term relief measures, e.g. no longer paying one month's rent for PRH tenants.

11. Mr James TO considered that CCF should continue the One-off Living Subsidy Programme for the "N have-nots" to help relieve their financial burden, irrespective of the scale of relief measures introduced in the 2016-2017 Budget. In particular, he noted that the One-off Living Subsidy Programme had provided assistance to more than 65 000 households with financial difficulties (i.e. more than 162 000 persons). Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung considered it unacceptable that the One-off Living Subsidy Programme was discontinued while the 2016-2017 Budget continued to waive rates for property owners, as the "N have-nots" were surely much more in need than those persons.

12. Mr SHIU Ka-fai said that although he did not support the Government handing out cash subsidies to all people indiscriminately, he considered that the "N have-nots" were amongst the most needy groups. He opposed CCF's decision to discontinue the One-off Living Subsidy Programme.

13. Referring to the launching of the six assistance programmes as set out in paragraph 7 of the Administration's paper, Ms Claudia MO enquired about CCF's considerations for setting priorities in launching the assistance programmes. C of CCF Task Force said that CCF had not set particular priorities. He explained that upon receipt of any proposed assistance programme, CCF would consider its feasibility, compatibility with the existing policies and whether it could achieve the objective of CCF.

14. In response to Mr YIU Si-wing's enquiry, C of CCF Task Force said that any proposed assistance programme would first be referred to the relevant Government bureaux and departments for consideration and advice as to whether it was a duplicate of any existing Government assistance/service programme or whether it was in conflict with any Government policy.

Action

Admin

15. Mr SHIU Ka-chun asked whether CCF had conducted any review as to how far CCF had fulfilled its objective of "providing assistance for people facing financial difficulties, particularly those who fall outside the safety net". C of CCF Task Force said that while CCF had not conducted any such review, evaluation would be conducted on each assistance programme launched by CCF. At the request of Mr SHIU, C of CCF Task Force agreed to provide after the meeting supplementary information on the poverty alleviation effectiveness of the assistance programmes under CCF which covered the non-recurrent cash benefits provided by CCF over the past few years.

"Subsidy for patients of Hospital Authority for specified self-financed cancer drugs which have not yet been brought into the Samaritan Fund safety net but have been rapidly accumulating medical scientific evidence and with relatively higher efficacy" ("Subsidy for Drugs Programme")

16. Mr CHAN Chun-ying noted that as at 30 November 2016, a total of 6 911 person-times (i.e. about 1 400 person-times a year between 2011 and 2016) had benefitted from the Subsidy for Drugs Programme. He enquired why the number of beneficiaries was relatively small compared with the total number of cancer patients in Hong Kong (i.e. 30 000 in 2014). Mr Holden CHOW expressed concern about the drug costs borne by patients-in-need with rare diseases, e.g. paroxysmal nocturnal hemoglobinuria ("PNH"). He urged CCF to consider subsidizing the drug costs borne by needy patients with rare diseases by broadening the coverage of the Subsidy for Drugs Programme.

17. C of CCF Task Force explained that the Subsidy for Drugs Programme under CCF targeted at a specific group of cancer patients, i.e. those who needed to purchase specified self-financed cancer drugs which had not been covered by the Samaritan Fund but had been rapidly accumulating medical scientific evidence and with relatively higher efficacy. With these drugs rapidly accumulating medical scientific evidence, it was likely that after some time, these drugs would be considered to be covered by the Samaritan Fund. Furthermore, CCF would from time to time consider inclusion of new drugs which had been rapidly accumulating medical scientific evidence but yet to be covered by the Samaritan Fund under the Subsidy for Drugs Programme. Besides, CCF had received similar proposal to subsidize patients with rare diseases to purchase very expensive drugs previously and was exploring the proposal.

Action

Criteria for incorporating CCF assistance programmes into the Government's regular programmes

18. Members noted that 11 pilot programmes under CCF had been incorporated into the Government's regular assistance programmes, involving an annual recurrent expenditure of about \$700 million. Mr Alvin YEUNG and Mr SHIU Ka-chun enquired about the criteria for considering which pilot programmes should be incorporated into the Government's regular programmes. Mr YEUNG enquired why the Government had not incorporated programmes such as the Subsidy for Drugs Programme, the "Subsidy for the severely disabled persons aged below 60 who are non-CSSA recipients requiring constant attendance and living in the community" ("Subsidy for the Severely Disabled Persons Programme") and the "Subsidy for CSSA recipients living in rented private housing and paying a rent exceeding the maximum rent allowance under the CSSA Scheme", which all had been implemented for more than five years.

19. The Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs (Community Care Fund) ("PASHA(CCF)") explained that generally speaking, the Administration would consider the evaluation report of the relevant assistance programme, service demand for the programme and the availability of Government resources. For the Subsidy for Drugs Programme, as it was designed to cover drugs which were not yet ready to be brought into the Samaritan Fund safety net due to inadequate medical scientific evidence, it was difficult to incorporate this programme into the Government's regular programmes and would continue to be funded by CCF. He added that new drugs would from time to time be introduced into the Samaritan Fund safety net after accumulating sufficient medical scientific evidence. The Assistant Director (Family and Child Welfare) said that the Administration was currently reviewing the implementation of various assistance programmes for persons with disabilities and would later consider the way forward for the Subsidy for the Severely Disabled Persons Programme.

Motions

20. After discussion, Dr LAU Siu-lai moved the following motion:

"鑒於領取'非公屋、非綜援的低收入住戶一次過生活津貼'的住戶因未獲編配公屋，才入住不適切的居所，然而不適切

Action

居所住戶面對業主高租金及濫收水電費的情況，取消'非公屋、非綜援的低收入住戶一次過生活津貼'定必對該批住戶構成沉重經濟負擔，若政府仍漠視民意而取消'非公屋、非綜援的低收入住戶一次過生活津貼'，本委員會促請政府當局必須重新考慮恢復'非公屋、非綜援的低收入住戶一次過生活津貼'的同時，必須提出建議方案以減輕不適切居所住戶在未獲發公屋單位前的經濟壓力，向申請超過三年仍未獲發公屋的不適切居所住戶發放津貼和水電費津貼。"

(Translation)

"Given that households receiving the 'One-off Living Subsidy for low-income households not living in public housing and not receiving CSSA' live in unfit dwellings simply because they have not been allocated public housing, yet the households living in unfit dwellings are to face high rental and overcharge of utility bills by property owners, the abolition of the 'One-off Living Subsidy for low-income households not living in public housing and not receiving CSSA' will certainly impose a heavy financial burden on such households; if the Government continues to disregard public opinions and abolish the 'One-off Living Subsidy for low-income households not living in public housing and not receiving CSSA', this Panel urges the Administration that it must reconsider re-launching the 'One-off Living Subsidy for low-income households not living in public housing and not receiving CSSA', and at the same time put forth proposed measures to relieve the financial pressure of households living in unfit dwellings before they are allocated public housing flats; it should also grant allowances as well as subsidies for utility bills to households living in unfit dwellings who have applied public housing flats for more than three years but not yet been allocated such flats."

21. The Chairman put the motion to vote. 11 members voted for the motion, no members voted against it and one member abstained from voting. The Chairman declared that the motion was passed.

22. Dr Fernando CHEUNG moved the following motion:

"鑒於沒有領取綜援及沒有入住公屋的低收入人士及家庭生活困難，面對高昂租金及物價飛升，本委員會促請關愛基金在政府未恆常化'N無津貼'之前，必須繼續'非公屋、非綜援的低收入住戶一次過生活津貼'計劃，以抒緩N無人士的困難。"

Action

(Translation)

"Given that low-income earners and households not receiving Comprehensive Social Security Assistance ("CSSA") and not living in public housing encounter hardships in their livelihood, face high rental and hiking commodity prices, this Panel urges the Community Care Fund that, before the Government regularizes the 'subsidy to the N have-nots', it must continue with the 'One-off Living Subsidy for low-income households not living in public housing and not receiving CSSA' programme, so as to alleviate the hardships of the "N have-nots"."

23. The Chairman put the motion to vote. 16 members voted for the motion, no members voted against it and no members abstained from voting. The Chairman declared that the motion was passed.

24. Mr SHIU Ka-chun moved the following motion:

"鑒於關愛基金決定今年將不再發放'非公屋、非綜援一次性生活津貼'，無視活在水深火熱的N無人士。本委員會促請關愛基金須改名為'關人基金'，以表示'關愛基金'不理N無人士死活的涼薄。"

(Translation)

"Given that the Community Care Fund ("CCF") has decided that it will not grant the 'One-off Living Subsidy for low-income households not living in public housing and not receiving CSSA' again this year, thus turning a blind eye to the 'N have-nots' who live in great difficulties, this Panel urges CCF to change its name to 'No Care Fund', so as to reflect the indifference of CCF which cares nothing about 'N have-nots'."

25. The Chairman put the motion to vote. Eight members voted for the motion, six members voted against it and one member abstained from voting. The Chairman declared that the motion was passed.

Action

IV. Proposed retention of a supernumerary directorate post in the Community Care Fund Secretariat
[LC Paper No. CB(2)401/16-17(05)]

26. At the invitation of the Chairman, SHA briefed members on the salient points of the Administration's paper.

Discussion

27. Mr LUK Chung-hung and Mr Holden CHOW said that they had no strong view on the staffing proposal. Mr LUK, however, considered that there was room for improvement in the work of CCF, such as to streamline the application procedures for its assistance programmes. Mr CHOW reiterated his view expressed earlier that CCF should study ways to subsidize the drug costs borne by needy patients with rare diseases (such as PNH), such as by broadening the coverage of the Subsidy for Drugs Programme.

28. SHA said that members' views and concerns about the work of CCF would be relayed to the CCF Task Force. Mr LUK Chung-hung urged CCF to further lower the age threshold of the Elderly Dental Assistance Programme and to re-launch the One-off Living Subsidy Programme in 2017. PASHA(CCF) explained that given that the total number of target elderly persons exceeded 100 000 but the number of participating dentists and dental clinics under the Elderly Dental Assistance Programme were some 400 and 50 respectively, CCF had to consider expanding the target beneficiaries to other age groups progressively, having regard to the progress of implementation and the manpower situation in the local dental profession.

29. Dr Fernando CHEUNG asked why the Principal Assistant Secretary (Community Care Fund) ("PAS(CCF)") post was not proposed to be converted to be a permanent post given that CCF was expected to continue to operate in the long term. SHA explained that as CCF was tasked to provide assistance programmes on a pilot basis, the Administration considered that the existing arrangement with the PAS(CCF) post was appropriate. Nevertheless, the Administration recognized the important role played by CCF in plugging the gaps in the existing system and launching assistance programmes/pilot schemes to help people with financial difficulties. Hence, the Administration now proposed to retain the PAS(CCF) post for five years up to 30 June 2022, instead of three years as it was previously proposed in 2011 and 2014. SHA explained that the proposed longer duration was aimed to ensure smooth operation of CCF.

Action

In the early half of 2022, the Home Affairs Bureau would review the need for further retaining the post in the light of CCF's operation. Dr Fernando CHEUNG added that the responsibilities of the PAS(CCF) post should include mapping out objective criteria for determining which assistance programmes should be incorporated into the Government's regular assistance and service programmes.

30. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung urged the Administration to step up its work in regularizing the CCF assistance programmes. Mr Nathan LAW said that while he did not object to the staffing proposal, he saw a need for CCF to refine its work and review its strategic planning so that CCF would re-consider its decision not to re-launch One-off Living Subsidy Programme. SHA affirmed that the CCF assistance programmes had benefitted a large number of the underprivileged as detailed in Annex 2 to the Administration's paper (LC Paper No. CB(2)401/16-17(03)), and the PAS(CCF) post was important to ensure the smooth operation of CCF.

31. Mr SHIU Ka-chun enquired whether the Government had regularized any CCF assistance programmes before the relevant evaluation reports were completed or before the relevant programmes had been implemented for three years. PASHA(CCF) said that the incorporation of CCF assistance programmes into the Government's regular programmes was considered on a case-by-case basis, and there were no such rules stipulating that a CCF assistance programme could not be considered for incorporation into the Government's regular programmes before it had been implemented for three years. The 11 CCF pilot programmes were incorporated into the Government's regular assistance programmes after the completion of relevant evaluation reports. Among them, the "Financial assistance for non-school-attending ethnic minorities and new arrivals from the Mainland for taking language-related international public examinations" programme was incorporated into the Government's regular programme after it had been implemented for two years.

32. Summing up, the Chairman said he noted that no members raised objection to the submission of the staffing proposal to the Establishment Subcommittee for consideration.

V. District-led Actions Scheme: progress report
[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)401/16-17(06) and (07)]

33. At the invitation of the Chairman, SHA briefed members on the salient points of the Administration's paper. With the aid of Powerpoint,

Action

the Director of Home Affairs ("DHA") briefed members on the progress of the District-led Actions Scheme ("DAS") in the 18 districts [Presentation materials were issued vide LC Paper No. CB(2)485/16-17(01)].

Discussion

Implementation of the District-led Actions Scheme

34. Mr YIU Si-wing expressed support for DAS and welcomed the launch of the "Handling Tourism-related Issues" project in the Kowloon City district which, in his view, was able to tackle effectively the environmental problems encountered by local residents. He enquired whether the Administration would implement longer term measures to achieve sustained improvements. Mr Wilson OR and Mr LAU Kwok-fan expressed support for DAS. They also considered that the improvements brought about through DAS could only be sustained by implementation of long-term policy measures and provision of necessary resources by the Administration. Taking the issue of illegal parking of bicycles as an example, while agreeing that DAS had proven to be effective in tackling the problem, Mr LAU considered that it was still necessary for the Administration to implement long-term policy measures to tackle the issue, including to step up law enforcement and publicity, and to increase the provision of parking sites in the districts concerned. Mr OR echoed Mr LAU's views and stressed that district problems which were "long-standing, of large magnitude, and complex" could not be tackled merely through implementation of DAS unless sustained efforts were to be made by the Administration and with the Administration's policy support.

35. SHA said that the Administration attached great importance to sustaining the momentum of tackling district problems under DAS. To this end, the cooperation and concerted efforts of stakeholders concerned, District Councils ("DCs") and government departments were needed. He quoted the tackling of the problem of illegal parking of bicycles in some districts as an example which highlighted the importance of inter-departmental cooperation. On the one hand, inter-departmental enforcement had been stepped up against illegal bicycle parking. On the other hand, government departments would continue to explore ways to create additional bicycle parking spaces. SHA cited curbing shop-front extensions as a recent example of effectively addressing district problems at policy level and with effective frontline operation. The Administration had made legislative amendments to the Fixed Penalty (Public Cleanliness

Action

Offences and Obstruction) Ordinance (Cap. 570) to enable more effective and efficient enforcement actions against illegal shop-front extensions. The Administration stood ready to consider any measures to tackle district problems requiring resource backup and policy support.

36. The Chairman also expressed support for DAS. He enquired whether the scope of DAS could be expanded, such as by empowering DCs to manage the recreational and cultural facilities in districts. SHA said that the issue was related to the strengthening of the role and functions of DCs, the discussion of which had been ongoing. The Administration was open to views and suggestions. SHA further said that DCs had been involved in the work of District Management Committees, and maintained close working relationship with relevant government departments like the Leisure and Cultural Services Department, the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department ("FEHD") etc. These departments had taken on board DCs' views and suggestions.

Admin

37. Mr Wilson OR noted that from the 2016-2017 financial year onwards, an additional annual funding of \$63 million was provided to implement DAS in all 18 districts. He enquired how the funding was allocated among the 18 districts. SHA agreed to provide the requisite information after the meeting.

(Post-meeting note: the Administration's paper on a breakdown of the additional annual funding of \$63 million for the implementation of DAS by 18 districts was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(2)696/16-17(01).)

38. Mr Alvin YEUNG expressed concern whether DC secretariats had sufficient manpower to cope with the additional workload arising from the implementation of DAS. In particular, he noted that there had been an increase in the number of constituencies of the Shatin DC since 2008 but that the manpower of the Shatin DC secretariat had not been increased accordingly. Mr YEUNG enquired whether the Administration had any plans to strengthen the manpower of DC secretariats to better support the implementation of DAS.

39. SHA said that to implement DAS in all 18 districts, apart from providing an additional annual funding of \$63 million from the 2016-2017 financial year onwards, the Administration had also created 38 new civil service posts and 33 contract staff posts. These posts had been created under the Home Affairs Department, FEHD, 18 District Offices and the

Action

Lands Department. As regards the need to strengthen the manpower of DC secretariats, he advised that this would be considered subject to availability of resources. In replying to the Chairman's enquiry, DHA said that, as the DAS projects in 18 districts only commenced in July 2016, and it took time for the projects to be fully implemented, therefore the Administration had so far not received any request for additional resources from the districts.

The "Strengthening Support for Street Sleepers" project in Sham Shui Po

40. Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai said that the operations carried out by FEHD to fence off some 100 street sleepers residing underneath the Tung Chau Street flyover by using mills barriers had endangered the street sleepers. They criticized FEHD for neglecting the safety of the street sleepers concerned. They further said that a motion had been passed at a meeting of the Environment and Hygiene Committee of the Sham Shui Po District Council ("SSPDC") in early December 2016 urging FEHD to remove the mills barriers. However, FEHD had subsequently erected iron frames attached with wooden boards in the area in a bid to force the street sleepers there to leave. They considered that FEHD should have due regard to the motion passed by SSPDC and cease erecting the wooden boards.

41. District Officer (Sham Shui Po) ("DO(SSP)") briefed members on the background to the operations carried out by FEHD in the area underneath the Tung Chau Street flyover. DO(SSP) said he was aware that FEHD had already suspended the erection of the wooden boards. FEHD had also arranged a meeting with the relevant concern groups to follow up on the needs of street sleepers to work out the appropriate arrangements. Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai stressed that the erection of the wooden boards had jeopardized the safety of the street sleepers concerned, making it difficult for them to escape in the event of fire or for ambulances to reach them during emergencies. Mr CHU Hoi-dick and Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung queried whether the operations of FEHD had contradicted the purpose of the "Strengthening Support for Street Sleepers" project ("the Project") implemented by SSPDC under DAS, and whether there was a lack of coordination between FEHD and SSPDC as reflected in this incident. DO(SSP) explained that under the Project, the Society for Community Organization and the Salvation Army were engaged to enhance support for the street sleepers with a view to helping them to quit street sleeping. The operations carried out by FEHD did not hinder the implementation of the Project.

Action

Motions

(The Chairman left the meeting at 12:45 pm due to other urgent commitments and the Deputy Chairman took over the chair. The Deputy Chairman advised that the meeting would be extended for not more than 15 minutes.)

42. Mr Nathan LAW moved the following motion:

"本委員會促請政府尊重深水埗區議會的決定，停止圍封露宿者，以貫徹'地區主導行動計劃'的精神。"

(Translation)

"This Panel urges the Government to respect the decision of the Sham Shui Po District Council and stop fencing off street sleepers, so as to uphold the spirit of the 'District-led Actions Scheme'."

43. The Deputy Chairman put Mr LAW's motion to vote. Mr Nathan LAW requested a division.

44. The following members voted for the motion: Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Dr Helena WONG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Mr KWONG Chun-yu, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai. No member voted against the motion. Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Holden CHOW and Mr LAU Kwok-fan abstained from voting.

45. The Deputy Chairman announced that 12 members voted for and no member voted against the motion. He declared that the motion was passed.

46. Dr LAU Siu-lai moved the following motion:

"鑒於食環署近月多次用大量鐵馬或鐵架圍封通州街天橋底，令發生火警時無家者逃生困難，本委員會建議'地區主導計劃'要求食環署在政府妥善安置該處無家住者住屋問題前，停止該行為，不得再圍鐵馬/鐵架。"

(Translation)

"Given that in recent months, the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department ("FEHD") repeatedly used a lot of mills barriers or metal

Action

frames to fence off the space underneath the Tung Chau Street flyover, making it difficult for homeless people living there to escape in the event of fire, this Panel suggests that, before the Government can properly address the housing problem of the homeless people there, the District-led Actions Scheme should request FEHD to cease that operation and stop fencing off the space with mills barriers/metal frames."

47. The Deputy Chairman put Dr LAU's motion to vote. Dr LAU Siu-lai requested a division.

48. The following members voted for the motion: Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, Dr Helena WONG, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr SHIU Ka-fai, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Mr KWONG Chun-yu, Mr Nathan LAW and Dr LAU Siu-lai. No member voted against the motion. Mr YIU Si-wing abstained from voting.

49. The Deputy Chairman announced that 12 members voted for and no member voted against the motion. He declared that the motion was passed.

VI. Any other business

50. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:53 pm.

Council Business Division 2
Legislative Council Secretariat
14 March 2017