

# 立法會

## 公營房屋建築問題專責委員會

---

---

第二次研訊的逐字紀錄本

日期： 2001年4月24日(星期二)

時間： 下午2時30分

地點： 立法會會議廳

---

---

### **出席委員**

劉健儀議員, JP(主席)

何俊仁議員(副主席)

何鍾泰議員, JP

李卓人議員

呂明華議員, JP

陳婉嫻議員

陳鑑林議員

黃宜弘議員

楊孝華議員, JP

鄧兆棠議員, JP

石禮謙議員, JP

麥國風議員

劉炳章議員

余若薇議員, SC, JP

### **缺席委員**

涂謹申議員

### **證人**

*公開研訊*

房屋署署長

苗學禮先生, JP

# Legislative Council

## Select Committee on Building Problems of Public Housing Units

---

---

Verbatim Transcript of the Second Hearing  
Held on Tuesday, 24 April 2001, at 2:30 pm  
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building

---

---

### **Members present**

Hon Miriam LAU Kin yee, JP (Chairman)  
Hon Albert HO Chun-yan (Deputy Chairman)  
Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai, JP  
Hon LEE Cheuk-yan  
Dr Hon LUI Ming-wah, JP  
Hon CHAN Yuen-han  
Hon CHAN Kam-lam  
Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong  
Hon Howard YOUNG, JP  
Dr Hon TANG Siu-tong, JP  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, JP  
Hon Michael MAK Kwok-fung  
Hon LAU Ping-cheung  
Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee, SC, JP

### **Member absent**

Hon James TO Kun-sun

### **Witness**

#### *Public hearing*

Mr J A MILLER, JP  
Director of Housing  
Housing Department

**主席：**

今天是公營房屋建築問題專責委員會的公開研訊。我想提醒各委員，整個研訊過程必須有足夠的法定人數，即連主席在內共有5名委員；現時我們有足夠的法定人數。但在整個研訊的過程中，會議廳內亦需要有足夠的法定人數。此外，我亦想提醒出席今天研訊的公眾人士及傳媒——其實我是再次提醒他們——在研訊過程以外的場合披露有關研訊上所提交的證據，將不會受到《立法會(權力及特權)條例》的保障。因此，各有關人士及傳媒應就其本身的法律責任，如果有需要的話，徵詢法律意見。

如果委員就程序上沒有其他的意見，我宣布開始進行今天的研訊。今天我們會繼續探討房屋署、房屋委員會及其轄下各小組委員會之間的關係；房屋署在公營房屋建屋量預測當中所擔當的角色；以及在保證公營房屋建築的質素所採取的措施等各方面索取證供。苗學禮先生已進入會議廳。

首先，多謝苗學禮先生今天再次出席本專責委員會的研訊。我想提醒苗學禮先生，你仍然在宣誓之下作供。苗學禮先生，在上次會議後，本專責委員會收到房屋委員會向我們提交的數份文件，包括有關房屋署署長的職責範圍的文件。這問題曾在上次研訊時提出，當時署長呈交了一份1997年的文件；但委員要求知悉有關職責說明在過去多年以來有否改變，所以房屋委員會向我們提交了有關資料。

此外，亦有委員提及房屋委員會轄下建築小組委員會的開會次數為何？房屋委員會亦撮錄了很多報告，並輯成一套報告，向本專責委員會提交。另外，也提交了一次建築小組委員會在1996年1月18日舉行會議的紀要。在當時的會議中，曾提述有關短樁是否適用的方式。請問苗學禮先生，你是否向本專責委員會正式提交上述我所說的3套文件？

**Mr J A MILLER, Director of Housing:**

Yes, Madam Chair.

**主席：**

謝謝各位委員。有勞各位寫上該3套文件的編號。第一套文件，有關房屋署署長職責的描述，編號是SC1-H0039；第二套文件，有關建築小組委員會所提交的報告，即數年內的報告，整套文件

的編號是SC1-H0040；最後一套文件，即建築小組委員會會議其中一次會議紀要，編號是SC1-H0006(c)。我想提醒大家，第三份文件是一份保密文件，所以其編號稍有不同。

我們現在可以繼續今天的研訊，在上星期六公開研訊的末段時，曾有數位委員舉手，但沒有機會發問。我首先邀請上星期六曾舉手的委員開始發問，李卓人議員。

**李卓人議員：**

多謝主席。我想問有關建築小組委員會的問題。根據資料顯示，建築小組委員會的工作量非常驚人，例如審核投標方面，在96至97年有標書200份、97至98年有267份、98至99年有165份、99至2000年有193份，4年內共審核了825份標書。如果以每月開會一次來衡量其工作量，每次會議須審核最少10多份標書。請問署長，這樣的工作量其實是否實際呢？以及署長在上次研訊曾經提及一點，是有關程序的問題，我希望你能作出澄清。署長曾提及你本人的同事，尤其是負責建築方面的同事，訂立了一個內部工作程序，將所有標書中不符合要求者“screen out”，即予以剔除；然後把符合要求者提交建築小組委員會審核。我想問，你們是否不會把不符合要求的標書提交建築小組委員會審核，而只會提交符合要求的標書？這時，你們已經完成第一層的工夫，而建築小組委員會並不知道你們剔除了哪些標書。當標書提交至建築小組委員會時，委員會純粹以單一角度考慮，單以價錢衡量。在過往多次的經驗中，委員會是否把合約批予價錢較低的投標者？而你們亦會建議把合約批予價錢較低的投標者？我想知道整個程序是否如此。多謝主席。

**主席：**

苗學禮先生。

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Madam Chair, could I start by saying that I was advised that the SIs had some difficulty last time and that it would help them if I paused between the question and starting speaking. Would that be acceptable?

**The Chairman:**

That would be acceptable.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Is the workload reasonable? The answer is normally the workload is reasonable. During the period of bunching, clearly the workload was heavy. It was still, in my view, possible, through the exertions of members and by the holding of additional and prolonged meetings, to carry out a proper scrutiny of all of the tender documents.

The second part of the question, the clarification which has been asked. In practice, all tenders - and let us stay with piling tenders for the moment - all tenders which are received are examined, quite often by contract quantity surveyors, sometimes in-house. They are checked for both accuracy of calculation and for technical compliance with the conditions or the specifications of the tender. They are then ranked in a paper. That paper in its draft form is seen by the Chairman of the Housing Authority at the Monday meeting to which I referred on the last occasion, and the final paper goes to the Building Committee.

Where there is a non-compliance, that is normally referred to in the papers. So members are aware of the problem with particular tenders and the reason why they may have been excluded from the final recommendation. After that, they are ranked by bid price.

We also look in the same paper at whether or not the companies which have put forward bids meet the stringent financial criteria, financial health criteria, which the Authority has traditionally adopted in vetting its partners. If there is any concern about any of the tenderers' financial condition, that too will be noted. If there is any concern about the tenderer's performance on a recent contract, that also will be noted and taken into consideration in coming at a final recommendation.

In most cases, leaving aside those reasons for excluding a particular tender, then the tender will go to the lowest bid. There are occasions on which there have been discussions on whether or not a second or third lowest bid should be accepted but, in most cases, following the screening process I have discussed or described, it would normally go to the lowest bid.

**主席：**

李卓人議員。

**李卓人議員：**

主席，我想跟進署長剛才所說的最後一段。他說通常合約是價低者得。可否更準確地表明，是否百分之百價低者得？因為你

曾提及，可能須就部分標書進行討論，然而，最後的結論是否也是百分之百價低者得？

**主席：**

苗學禮先生。

**Mr J A MILLER:**

After the screening process for all of the points I have mentioned, technical feasibility, compliance with specifications, financial health, current performance, then normally, and I would say probably 97, 98 per cent of the time, it would go to the lowest bid.

**主席：**

下一位，黃宜弘議員。

**黃宜弘議員：**

多謝主席，現時我們仍在討論有關建築小組委員會，是嗎？

**主席：**

是的。

**黃宜弘議員：**

我想問，建築小組委員會在考慮或審核有關標書時，有否注意有關承建商的公司內有多少專業人士，或要求他們在標書內註明專業人士的數目？在慣例上，有沒有這方面的要求？這是否其功能之一？

**主席：**

苗學禮先生。

**Mr J A MILLER:**

All tenders specify the inclusion of appropriate professional and technical staff in the bid, regardless of whether this is a piling contract or a superstructure contract or a consultant management contract. There are explicit conditions in the letters of appointment of the tender as appropriate regarding the level of professional and technical expertise required.

**主席：**

楊孝華議員。

**楊孝華議員：**

主席，我並非想問有關建築小組委員會的問題，我而是想繼續跟進有關房屋署、房屋局與房屋委員會三者之間的關係。我不知道主席是否打算待有關建築小組委員會的討論完畢後，才讓我就這點發問？

**主席：**

不要緊，既然你已經開始發問。

**Hon Howard YOUNG:**

I wish to follow up on the triangular relationship between the Director of Housing and the Chairman of the Housing Authority and the Secretary for Housing. This is in relation to a question already posed by the Honourable Michael MAK on Saturday. It was mentioned that, as far as the Director of Housing being a civil servant, his report, according to the minutes, I think you said that that was done by the Chairman of the Housing Authority but then the Secretary for Housing was a countersigning officer.

I would like to know to what degree this would cause a great deal of uneasiness in case there was a difference of opinion on certain policy matters between the Secretary for Housing and the Chairman of the Housing Authority, in relation that one is your countersigning officer and one is the one who does the report, because being a civil servant, you obviously probably look forward to a career path within the civil service as well. In that case, it would be the Secretary who might have a greater influence. Would it cause a great deal of embarrassment in that post if the two people who are doing your reports obviously had differences of opinion on a certain matter and you had to side with one of them?

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I'm not sure whether that is a hypothetical question or not?

**The Chairman:**

Has it occurred in the past?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

It has never caused me any embarrassment at all, Madam Chair. If there are or if there were at any point differences between the two persons concerned, that would be for them to comment on. I wouldn't describe it as a triangular relationship, by the way. It is a straight-line relationship. But, that relationship has never caused me any embarrassment at all.

**Hon Howard YOUNG:**

I don't think it's entirely hypothetical as I got the impression from last Saturday that one was the mention of the so-called black hole. I wasn't quite sure whether both the Chairman of the Housing Authority and the Secretary for Housing totally agreed on your discovery or view in that respect. The second thing was on whether you should aim for the not so peaking target in implementing the housing programme. That could have been a reflection of not 100 per cent agreement on both sides and, therefore, causing the Director of Housing to be in a very embarrassing position?

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I hope my answers on the last occasion were not misinterpreted. I said last time that the targets are set by central government and central government does its best to provide sufficient land to meet those targets. It is clearly for myself, as director, to assess whether or not the land provided is sufficient to meet the targets required and to advise the Authority of my conclusions. Where land supply in the past has been uneven or insufficient, traditionally there has always been considerable discussion between department, authority and the bureau.

It was frankly because central government was unable to provide sufficient land that the task force was set up in 1994 under the Secretary for Planning and Lands, for example. That is not a cause for embarrassment. That is a sort of creative tension that exists in other bits of the organisation. Tasks are set. One has to assess whether or not the resources are available for them. I would not regard that sort of disagreement as embarrassing.

If I could also, Madam Chair, perhaps clarify one other misreading of what I said. I think as we very wisely look back on the events of the last few years, we should also bear in mind the circumstances in which all parties were operating. In 1996/97, the property market was still soaring to incredible heights. The waiting list for public housing was at an all time high and there



were considerable demands, not least within this chamber, for more and faster. I think it would have been a heroic performance for somebody to have stood up publicly and say we should do less at that time.

It was for me to advise whether or not, as a result of the provision of land, there were going to be difficulties, strains within the system and I had no hesitation advising on that. It is quite another matter to move from that to say that we should have stopped or rephased. I hope that no one implied from what I said that we stopped or rephased. We did not. We continued to press for the targets which had been set and to advise that there needed to be some adjustment, that the slippage which occurred was natural slippage as a result of events on the ground.

**主席：**

下一位，余若薇議員。

**Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee:**

Thank you, Madam Chairman. Mr MILLER, I just wanted to clarify with you your job description, which I asked you about last time. The document you gave us last time was dated 1997 and that is SC1-H0037. I just wanted to clarify with you whether that job description came about as a result of the Coopers & Lybrand review that tried to streamline on a sort of business basis the management of the Housing Department and resulted in the project management basis or whether it was something independent of that?

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

It was something independent of that.

**Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee:**

Mr MILLER, can I also, therefore, just confirm with you that the document you provided on the last occasion which is SC1-H0037, plus the one that you provided and produced today which relates to the year 1992 or 1991 which is now marked part of SC1-H0039, that these two documents therefore comprise your job description for the relevant period, that is, from about '92 really up to date?

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I think the answer to that must be yes. There is no inherent difference between the two. One is a slightly compressed version of the other but there is no substantive difference, as far as I am aware. If you wish me to elaborate on the other circumstances at some point, I would be happy to do so.

**Chairman:**

You want to continue?

**Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee:**

Mr MILLER, just a slight point of clarification. You said on the previous occasion that you only had one boss and you say that in fact you disagree with the description that you have two bosses. Certainly, from the job description it would appear that you have to answer to both, not just one?

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER, you want to comment on that?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

May I take it that the reference is to the words "reports to"? I think you will find that in the civil service "reports to" normally refers to a reporting chain and certainly in the completion of the staff reports there is always a chain, which is reporting officer, countersigning officer.

**Chairman:**

But isn't it correct that the words are not "reporting to" but "responsible to"? If you refer to the job description dated 1997, it is "responsible to". Is there a difference there, Mr MILLER?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

In practical terms I hadn't been aware of a difference, no.

**主席：**

呂明華議員。

**呂明華議員：**

多謝主席。我有兩個問題，都是關於架構內的質量保證。房屋委員會和房屋署都是兩個龐大的機構。一個機構的僱員有1萬多

人，另一機構的僱員則有10萬人。但在整個架構中，我並未察覺到由哪個部門負責質量管理“quality assurance”，這令我感到非常奇怪。為何我會這樣說呢？製造業是我最早從事的行業。在製造業行內，負責質量的是一個獨立部門。如果在質量方面發生任何問題的話，尤其是所謂“critical defect”，例如，若有關電壓或對生命攸關的產品出現問題，是不會獲准出廠的。但是在兩個如此龐大的機構內，竟然沒有獨立的部門管理質量和負責驗收產品。因此，苗學禮先生較早前說有99%的房屋沒有問題，只有1%的房屋有問題，這句話令我兩晚無法入睡。我曾到日本參觀當地的工廠，那些工廠對電子產品的quality的要求，達千分之一，而我們卻認為1%的房屋有問題已很不錯，這令我感到非常奇怪。這是否表示我們的架構出現問題呢？為何我們沒有考慮質量的問題呢？我們是否只顧建屋，根本沒有人注意到質量的問題？請問在架構方面錯在哪裏呢？請苗學禮先生解釋一下。

**主席：**

苗學禮先生。

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Thank you, Madam Chair. I think at one point I was advised that I shouldn't refer too often to the reforms which were put in train as a result of the consultative document here. But, clearly, there are several references in that consultative document to things which we believe we could do better and I would like to say now that for the rest of my answer nothing that I say should be taken to contradict what is in that document.

As regards the 1 000:1; 100 or 99: 1, whatever, I would be happy to wager that the Housing Authority's and the Department's record over the last 20 years, even if it doesn't meet your defect of 1 in 1000 measure, it is certainly radically better than the private sector. The Housing Authority has led industry quality reform quite vigorously from the 80s onwards. The most recent drive, until this one, started at the end of the 80s, beginning of the 90s, when the Authority, first of all, proposed the establishment of its own list of contractors so that it would have a greater degree of control over the contractors with whom it did business.

Then in 1990 - all of this is before my time but I know from the record this to be the case - the Building Committee approved the concept of a Performance Assessment Scoring System (PASS), which would allow the Authority to rank those with whom it contracts and give them preference in awarding contracts. In the same year the Building Committee launched a three-pronged strategy for improving quality, which started with accreditation for a quality assurance

system and an insistence, by agreement with all partners, that all contractors and consultants would comply with the industry standard ISO 9000. It agreed to introduce, as soon as that was done, to introduce with effect from 31 March 1993 the PASS system to which I just referred and to introduce the preferential tendering system thereafter.

All the work was done and delivered in time. Contractors and consultants did go through quality assurance accreditation and the Department also put itself through accreditation at the same time. This accreditation is revisited by HKQA on a six-monthly basis and it is taken very seriously.

At the same time, I think in early or mid-1991, the Authority contracted in a joint contract with the Hong Kong Construction Association for a quality drive. This was led by the Mortiboy's Business Management Consultants, which introduced a number of reforms which were accepted by both the industry and by the Housing Authority. All of that is by way of background. At the end of it, what has been produced for the Authority and those with whom it works is a near encyclopaedic quality management system and it is encyclopaedic precisely because it is designed for reference by all parties at all levels, whether it is at the policy level or working down through to the frontline.

In practical terms, there is no department within the Housing Department called the Quality Assurance Department but there are a number of units within the Department which are responsible for doing that sort of work.

**主席：**

呂明華議員。

**呂明華議員：**

主席，我明白苗學禮先生剛才的說話，即整個政府的運作都是基於一個信任的制度，一層一層的互相信任，這便沒有問題，因為大家都按照ISO 9000的要求。現在的問題是，這個機制沒有“check and balance”，沒有最後的“check and balance”，便不能做到互相配合的質量驗收，為何會這樣呢？如果每個人都做得好的話，根本不會發生短樁事件。為何發生了短樁事件而機制卻毫不察覺呢？是因為在管理質量的哲學上出錯。為何會出錯呢？如果大家按照整套機制執行工作，是不會有問題的。如果機制能check到——正如苗學禮先生剛才所說的——從事“criminal activity”的人的話，這個機制才有效用，否則，整個機制便沒有效用了……

**主席：**

呂議員，請問你的問題是甚麼？

**呂明華議員：**

我的問題是，為何沒有最後驗收的機制？是否因為管理哲學方面出了問題呢？

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Again, to provide context, the contracts which the Authority issues, as I mentioned earlier, require those who contract with us to provide professional and technical staff, who have a responsibility within the terms of their profession and the contract, to deliver a certain quality of product. It is quite separate from the responsibility of the contractor himself. Separate from that, the Department, through its own professionals, provides supervision of the work on the ground and the levels of that supervision are specified at some length within the quality management system which I have previously described.

In addition, under my own office we have a Technical Audit Unit and a Finance Audit Unit and within the Development Construction Bureau since January 1998 there is an independent audit unit which looks at the sort of problem which the honourable Member has referred to. That is quite separate from the normal quality control of the PASS unit which I also referred to. So, yes, there are checks and balances there and I submit that if there weren't we wouldn't have found these problems.

**主席：**

呂明華議員。

**呂明華議員：**

多謝主席。問題是，今次並非由機制本身發現短樁問題，而是有人舉報才發現問題，換言之，是機制失了效。請問苗學禮先生，是否同意由於機制本身失效才導致即使發生了問題，也無法 check 到，要重新測試才能發現有短樁問題？否則，應在接收房屋時便已察覺。

**主席：**

Mr MILLER，是否同意機制出錯呢？

**Mr J A MILLER:**

As I have said within this document, there are references to improvements which can be made to the system and I don't deny those. But, I would submit that a large proportion of the problems which we have discovered over the last few years have been discovered through the system, and the rechecking which was done in the two cases referred to. Yes, we caught them late, but we did catch them.

**主席：**

劉炳章議員。

**劉炳章議員：**

多謝主席，我想再次討論有關建築小組委員會的問題。請問苗學禮先生，建築小組委員會在考慮各份標書時，包括承建商和顧問公司的標書，除了考慮價錢、技術能力、過往表現、財務能力和管理制度等外，有否要求承包商或牽頭的顧問公司提交分判建議書，以及當中列明可分判及不可分判的工種、可作多少層的分判、可判給誰、判頭的資格及能力等？請問建築小組委員會有否考慮有關分判的情況呢？

**主席：**

劉議員，你是否問及在4宗事件發生之前的情況？

**劉炳章議員：**

對。

**主席：**

即4宗事件發生之前，是嗎？

**劉炳章議員：**

根據當時的制度，建築小組委員會除考慮技術能力和財務能力之外，有否考慮分判建議？或有否要求提交分判建議？

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Madam Chair, I understand that in the previous contracts there was a general prohibition of total assignment of a contract, i.e., total subletting, but there was no restriction on what is called domestic subletting. This is an industry which traditionally has relied on subletting for efficiency. As we have said in other areas, it has become excessive and we believe it should be changed.

**劉炳章議員：**

主席，既然沒有要求投標者提交分判建議書，而在施工時亦已知道有些工程已被分判，並也知道有“借牌”的情況，多年來這個行業都有“借牌”的情況出現，而且相當嚴重，那麼，請問房屋署或建築小組委員會有否在任何一次的會議上檢討這問題呢？若有，檢討結果為何？

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I understand, again from the record, that there have previously been discussions of this. The first proposals for changes to the system of a significant sort are those which start in this document, not before.

**主席：**

苗學禮先生，剛才你說你們曾就此事進行討論，可否向我們提供有關紀錄，說明曾在哪些會議上進行討論，以及有何結論？

**Mr J A MILLER:**

When I said there had been previous discussions I am referring to, for example, the Mortiboys consultancy to which I earlier referred, I believe the subject is discussed in that as well.

**主席：**

下一位，何鍾泰議員。

**Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:**

Thank you, Madam Chairman. At the last session last Saturday, Mr MILLER, you did mention that because of the bunching effect and also the "black hole" during the time when you saw that the peak of the volume of

housing units to be completed was forthcoming in 1996, at least, that is the time when you were taking up the position as Director of Housing. Also, you told us that you raised your concerns with the Secretary for Housing in November 1996. Obviously you saw that there were problems but then your concerns were not really taken heed of at the time.

Also at the time you noticed that a study by Coopers and Lybrand was being undertaken and one of the staff associations in your department did write to your assistant or Deputy Director to say that there should be a change in the site management, that there should be a resident site staff system because it was not in existence at the time whereas that system was being used and is still being used by works departments. Did you actually at the time just accept that the volume of work was going to increase? And yet the bunching was there, the black hole was there. You did not actually pay enough attention to the main concerns raised by the technical staff of your Department?

**Chairman:**

Do you accept that, Mr MILLER?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

No, I don't, but it is rather an involved set of questions. If we could take it piece by piece it might be clearer.

**Chairman:**

Perhaps you break down your questions.

**Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:**

Yes, the first one. I would like you to tell us when you raised your concern in November 1996 with the Secretary for Housing and you did not really get a satisfactory response in saying that something could be done about it, how did you react to it? Did you just accept what was actually planned for the Housing Department? You would just try to implement what is being given to you?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I think the simple answer to that is we continued to argue the case.

**Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:**

And that was it, was it? You didn't try any additional efforts at all, you just tried to argue the case? How did you continue to argue the case, Mr MILLER?



**Mr J A MILLER:**

Perhaps if I could expand a little bit on the preparations which the Authority and the Department took, that might put it in better perspective. First, a point of detail. I understand that the term "black hole" was wildly misinterpreted, not least by the unfortunate SIs. The "black hole" is Housing Authority and Department slang for the rapid decline in land supply after 2001, not before. What we were facing in 1996 was a sharp peak, not a black hole.

The preparations by the Authority and the Department for the peak, which was becoming visible as early as 1995, which I know from the record, started with a risk assessment by the Building Committee in 1995 which looked in particular at the need to tighten up the vetting of contractors working for the Authority. The Authority subsequently adopted a three-part strategy, which involved the Coopers & Lybrand business process review, which started in the early part of 1996, and the gradual provision of additional staff for the Development and Construction Division throughout the period leading up to the peak, and a deliberate strategic decision to outsource ultimately 40 per cent of contract management to consultant architects firms.

At different stages thereafter, the Authority also reviewed what are known as the capping limits, i.e., the maximum amount of work which may be held by a contractor at any particular time, and we also strengthened the directorate. Throughout this we also maintained a dialogue with the HKCA.

The business process re-engineering, which, as I say, began in early 1996 before I arrived, was in full swing by the time I got there. It deserves a little bit of explanation. In the past the construction arm of the Department was divided or organised along what is known as discipline lines, different professional disciplines. This is very different from private sector practice and, in summary, the recommendations which Coopers Lybrand came up with, and which were talked through with staff of the Department, involved the introduction of what is called project management, using mixed discipline teams. The report was completed at the end of 1996 and introduced the following year, I think in the second half of the year.

As part of that business process review, there was extensive consultation by my predecessors with staff. They were invited to put forward their views on both the existing organisation and the way in which they thought we could best approach this very large volume of work which was forecast. At the time I arrived I have to say I was not aware of the letter which you referred to, which was not addressed to the Director. But, I was aware very quickly of a certain enthusiasm within particularly the engineering disciplines of the department for project management. They saw this as a new opportunity. Other disciplines were perhaps a little more wary.

Having reviewed the letter which you referred to, I note that there are three requests in that letter; one relates to resident site engineering posts, one relates to project management, and the other I think relates to vetting of consultants' performance. In practice, the project management system was introduced and I'm happy to say that engineers took two of the positions. We were not short of volunteers for that and I am very pleased with that. The vetting of consultants was introduced I think at the beginning of 1998.

The only bit which appears to be missing was a response to the request for what is referred to as the proper establishment of a resident site engineer system. I have checked the record on it and I am aware that resident site staff were in fact introduced earlier and that in 1995 there were already 21 posts established for resident site engineers. I think there is a little bit of a dilemma there.

***Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:***

Just now you mentioned about this sort of consultant management or project management arrangement using a mixed disciplinary approach. You said it is something new. In fact it is nothing new. For decades this system has been used, for instance, by the works groups of the government, such as the Territory Development Department when they are implementing new town work. It is nothing new. The thing is, you said some site staff positions had already been established. In fact, for piling works in particular not only you don't put enough people on-site ...

***Chairman:***

Can you ask a question please?

***Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:***

Also, it is not the right kind of discipline you have utilised for such type of work because if you refer to the amount of work during the years 1996, 1997 and 1998, piling work increased three to four times. How do you explain the 21 positions that you mentioned just now is relevant to the piling works? I think you may be talking about superstructure work. Is that the case, Mr MILLER?

***Chairman:***

Mr MILLER?

***Mr J A MILLER:***

Madam Chairman, no, and can I say straight away that I did not say that project management is new. It was new to the Department but it is by no means a new type of organisation. I also said that it was welcomed by the engineers.

I think this perhaps lends some explanation to a particular phenomenon. Although I had been made aware of the letter to which you referred, which as I say was delivered to the Deputy Director of the Department before my arrival, I was not subsequently approached with any request concerning the establishment of resident site engineers until after the events into which this panel is inquiring. Whatever the reasons for this, it is quite clear that the reforms which came in following the business process review, the setting-up of the project management, the opening up of new opportunities for the engineering grade, were well received.

As regards the question of the posts and for which purposes they were created, the correspondence is there. The papers for the committees of the Authority are there. This is not in any way to dispute the desirability of having resident site staff on piling projects. I agree with you they should have been there and that is why the recommendation is in that document.

***Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:***

Madam Chairman, that is not what Mr MILLER told us just now. He said twice that the letter written by the engineering staff association was written to the Deputy Director a couple of months before his arrival. I would like to ask Mr MILLER after you have arrived at the Department taking up the position of Director did you actually talk to the various disciplines of your Department to find out what views they had?

***Chairman:***

Mr MILLER.

***Mr J A MILLER:***

Yes, Madam Chairman, as soon as I arrived I embarked on a round of discussions with all of the various grades of the Department and the unions. I have to say I should have been aware of the letter. I wasn't. I wish I had been aware of the letter.

***Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:***

Just one more point, Madam Chairman. This is the same point. Are you saying to us that none of the disciplines actually said to you that resident site staff establishment was essential for this type of work, particularly piling works? No discipline at all mentioned that to you?

***Chairman:***

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Madam Chairman, I don't recall it. It may have been said. I don't know. What I do recall very vividly is that in the workshops which were conducted for all of the disciplined staff in which we were talking through these reforms this particular subject did not emerge, but there did emerge a very clear enthusiasm for changing what was clearly regarded as a restrictive system.

**主席：**

我想提醒各位委員，我們仍在探討房屋署、房屋委員會及房屋委員會轄下各小組委員會之間的關係。希望大家集中在這範疇上發問。

石禮謙議員。

**Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him:**

Madam Chairman, I would like to follow up a number of questions which Mr MILLER answered Audrey and Raymond and P.C. In fact, the first question I would like to pose is, Mr MILLER, do you consider the Building Committee is too powerful because basically they are in charge of everything, from appointment, design, construction, the tender board? That is the first question.

Secondly, with the number of contracts they have to go through there must be full-time work, but they are not full-time workers, the majority of them are part-timers, with the exception of the four. So, indirectly, the Building Committee becomes the tool of the Development and Construction Bureau, in fact listening to what the bureau of the Housing Department give them. I might be wrong but please answer that?

The second question is earlier you have said that the tenders are being awarded to the lowest tender. How can they award to the lowest tenders when there are different types of piling in terms of tendering for piling, different types of piling which command different types of prices? For instance, Daido price is different from H-piles, from big diameter bored piles. How can you compare what is not apples with apples? Was there a design in one of the four incidents of piling problems that Daido pile was originally conceived that you should actually decide that you use Daido piles? On that basis then if you ask the other piling contractors providing H-piles or large diameter bored piles to submit tenders, you know very well that they would not be in the class in terms of comparison of prices. That is the first question.

**Chairman:**

That is actually the second question, OK? Would you like to pause here and perhaps allow Mr MILLER to answer first? Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Is the Building Committee too powerful? No. The Building Committee acts as the Authority's tender board. The volume of work which is provided to the Housing Authority is, frankly, a matter for government to decide in setting targets for us.

Is the Building Committee well equipped to perform that function? There was some discussion on that on the last occasion when you were not present. If I might, Madam Chairman, I wish to correct here a misperception. I think that the Honourable P.C. LAU\* said that only a third of members of the said Committee were professional or related to the industry. That is not the case and I would be happy to distribute to members a marked-up copy of the membership over the last five years, indicating the level of expertise of members which might clarify that point. I think they have performed the function extremely well.

There was also a question as to whether or not it was appropriate that this be performed by part-timers. I tried to make the point last time that the government, having tasked the Authority to perform this function, if the award of tenders was to be conducted by full-time bureaucrats under the umbrella of the Authority, then I think the community would suggest that this was not particularly transparent. The Building Committee, by involving non-officials, provides transparency to the process which would not be there otherwise.

To come back to the technical question. Again, last time in response to another question I stressed that traditionally 95 per cent of piling contracts have been let on a design and build basis. The Department's geotechnical and structural engineers produce a set of specifications on the basis of site investigation and feasibility study. Sometimes that is contracted out, as it was in one of the two cases in question, and from that flows a recommendation as to which sort of piles would be appropriate for this particular project. That goes into the tender specifications and tenderers respond to it. I think that answers the question.

**Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him :**

Madam Chairman, the question is if it is a Daido pile in this case then in the circumstances you should not even ask other piling contractors to submit tender, knowing very well that they would not be in the same class of pricing.

---

\* Director of Housing later advised that the member he referred to should be Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai.

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Madam Chair, we invite companies to tender for work traditionally on the basis of design and build subject to the specifications. It is for them to decide which is going to be the most efficient piling system for that particular tender. That is the whole point of competitive tender.

**Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him:**

A follow-up question.

**Chairman:**

I would appreciate if members would only speak after I have called your name please. It is to facilitate the SIs. Otherwise, they get all mixed up. Mr SHEK?

**Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him:**

I would follow up further. In the incidents where the piling problems arose, was it the recommendation from the resident geotechnical expert that Daido piles should be used?

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

In which particular project?

**Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him:**

In the four problematic areas, two of them in Yuen Chau Kok or Tin Chung Yuen.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Madam Chairman, there are only I believe two piling projects under review, not four.

**Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him:**

Of the four incidents, two of the four, was it the recommendation of the geotechnical expert that Daido piles should be used?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I have to say I understood that we were not going to discuss individual cases today but I understand from the investigations by the NUNN...

**Chairman:**

Can we reserve that question until we go into phase 3?

**Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him:**

OK, because I am talking about the BC, the Building Committee. Were they aware of all these situations? Because they sit on the tender board and they should be aware of all the circumstances. My point is, as Mr MILLER was saying, the Building Committee is perfect as I am given to understand. In that sense I consider the Building Committee wasn't given the full information.

**Chairman:**

Perhaps the question should be asked whether the Building Committee was aware of the type of piles being used? Was it apparent from the papers produced to the Building Committee?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

It was most certainly apparent from the papers put before the Committee and, as I said on the last occasion, prior to that there had been discussion within the Building Committee on piling types.

**Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him:**

Madam Chairman, may I ask a further related question?

**Chairman:**

May I put your name down, because there are other members. We have actually agreed amongst ourselves that there should be only one follow-up and then we take the queue again.

**李卓人議員 :**

謝謝主席。剛才我曾詢問建築小組委員會如何審批標書。署長曾提及其中97%都是“價低者得”，但除此之外，他們也會考慮投標者過往的表現及財政能力。我想請問，建築小組委員會曾否向過往表現不佳、有不良紀錄或不良報告的承建商批出合約，原因是該承建商出價最低，而且也是基於房屋署的建議有此決定？

**主席：**

苗學禮先生。

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Madam Chair, the management of contractors and other partners who work with the Authority is the subject of a system of listing. The List Management Committee is chaired by the Business Director (Development) and involves all of his senior staff. They review the performance of consultants and contractors against the scoring system to which I have referred and take into account any other complaints or incidents, safety incidents, and so on. They make recommendations as to whether or not listed contractors and consultants should remain eligible to bid for the Authority's business.

In the event that they feel that the performance is not up to scratch, they may recommend either removal from the list or suspension and that recommendation is put to the Building Committee for endorsement. Prior to the letting of any tender, a check is made on the records of the List Management Committee to ensure that only those who are at that time eligible to tender will be invited to tender. It is not unusual for suspensions to happen and for contractors who would normally be bidding to be excluded from bidding or, in some cases, I have to say where as a result of a particular incident for a contractor to be simply taken off the list.

**主席：**

李卓人議員。

**李卓人議員：**

主席，我的問題並不是指那些已被除名的承建商，已被除名的承建商的標書當然不會獲投標委員會審批。我的問題是，建築小組委員會在考慮標書時，會否考慮過往表現不佳、有不良紀錄，但又未至於要從認可承建商名冊中除名的承建商？他們雖未被除名，但過往有不良表現的紀錄仍是事實。署長這樣回答，那就表示當局完全不會理會承建商過往的紀錄，只要他們未被除名，便一定可以因“價低者得”而獲批合約，當局是不會考慮其過往表現的。

**主席：**

苗學禮先生，是否有此情況呢？



**Mr J A MILLER:**

Madam Chair, an earlier reply may not have been understood. The performance assessment system known as the PASS, PASS scoring system, is used to rank the performance of contractors and consultants and they are given preferential scores on the basis of that performance. If their performance is not consistently good, they would be at a disadvantage in tendering for projects. We will not consciously give contracts to those who are performing badly.

**李卓人議員：**

主席，我想跟進一點。建築小組委員會曾否因投標者出價低便向該投標者批出合約，而不理會其過往的不良紀錄，建築小組委員會照樣批出合約，又或署方照樣建議建築小組委員會批出合約？

**主席：**

曾否有此情況呢？苗學禮先生。

**Mr J A MILLER:**

No, that is , as far as I know, there have been arguments over specific tenders where the argument has been whether or not it should be the first or second lowest tender as a result of particular considerations, but not generally.

**主席：**

鄧兆棠議員。

**鄧兆棠議員：**

謝謝主席。署長在上星期六回應我們的問題時表示，房屋委員會很有作用。據當局提供的文件所載，建築小組委員會在1995至96年度一年間共討論了528份文件，大約每月要討論數十份文件。相信他們不會通宵達旦開會，多是半天或甚至一整天。在這種情況下，是否每份文件均能詳細討論？又或委員只是按署方的意見做一個橡皮圖章呢？

**主席：**

或許請苗學禮先生告訴我們，有關會議每次進行多久，是4小時、兩小時，還是8小時？

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Meetings of the Building Committee, Madam Chair, start at 8.45 on Thursday. In the last couple of years we have been very lucky to get off before lunch, without a break.

**主席：**

答案即是約4小時。

**鄧兆棠議員：**

我覺得很可惜，4小時便能通過數十份文件，而又能就標書作出決定等，我覺得時間上頗為緊迫……

**主席：**

我想這屬個人意見，現在可否提出問題？

**鄧兆棠議員：**

我現在要問的是標書中所訂定的 specifications，即特別要點，是由署方訂定的、由建築小組委員會訂定的，還是由何人訂定的呢？

**主席：**

你指的是規格吧？

**鄧兆棠議員：**

對，是規格。究竟有關規格是由何人訂定的？因為所訂定的規格會影響到投標人落標決定和中標的機會。

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER ?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I am not an expert, Madam Chair. But if we are talking about piling contracts, in general terms, the standards are set by the Buildings Authority or Buildings Department. Although the Authority has a waiver, traditionally it has followed those standards. I may have misunderstood the question but the particular specifications for a particular project depend on the results of the assessment done by or arranged by the geotechnical engineers and the feasibility

study done by the structural engineers of the Department. Occasionally, this work is contracted out so that the contract specifications may come in from either of those two sources. But, they are highly professional sets of specifications.

**主席：**

鄧兆棠議員。

**鄧兆棠議員：**

即是說這些規格在普通情況下是由 **Building Authority**，即建築事務監督負責訂定。但因為房屋委員會並不受屋宇署監管，所有決定都由房屋委員會自行作出，所以當決定有問題或房屋委員會對某種樁柱有所偏好時，便可能會有誤差，對嗎？

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

There is a key difference between the way that the Housing Authority's projects proceed and the private sector projects proceed. It is not in the preparatory work itself but the design work itself. The key difference is in the absence of a third-party audit.

**主席：**

下一位，石禮謙議員。

**Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him:**

I would like to follow up on the job description of the Director of Housing. Have there been cases when the Chairman of the Housing Authority and the Secretary for Housing do not see eye to eye? Where does your allegiance stand?

**主席：**

石議員，其實你已問過這問題，如果問題一再重複提問，研訊便會十分冗長，不如你先查看紀錄，再依紀錄跟進好嗎？

**Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him:**

I lead up to the question. In that case where does your allegiance lie? And in the case that when you see the bunching of flat productions coming up during

the period after '96 and knowing that with the resources you would have problems in fulfilling the targets but the policy was fixed on producing what the Housing Bureau wants, have you, as the head of the Housing Department staff, Housing Department organisation, warned the Secretary for Housing on this issue?

**主席：**

其實這問題在上星期六已提出過，但因為你當天沒有出席，我今次破例讓Mr MILLER簡短地回答你。若同事一再重複問題，便會大大拖慢整個研訊進程，我希望同事不要常常重複已問過的問題，好嗎？Mr MILLER, I make this an exception. I hope it is not repeated.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

My answer last time consisted of two parts. The first was in general. If the government is going to intervene in the market place on the scale in which it has intervened in respect of housing, then it owes it to the economy and society to do so in an even-handed manner and not to have fluctuations. They are not healthy for any of the players, whether it is staff of the Department or investors or the contractors and consultants who work for us. So the general point is that I think we have always argued for a steady supply of land and a steady set of targets at whatever level the government chooses. But, I stress it is for government to choose the target.

Secondly, did I raise concerns? Yes, I did, and those related to all of the impacts to which I have just referred. At the time not the least of our concerns was that the economy was already quite clearly quite warm and, in discussion with the Construction Association, there were concerns over supply of labour in particular trades, for example.

**主席：**

如果你再想跟進，請先查看紀錄，看是否有其他問題希望提出？楊孝華議員。

**Hon Howard YOUNG:**

Madam Chairman, I wish to reconcile the question that Mr LEE Cheuk-yan asked just earlier on whether tenders have been awarded to not so well performing contractors based on lower price and the answer given by the Director that there was a scoring system. My understanding of the answer just now was that there was a scoring system and if people didn't perform well but not dropped from the list they would be disadvantaged. Would that not mean that being disadvantaged, if that contractor wanted to get into a contract, he would

have to really bend over backwards to offer rock bottom or even losing his shirt prices to get in and, therefore, come exceptionally low? That would almost automatically create a system where the lowest tender would be to someone who has got bad marks against him and, therefore, create the situation which I believe LEE Cheuk-yan was worried about. Based on lower prices, it would be the not so well performing contractor who got the contract.

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Hon Howard YOUNG:**

But the answer was that it had not happened. So I am a bit puzzled about that.

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Madam Chair, bids are vetted by experienced quantity surveyors. If a bid is too aggressive, clearly, a question mark would have to be raised. So hypothetically the answer is yes, such a thing can happen but you are dealing with a committee that is a responsible committee.

**Hon Howard YOUNG:**

Is the Director saying that the reason why the disastrous or not so good scenario that Mr LEE was worried about wouldn't happen is because so-called irresponsible ones have been rejected in the past? Before even coming before the tender board I mean.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

No, sorry, don't misunderstand me. The advice of the quantity surveyor, whether it is in-house advice or consultant quantity surveyor advice, goes to the Building Committee. It is not for the Department to exclude it arbitrarily.

**主席 :**

何鍾泰議員。

**Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:**

Madam Chairman, in the last session, Mr MILLER, you said that even in the private sector there were a large number of cases which had construction

problems and you put these housing difficulties or site problems to the financial crisis in the second half of 1997. But we all know that, for instance, the works departments of the government did not have any difficulty at all in the implementation of their works. How come there is such a difference? Didn't you see at that time that surely it was not due to the financial crisis at the time but it is due to other areas which caused these housing site problems?

**Chairman:**

So what specifically is your question?

**Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:**

If I can make it more specific. Because just now Mr MILLER said that in 1996 he raised the concern with the Secretary for Housing for an even workload and also you said that the work volume was too excessive, three times as much as previously. Did you then go to, for instance, the Housing Authority, the Chairman of the Authority, or did you use your whip more often to press your staff to work harder, or you use your whip on the contractors and consultants, for instance, asking for much shorter contract periods and much heavier liquidated damages? Did you actually go to the Building Committee for assistance or the Chairman of the Authority for assistance to resolve your worries?

**Chairman:**

Perhaps specifically over and above what Mr MILLER has already told us that he did. Did you go specifically to the Building Committee and raise your concern with the Chairman of the Housing Authority? Is that OK?

**Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:**

I was trying to make it more plain to Mr MILLER actually.

**Chairman:**

That would be more specific because he has gone into this particular scenario many times. I don't want him to repeat what he has already told us. Mr MILLER, can you be more specific? Did you bring your concerns to the Building Committee and the Chairman of the Housing Authority?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

The first point is I did not relate the individual events directly to the financial crisis. I very deliberately said that that may have been one of the contributing factors. I also very deliberately said that I thought the prime reason we had these problems is criminality.

Now to the second part of the question. Even before I arrived within the Development Committee of the Authority, questions were raised about the strain likely to be imposed on the Department and the industry alike. Following my arrival, it was discussed again in the Development Committee as I have suggested and within the Building Committee there were discussions on, for example, forward planning for the likely increase in workload for the construction industry and different trades within that industry. Those discussions were transferred to discussions with the Secretary for Works' staff and the Secretary for Education and Manpower. There was a general concern about the demand on resources as we moved forward.

**主席：**

何鍾泰議員。

**Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:**

Madam Chairman, I do not quite agree that...

**主席：**

請你提出問題。

**Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:**

Mr MILLER just said that the housing site problems weren't only related to the financial crisis but also related to criminality. You did say on the record that you suggested, as well as others, a link to the financial crisis in the second half of 1997. At that time last session you were not talking about criminality. I think you actually isolated the issue of the financial crisis in defending the housing site scandals in that case.

**Chairman:**

I think we are not debating here, Mr HO. Can you specifically ask a question or a follow-up question to your earlier question?

**Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:**

The first part of my question. I ask Mr MILLER would he agree or not agree that at the time when he was responding to our question last week that actually he was singling out the financial crisis as the main reason for housing site scandals and not actually related to other things as he suggested just now?

**Chairman:**

He has already answered in the negative. He said no.

***Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:***

His answer just now is different to what he gave us last week.

***Chairman:***

That is a matter of interpretation. We can look into the transcript later on and arrive at our own views. I don't want a debate. It is on the record already. If Mr MILLER wants to clarify then he wants to clarify.

***Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:***

The second part, Madam Chairman, I don't think Mr MILLER has actually answered my question because I said if he knew that the work volume was going to be three times as heavy, what sort of solutions would he try to adopt. Would he go to the Authority, or his department, his staff, or contractors? Because in the end we know that contract periods were shortened a lot and liquidated damages were raised a lot. In fact these could be main factors for all these housing site problems. I want to ask Mr MILLER whether or not he adopted that approach at the time?

***Chairman:***

Mr MILLER?

***Mr J A MILLER:***

The first point, Madam Chair. I have only distinguished between what I call primary and contributory causes. The Asian financial crisis was clearly a contributory cause but it cannot be used as an excuse for what happened.

The second point. Were there shorter contract periods? I know from the record that before my arrival what was called tender A and tender B contracts were introduced where, for a variety of reasons, not purely cost and not purely time, the Building Committee gave contractors the option to bid for different completion times. I have to say from the record that these do not appear to have been a significant factor in relation to the problems which came subsequently.

***主席 :***

下一位，余若薇議員。

***Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee:***

Thank you, Madam Chairman. Mr MILLER, you produced amongst the papers you produced to us Annex A to HCI-0021 which gives a list of the membership and composition of the Building Committee for the year 1995 and



1996 only. Earlier on I think in your answers today you said the Honourable Mr P.C. LAU was mistaken in relation to the expertise of the Building Committee members. Can you, therefore, very kindly supplement our documents with a list of the members of the Building Committee for the relevant years, after 1995 to 1996, up to maybe 1999 and 2000, and also mark it up with the relevant expertise, such as construction, surveying and whatever relevant expertise you think we should look at?

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER, do you have those available now?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Madam Chairman, I don't have them with me now but I would be happy to make them available before the next session.

**Chairman:**

Thank you.

**主席：**

下一位，李卓人議員。

**李卓人議員：**

謝謝主席。很多時，建築小組委員會所討論的標書都是由房屋署提出建議，再由建築小組委員會作決定。我想請問，是否差不多所有房屋署的建議都會獲得建築小組委員會同意呢？獲同意的百分比約多少？當中可能有一、兩次建議不獲採納，但4年內800多份標書中，是否有差不多97%至98%都採納了房屋署的建議呢？謝謝主席。

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Madam Chairman, I don't have the figures with me but I think it would be true to say somewhere in the region of 85, 90 per cent. But, the degree of scrutiny is actually quite severe with a lot of questioning on all of the papers. As I said last time, we don't get an easy time of it. It would be nice if we did.

**主席：**

劉炳章議員。

**劉炳章議員：**

謝謝主席。我知道苗學禮先生在上任後推行了若干計劃，包括 Management Enhancement Programme。我想舉出一些例子：他曾將顧問工作外判，將建築期縮短，亦曾成立升降機條例執行股。我亦知道，房屋署的建築工程並不受屋宇署監管。隨後他在改善計劃中又將建築期延長，但成立了升降機條例執行股，卻沒有成立有關《建築物條例》的管理小組，我想請問苗學禮先生，這些做法會否有前後矛盾之嫌呢？

**主席：**

苗學禮先生。

**Mr J A MILLER:**

The first point is that at no point during my tenure have I, quote, shortened the construction period. I made that clear in answer to a question last time. The lead-in time for projects was reduced but the relevant part of the reduction was the planning and preparation, not the construction period. The construction period was retained as it had been previously.

The second point, contracting out. The contracting out of contract management consultancies, the contracting out of quantity surveying consultancies, the contracting out of site investigation, the contracting out of construction, the contracting out of a whole host of work done by the Building Committee has been going on ever since the Authority was set up in 1972. So, no, that was not innovation from myself, nor was it an innovation from the Management Enhancement Programme. The Management Enhancement Programme was about internal reform. The contracting out of management and maintenance services for the estates, that had also started before I arrived. The one bit which I will take credit for there is the phased service transfer for management and maintenance but that is not pertinent to the work of the Building Committee.

The Lift Ordinance Enforcement Unit was transferred to my office as part of the reorganisation of the Department along core business lines in the latter part of 1997, when it was recognised that it would be more sensible for that function to be as independent as it possibly could within the organisation, as, for example, the Technical Audit Unit. The waiver from the Buildings Ordinance is historic

and, again, my views on that are a matter of record. Indeed, the Independent Checking Unit has already been established. I think that answers it.

**主席：**

劉炳章議員。

**劉炳章議員：**

主席，我想最重要的一點是，一方面房屋署不受屋宇署的監管，當然，我亦明白這是歷史性的問題，但另一方面，房屋署亦成立了我剛才所說的升降機條例執行股“Enforcement Unit”，即是說，他明白到他雖然不受監管，但有些地方他想做得好一點，那麼，為何在《建築物條例》方面他又不想成立一個獨立的管理小組或控制小組來控制？因為他是不受屋宇署的條例管制，他既然知道不受管制，那麼，為何不自行成立一個獨立的單位來管制呢？因為在另一方面已經有這樣做，他亦是不受管制，而且亦已經自動成立一個管制小組來管制，但為何在《建築物條例》方面他又不這樣做？

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

The Lift Ordinance Enforcement Unit existed prior to my arrival. It was merely moved within the organisation. The setting-up of the ICU has already taken place, and I think the rest of the answer is already in the written documentation.

**主席：**

何俊仁議員。

**Hon Albert HO Chun-yan:**

Mr MILLER has mentioned that in the past there were discussions in the Building Committee meetings over technical matters, such as piling, the type of piles to be used in particular projects. I suppose that sort of technical discussions are not as frequent or usual as discussions over matters like pricing or superstructure design and so on and so forth. Can you confirm that that sort of technical discussion is not very frequent? In case there is disagreement between members of the Building Committee over certain technical issues such as

whether certain piles should be used with your technical staff, would the Building Committee bring in outside expertise or second opinions, say, from the Buildings Department or from academics or from the private sector to resolve differences in opinion?

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I confirm that detailed discussion of technical matters at a generic level, for types of piling, for example, is a comparative rarity and I gave last time the one example that I am aware of, which was a question raised in early '96 and the discussion after that. It is not infrequent, however, on particular projects for professional and technical members of the Building Committee to raise quite detailed questions about particular features of a project or contract and those are usually resolved within that meeting. Occasionally, they will be referred out for further deliberation. It is not unusual for the Authority to hire outside professional advice when confronted with a particular problem. That is a matter I think of natural caution in these circumstances.

**主席 :**

何俊仁議員。

**Hon Albert HO Chun-yan:**

I think the fact that discussions over technical matters were rare can be explained by the fact that there are constraints and limitations that the Building Committee is faced with, such as time and to a certain extent that some members are not experts. But, would it be fair to say that the main function that you would have expected the Building Committee to discharge is that they should oversee the project more from the angle as a developer to ensure the overall design suits the use or the target of the Housing Authority as a developer? Of course, equally important is the factor of pricing, the cost-effectiveness of the project, rather than the technical feasibility thereof.

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

That is a very perceptive question, Madam Chairman. If I can just add something to my earlier reply. We do have representation from, for example, the

Works Bureau on the Building Committee, so reference to, assistance or advice from colleagues elsewhere is available. For example, briefings on piling problems outside have happened.

You are quite right that the way the Building Committee has operated over the last few years is divided into two parts; one is design and construction and the other is the tender board function. We have given consideration to whether or not those two should not be split apart but they carry, frankly, equal weight. As I have said, although the design side is very important and the Building Committee members provide a lot of very professional and quite detailed advice both inside the meeting and outside in what we call the Project Design Review Committee, the tender board role is I believe very important from the point of view of the transparency of the operation of the Authority, given the very large sums of money which it is disbursing.

**主席：**

現在是下午4時，我們在前一段時間都是在探討房屋署和房屋委員會之間的關係、房屋委員會轄下各小組委員會的運作、房屋署署長在那些小組委員會內擔任的工作，以及有關程序等，我想在這個範疇我們也探討得頗為深入，我們現在休會10分鐘，復會後我們進入一個新的範疇好嗎？如果大家同意，我們就這樣進行。

**(研訊於下午4時05分休會)**

**(研訊於下午4時15分繼續)**

**主席：**

記得請苗學禮先生進來.....現時已有足夠的法定人數，我們可以繼續進行今天的研訊。我們現在進入另一個新的範疇，有沒有同事想發問？黃宜弘議員。

**Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong:**

Madam Chairman, referring to the period 1995 to 1997, I suppose the Housing Department has a role to play in setting the housing targets each year? I would just like to know if Mr MILLER can tell us in setting those targets what factors you actually took into consideration?

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Madam Chairman, I am conscious again that part of that predates my arrival. I understand that prior to 1997 the work on what is called the housing demand forecast was carried out by an interdepartmental working group under the Committee on Planning, Land and Development but that the main work on crunching numbers and so on was done by the staff of the Department. The translation of that number into target numbers for production and the land supply necessary for the achievement of those targets, again, from the record, appears to have been a process which is more central government than the Department, in particular, something which came out of the Task Force on Land Supply.

In practice, as I think must be clear from the answers given by my colleagues in the Bureau to the written questions, in the period immediately following the task force, what was happening was that the production programme was being translated, the then existing production programme was being translated into targets more or less and it was only at the end of 1996 and the beginning of 1997 when the Planning Department, together with the Housing Bureau, produced the new housing demand forecast model which had been promised in the Task Force on Land Supply that the setting of targets formally reverted to the Housing Bureau. I think that's correct but I leave it to the Bureau to give the details.

**主席：**

是否有跟進？

**Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong:**

I'm still not quite sure of the specific factors that you took into account. You mentioned about land supply, for one. That's one factor. But what about others? Secondly, if you look at the set of factors before that period and after that period, are there any significant changes in the factors you took into account in establishing housing targets?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I have to profess a great deal of ignorance. I am not familiar with the previous model. Clearly, it will have taken into account the data available in Census and Statistics from census data about levels of family income because the Housing Authority, by definition, is providing services to particular income groups, and it will have taken into account data on the inadequately housed in terms of squatters, and it will have taken into account the demand for clearances and so on. Beyond that, I would not wish to go.

**主席：**

謝謝。我們現在談及的是有關建屋量預測方面的問題，李卓人議員。

**李卓人議員：**

謝謝主席。為了更易於討論建屋量預測的問題，我想特別看看SC1-H0033號文件的附件A，當中有一個表，我想根據表中內容向署長提出一些問題。謝謝。

**主席：**

署長，你的桌上亦放有一套文件，麻煩你翻閱第33號文件。

**李卓人議員：**

是附件A。

**主席：**

是附件A。

**李卓人議員：**

那是一個表。該表的題目是1995-96至2000-01年度房屋委員會每年的建屋量。

**主席：**

是附件A。

**李卓人議員：**

對，是附件A，那是一個表。

**主席：**

那是一份有關建屋量的文件。是否找到該份附件？我剛才看到似乎是翻錯了文件，是第33號文件的附件A。

**李卓人議員：**

對，是第33號文件的附件A。

**主席：**

是第33號文件的附件A。

**Mr J A MILLER:**

謝謝。I now have it.

**主席：**

李卓人議員。

**李卓人議員：**

其實我是想跟進剛才黃宜弘議員的問題，我覺得剛才署長答覆的最後一部分，可能較側重房屋需求的估計，不過，我們現在不是討論房屋需求的估計，我們是討論建屋量是如何預測？

首先，我想問一問——這可能發生在苗學禮先生擔任署長之前——從表中有關95年9月那一行，我們可以看見95至96年是35 791個單位，一直至2000至01年是69 000餘個單位，總數是296 730個單位。我想知道，署長其實是否知悉由35 000個增至六萬餘個單位，在當時政府還未有表示公屋興建目標為5萬個單位時，建屋量已達5萬個單位，95年的公屋興建目標平均已差不多達到5萬個單位，想請問，這其實是一個目標，還是一個政府建屋的承諾？抑或只是一個預測呢？

**主席：**

苗學禮先生。

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Again, this predates me but I am aware from the record that following the completion of the Task Force on Land Supply's work, which was conducted in parallel with the Housing Authority's mid-term review of the then Long Term Housing Strategy, the Authority offered to assist in the construction of additional units of housing, provided sufficient land could be made available and in good time. I assume that the figures here reflect the additional land which was made available at that time.

**主席：**

那份文件是房屋局交給我們的，可能未正式向專責委員會呈交。我們是收到了，但稍後當房屋局局長到來時，我們可以再跟進這個問題，好嗎？李卓人議員。



**李卓人議員：**

主席，我再討論那個表。署長剛才其實並未清楚回答究竟95年的預測是在已有land supply之後所作的預測，還是其實當時沒有land supply，根本不知道，只純粹是一個target。換言之，我想問署長他是否知道，或者他不知道也不要緊，因為我會接着問有關97年的情況。

**主席：**

是，明白了，如果你認為你能夠回答，便請你幫忙回答這個問題。如果你認為回答不到，我們可以問其他問題。

**Mr J A MILLER:**

If we go back to 1994 and 95 there had been, quite clearly, a failure of land supply for both public and private sector housing. It was clear from the figures and from the way the economy was performing that there was inadequate production of new accommodation, both public and private. That was why the Task Force on Land Supply was set up. Following its conclusions, there was a drive to very quickly introduce new land into the system, both for public and private housing, and the Housing Bureau was reborn.

I have to say, as an objective observer, that the work done following the Task Force was tremendous. There was an enormous pressure outside, not least within these four walls, for a lot to be done very quickly to ensure that something was done to get more housing there to bring the waiting list back down and to cool the market, and a tremendous amount of land was injected into the programme very quickly. I assume that this peak represents the results of that work.

**主席：**

請繼續跟進。

**李卓人議員：**

主席，署長剛才說在94至95年時有一個工作小組，然後這個工作小組便開始做很多有關土地供應的工作。如果是這樣的話，94至95年已經開始有土地供應，這如何解釋97年6月當你上任時——我想你看到這個情況也會頭痛——在你上任時會看到95至96年、96至97年、97至98年期間差不多都是3萬餘個單位，直至

98至99年也是3萬餘個單位，比起預計的少了萬多個單位。如果大家比較一下，便發現少了萬多個單位，即由97至98年開始，每年少了萬多個單位，一直至1999至2000年，然後突然之間在2000至01年就飆升至114 000個單位，這就是我們昨天時常說的“bunching effect”，即是說突然間在末段衝刺，然後便是“黑洞”。我想問署長，根據這個表，如果在94至95年期間的“Task Force”已有這麼好的土地供應，其實是不會出現95至99年間的情況，即在這4年間，建屋量一直都只有3萬多個單位。為甚麼會出現這情況呢？

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Thank you, Madam Chairman, I again revert to something which I said at the last meeting. Identifying land and developing it are two different things. Land was most certainly identified and it was allocated to the Housing Authority over a period. Translating that land into development is fraught with all sorts of practical problems on the ground. There was a considerable degree of slippage in the programme, to which I have referred, and that slippage represents problems with things which I have referred to in the written answers. It refers to rezonings, it refers to the clearance of land, it refers to problems with utilities, the hundred and one things which can go wrong before you actually get a building built.

Over the two or three year period which you are talking about, you will see that the numbers slide inexorably upwards towards the right and that is cumulative slippage. When I arrived in the middle of 1996 it was quite clear that the peak was going to be significant, unless some relief was given in the latter half of the programme, i.e., after 2001.

**主席：**

李卓人議員。

**李卓人議員：**

主席，成因是由於有“slippage”，最後造成在2000至01年有114 000個單位。其實署長是知悉114 000個單位這數字的。但到了98年3月，即在9個月後，署長卻把估計數量改為93 697個單位。請問你是基於甚麼數字、甚麼機制或考慮而修訂為這數量呢？

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Madam Chair, as I mentioned last time, internally we had already looked at what might be a more feasible outcome for 2001 if natural slippage was allowed to occur. The figures prior to June 1997 represent no slippage. After, they represent a calculation of what that slippage would in practice be.

**主席：**

你希望再追問。

**李卓人議員：**

主席，署長說先前沒有計算“slippage”，之後才計算在內。請問你基於甚麼方程式去計算“slippage”？例如你現在計算是93 000個單位，但最後是85 000個單位。請問你是基於甚麼來決定“slip”的約數？是基於以前的紀錄，還是手頭上的projects呢？

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I think I am correct in saying that around the November period of 1996, in looking at the forward programme it was quite clear that there were some 21 projects which were in danger of slipping beyond the end of the LTHS period, i.e., beyond 2001, because of the sort of practical problems to which I have referred. So we used that as a basis for calculating what was likely to happen in practice. This was the advice of my project management team working, as they always have, on the basis of practical problems.

**主席：**

好。余若薇議員。

**Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee:**

Thank you, Madam Chairman, the Honourable LEE Cheuk-yan just referred to the table. Although this is provided by the Housing Bureau, however, we also see from a document which is provided by the Housing

Authority and the Housing Department, which is SC1-H0032, the answer to question two, that the forecast is done quarterly and that the forecast for public housing production for the year 2000 and 2001 peaked at 114,700 units in June 1997, which is very similar to the table that we have just seen. I assume that the Annex A is accurate and that in fact accurately sets out the quarterly forecast for the purpose of the Housing Department as well.

There is one question I wanted to clarify in relation to this table because we understand that in about December of one year, the government announced that there would be an extra lot of land and as a result there was going to be 20,000 units more created as a result of this extra allocation of I think 30 hectares or something. Looking at table A, I'm not quite sure where and how the 20,000 extra units is factored into this table? Maybe the 20,000 is split in between two quarters or more than two quarters and that's why we can't see a 20,000 unit increase? I don't know whether you can help in relation to this particular point?

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Madam Chairman, not without further research. I am aware in general terms of the additional amount of land which was fought for but I'm not immediately able to say where it was factored in and in which year. But, I would be happy to try and discover it.

**Chairman:**

Can you provide an answer later on after you have done the research?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Most certainly.

**Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee:**

Madam Chairman, the peak production leads me to the particular area that we are interested in now, which is the additional resources. Can I ask Mr MILLER then to turn to the document in the bundle which is SC1-H0027. That is the responses to the production forecast. There are two main answers. One is the increase in terms of staff, 670 additional posts, and the other is the outsourcing.

Can I, first of all, ask in relation to the staff, the 620 additional posts? This is an aggregate figure from 1995, 1996 to 2000 and 2001. Can you

provide a breakdown, a table, showing the increase of staff per year and also the disciplines? This includes professional, technical and site supervisory staff in various disciplines. Can you provide the disciplines and maybe also the ranking, for example, in relation to supervisory staff whether it's a clerk of works or a more senior personnel? Can you provide that?

**Chairman:**

Can you give us a document later on?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I would be happy to. I would also be happy to say that the preparatory work which went into bringing these additional posts into existence began in parallel with the business process review and resulted in a paper to both the Building Committee and the Human Resources Committee in early 1998. As you will be able to see from the detailed figures, there is a progressive build-up, a deliberate build-up of staff within the Department to cope with the additional work. This is calculated on the basis of agreed manning ratios which are documented in the quality management system.

**Chairman:**

Can you give us a short paper on that?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Absolutely.

**Chairman:**

Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee.

**Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee:**

I don't know whether Mr MILLER can also give us the percentage of increase? I don't know whether it is possible to work out the percentage of increase in terms of staff? I suppose your paper is going to explain the rationale as to why you determined that proportionate increase in that class of staff is considered sufficient for the purpose of meeting the peak production forecast?

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I would be happy to provide that in the form that it went to the Building Committee and the Human Resources Committee.

**Chairman:**

Perhaps you just get out the relevant paper and give us a copy, a detailed breakdown of it.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I would be happy to.

**Chairman:**

Please work out the percentage. I think that is also very important, what the number of staff was prior to the increase and what the recommended number of increase is and the rationale for that percentage of increase.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

The rationale is the amount of work coming on stream, the type of work coming on stream, and the agreed manning ratios for dealing with that work.

**Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee:**

Madam Chairman, in conjunction ...

**主席：**

余若薇議員。

**Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee:**

Yes, in conjunction with the additional staff is the outsourcing. Again, on the same paper in paragraph 6 you gave us the figures or rather the Housing Department gave us the figures for an aggregate of three years. From 1995/96 to 1997/98 there is an outsourcing of contract relating to 54,000 flats, then later on for 1998/99 there is an outsourcing of another 35,000 flats, and then for 1999/2000 there is an outsourcing of 27,000 flats.

Again, can you give us a breakdown of these, particularly for these three years which you have included, and also explain the rationale and the sort of factors that you took into account or rather the Housing Department took into account at that time to say as to why there was this ratio between additional posts and outsourcing and why you think that would be sufficient to meet the forecast

and whether, for example, there were any worries or concerns raised as to whether that would be sufficient to meet the peak production?

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER, are you able to provide that paper?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I would be happy to do that in the form of exactly the same documentation. I would make one rider, which is a general consideration which I think ought to be made before you see it, and that is that it would not have been wise to have staffed up the permanent establishment of the Department to deal with a temporary peak. It was how to deal with that particular problem which was uppermost in our minds. How do you drive through a peak and yet not end up with long-term redundancies?

**主席：**

好，陳婉嫻議員。

**陳婉嫻議員：**

主席，我仍想跟進剛才幾位同事提出的問題。政府顯然表示在制訂“量”的過程中，不同的政府部門是按本身的程序行事。我仍想問有關過程的調整事宜。雖然主席指這份文件是由局長提供，但我們仍是參閱這份文件來提問的。我想問，在這個調整過程中，不同的專責小組有何看法？員工有何意見？署方有否聽取他們的意見？我們在翻查95至97年間的討論時，發現在制訂“量”的過程中，有員工表示現有的人手不足。雖然外判可以解決問題，但如何監察和安排外判的工作呢？請署長回答這方面的問題。

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Madam Chairman, the last three years have been an enormous strain on all staff of the Department and it is something we have had to prepare for a couple of years before that. As I have said earlier, the preparation started in 1995. Although staff were provided in the numbers which have been outlined and for which more details will be forthcoming, there has never been a time in the last three years when recruitment has not lagged to some degree behind the number of established posts. Therefore, there has never been a time when staff have not

been very, very busy. There has been a constant representation from staff of all grades and disciplines for more resources and we have responded to them as best we could.

**主席：**

陳婉嫻議員。

**陳婉嫻議員：**

請問署長，事實上，你每次與員工討論，或與人力資源小組委員會、財務小組委員會或建築小組委員會討論時，在調整過程中，有否將員工的因素納入考慮之列呢？

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

The answer must be yes. Madam Chairman.

**陳婉嫻議員：**

我不知道署長曾否向專責委員會提供這方面的文件。在專責委員會成立前，我知悉員工曾致函政府部門，指出人手方面可能十分緊張。請問就這方面的問題，你採取了甚麼措施？例如增加人手、外判等，你可否提供這方面的資料？

**主席：**

我們稍後會討論人手編制的問題。你想現在討論嗎？

**陳婉嫻議員：**

多謝主席，我並非討論人手編制的問題。

**主席：**

不是人手編制的問題。

**陳婉嫻議員：**

我是指建屋量，當提出該等數字時，署長本人亦曾作出相應的處理行動，包括把部分工程外判，並曾作出一些調整等。我只



是想提出一點，在該期間，有人認為計劃是行不通的，這包括了員工的意見。剛才署長表示，當時面對類似的問題，在會議上，他們也曾作出了一些技術上的處理措施。因此，我想知道可否提供有關當時處理過程的一些文件。

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I may be in danger of repeating myself. We have made serious preparations from 1995 onwards in three different particular directions.

**Chairman:**

The question was very specific because you gave a very general answer in that there were representations from the staff members that they were under a heavy workload. That was a very generalised statement. I think the question now is very specific. At the time when your department was aware of the volume of the buildings required and the workload required, there were specifically representations from the staff members that they were very concerned and you mentioned that you addressed those concerns or at least you heeded the concerns that were raised. I think the question specifically is were those concerns in writing and how did you specifically deal with those concerns? 你是否提出這問題呢？陳婉嫻議員。

**陳婉嫻議員：**

是，多謝主席。

**主席：**

這樣會較為具體，剛才署長作出的是比較一般性的回應。

**陳婉嫻議員：**

署長剛才回答時表示，曾因應這情況作出了一些調整。我相信當中一定牽涉在前線工作的員工；面對這工作量的情況，你在解決這方面的問題時，有甚麼相關的文件呢？我曾說過，在此之前我曾看過類似的文件，那是員工致署方的文件，當中指出計劃是行不通的。

**主席：**

我們曾看過甚麼文件或收到甚麼文件，是另一回事。或者這樣問署長，他曾否收到類似的文件，以及他如何處理這些文件？曾否就此進行討論？可否提供這方面的資料？這樣提問會否比較恰當？

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I find it difficult to comment on any "文件", if I haven't seen it.

**Chairman:**

I have actually rephrased the question. Did you receive any letters identifying the areas of concern, expressing concern over the volume of work at any specific juncture, and how did you deal with those expressions of concern? If you are not aware of any, then you tell us.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I wouldn't wish to be put in a position of appearing to contradict my staff. There were constant representations, most of them oral, about the level of work which was in hand and the problems of getting recruits into the system, and we responded to those all the time. More than that, beyond that, before we got into the real peak, there were two exercises which were going in parallel. One was under the Management Enhancement Programme, an outreach exercise to encourage staff to come to us and tell us what we could do to make life easier for them. That was a very serious exercise.

Secondly, there was the follow-up to the business process review in a working group led by the Business Director for Development, in which he reviewed the deployment of staff specifically for the peak, and the product of that deliberation, which involved representatives from professional and technical staff of the Department, was fed into the resource paper which I have just been asked to produce.

That is how it was dealt with. This is not one grade or two grades. This is a very large machine and we were looking at the needs of all grades at all levels and translating them into resource plans for the peak. That is how we were addressing them. It is very specific.

**主席：**

陳婉嫻議員。

**陳婉嫻議員：**

主席，你剛才處理得很好，其實署長無須詳細回答我的問題，他只需把當時的文件交給我們閱覽。另外，在文件上我們相應上可看到他在會議上如何處理，雖然他剛才第一個答覆……

**主席：**

他已解釋了如何處理。

**陳婉嫻議員：**

是，但我希望可以看一看……

**主席：**

署長可否回去翻查一下當時有沒有員工提供書面意見，如果是口頭意見，當然無法提供。但如果有員工以書面或信件表達對龐大建屋量的關注，你可否在下次會議舉行前向委員會提交呢？

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I would be happy to try that.

**主席：**

謝謝。下一位是楊孝華議員。

**Hon Howard YOUNG:**

I would like to pursue further the Annex A to document SC1-H0033 which we were discussing earlier, the same table that Mr LEE Cheuk-yan referred to earlier on. This is a series of six-year forecasts for annual production. I want to raise my question in relation to the problem of bunching and whether that is causal effect. As you look at these columns on the left-hand side, 1995/96, 1996/97, you go down, as you get nearer the date they can be more or less static. That is natural because when you forecast one or two years ahead you are accurate. If you look at the last column when you are forecasting six years ahead, you are talking about 55,000 and then as you go down the column vertically it gets bigger and bigger which I naturally understand that is because of slippage.

There is one thing that puzzles me here. If you look down the column of 1999/2000, the forecast in 1995 started off at 66,000 and you go down all the way to March and June 1997 and it went down to 51,000, 49,000, again more or less probably due to slippage. But, when you reach the forecast for December

1997 and March 1998 it suddenly jumps up by about 10,000. I thought that was rather unusual.

Since the six-year totals are more or less static, I would say, it appears to me that somehow a big bunch of roundabout 10,000 was taken out of the year 2000/2001 and pushed forward into 1999/2000, for whatever reason. Would that really cause a lot of artificial bunching in the other direction, the opposite effect? Because if you are talking about what is produced in the year 1999/2000, that seems to be more or less not too far away from the problem projects we are talking about at the times when the tenders were awarded and constructed and so forth. Therefore, that naturally makes me think what factors caused something to be grabbed and pushed forward and whether that caused a lot of related problems, which may or may not have something to do with the overall problems of the four projects that we are talking about.

**Chairman:**

Specifically, can you ask a question?

**Hon Howard YOUNG:**

I was wondering whether the Director had any explanation which he had in mind which explains the peculiarity in those particular statistics and the sudden jump of 10,000? I was wondering whether anyone knows if any of these were specifically related projects that happened to be including those four that we are talking about and for some reason were just put forward by one year, rather than slipped?

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Madam Chairman, without a lot of research I hesitate but, clearly, in the latter half of 1997, following the setting-up of the HOUSCOM chaired by the FS, there was agreement hammered out with other departments and bureaux to try and fast-track some of the preparatory work. I suspect that is what lies behind the lump. As to whether those represent the individual projects, I can't say definitively.

**Hon Howard YOUNG:**

Perhaps if later on we can be told whether that extra increase injection bringing forward the 10,000 was specifically identified and whether those did include the projects we are talking about might be a point of reference for our future discussions.

**Chairman:**

Can you bear that in mind, Mr MILLER?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Certainly.

**Chairman:**

And at an appropriate juncture if you think you have an answer you can come forth with an answer on that one.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Can I just say here that superficially the answer would be no since the piling contracts were tendered out before the relevant date. So I doubt it in the case of the two piling contracts.

**主席：**

李卓人議員。

**李卓人議員：**

謝謝主席。剛才余若薇議員已詢問有關人手和外判增加的問題，請問署長，可否告知外判的項目是甚麼？例如，房屋署從來不會親自建屋，它只是把建屋的部分外判，當它刻意表示要推行外判新策略時，是否指顧問建築師這部分的工作須要外判呢？請署長清楚說明。第二，外判的百分比大約是多少？最初可能只會把一成工作外判，但最後外判“build up”至九成，你可否清楚告訴我們有關情況，以及外判的比例為何？第三，我想你澄清那670人的身份，他們究竟是合約僱員，還是長俸公務員呢？

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER, can you include those information in the paper to be prepared or can you answer any part of that question?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I can answer some of it straight away. The Building Committee gave approval in large lumps for contracting out specifically of consultant management contracts, that is, the design and supervision of projects. Although the approvals were given in large lumps, the actual flow of work out to the private sector was more evenly spaced.

The second answer, as to the proportion of the 670 which were permanent or HA contract I would have to revert. But some of them were permanent posts because we were deliberately looking forward beyond 2000/2001 at what was going to be an increased overall workload for the Department. The Department was traditionally staffed for about 35,000 units. We knew that moving forward with an average target in the region of 45,000 to 50,000 we would need to beef up the department a bit, so some of the posts were permanent. I will give you the details next time.

**主席：**

好。既然有這些資料，你便不必再詢問了。我們如需要甚麼資料，便請他把有關資料納入文件內。

**李卓人議員：**

主席，我想跟進一點。署長剛才沒有回應有關外判的比率，即百分比的問題。舉例來說，我想知道他們有否訂明外判工作所佔的最高比率，例如，外判最多只可五成或六成；是否有這方面的構想呢？

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

It's about 40%.

**Chairman:**

Is there a conscious decision not to exceed a certain proportion?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Yes. 40 per cent was a strategic decision.

**主席：**

何俊仁議員。

**Hon Albert HO Chun-yan:**

Madam Chairman, I would like to ask whether at the time of the HA making a decision to outsource some of these projects, namely, by engaging consultant architects, by putting in place the consultant architect management

system, at that time whether or not you have already also put in place the organisational change recommended by Coopers & Lybrand, namely, the project management system under the Housing Department and whether or not the job and duty descriptions of the technical staff members are clearly drawn out?

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Thank you, Madam Chair. The Housing Authority has contracted out work to consultant managers, consultant architects in the past and there was already within the Department a staff set-up for both assessing and vetting contracts for consultant architects and for managing them day-to-day on projects. I believe that in one of the written answers already provided we have detailed the changes to that structure which occurred following the business process review. Within the quality management system there were already established procedures for the management of consultants and, subject to periodic updates, they remained roughly the same throughout. So, yes, there was clarity about the management of consultant architects.

**Hon Albert HO Chun-yan:**

Do I understand you correctly to say that the percentage of outsourcing would not be dependent upon the implementation of the recommendations of the organisational change under the business process re-engineering consultancy studies?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

They were quite separate but, as part of the business process review, we did look at how to best manage the outsourced work within the new project management set-up. In simple terms, the basic difference between in-house managed projects and consultant managed projects is that the project manager continues to keep an eye on the outsourced projects once they are under construction, where within the in-house contracts they are largely left to the supervision of the contract managers.

**Hon Albert HO Chun-yan:**

Just a last follow-up. Do you agree that the outsourcing decision would entail a change in the job descriptions necessarily of the architects and engineers responsible for monitoring these outsourced projects, compared with the monitoring of in-house projects?

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

As I say, the practice existed already. Therefore, the pattern was already set. So, the answer to that I think is no. The one change which we did bring in 1998 was to bring in or to create an Internal Audit Unit, specifically initially to audit the work of the consultant architects.

**主席：**

何俊仁議員其實已經帶出了一個問題，即房屋署為了應付建屋量的增加，在95年後開始推動改革。如果委員有興趣跟進這方面的問題，現在可以提出。何鍾泰議員。

**Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:**

Thank you, Madam Chairman. On the question of staff strength to cater for this management change, obviously the Director said that the additional amount of work was outsourced and also he appreciated that it would be necessary to have staff to supervise the consultants who looked after these outsourced projects. If that is the case, you must assume that there has always been a balanced workload, whether or not the work was outsourced or if there was not enough work at the time after you have outsourced certain projects then you would retain certain projects for your own department staff to handle. There must be a kind of balance all the time.

How come later on there were grievances from the staff associations, the technical staff associations, that the workload was three times as much compared with the equivalent disciplines in the works departments of the government under reference SC1-U0001? Even after this letter was actually written by one of the staff associations dated 21 June 2000, after four or five years outsourcing exercise, this very serious situation still existed. Why is that so, Mr MILLER?

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER, are you aware of those documents?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Madam Chairman, I don't have the documents, sorry.



**Chairman:**

If you have never had sight of these documents it would perhaps be a bit unfair.

**Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:**

I would leave it to the Director to have sight of these first and then maybe answer the question later on.

**Chairman:**

Would you like to come back later?

**Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:**

I will come back later.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

May I make one general point? Given the enormous strains on the Department over the last three years, it would be unthinkable for there not to be some representation from staff about heavy workload. It was very heavy and I have every sympathy for them and enormous respect for them.

**Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:**

I have to continue in this case, Madam Chairman, because Mr MILLER said that he would expect grievances from the staff because of such a heavy workload, etc. The grievances from all the staff associations, altogether about 30 of them formed a federation making out a lot of complaints because you were trying to change the staff structure of your department, all these grievances you were very concerned about? If that is the case, obviously you have to consider their grievances. I am sure the one I mentioned just now is one of the serious ones and I'm sure you have already dealt with it. I hope that you can give us your answer later on.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

If I could respond briefly, Madam Chair. The alliance of Housing Authority staff unions to which I believe the honourable member refers was established to provide a negotiating forum for arrangements related to the phased service transfer, i.e., the transfer out to the private sector of management and maintenance functions. It was nothing to do with the construction activity of the Development and Construction Division.

**Chairman:**

We have identified the relevant documents so, Mr MILLER, can you take that issue back and see whether you want to give us a response to Mr HO's question.

**主席：**

李卓人議員。

**李卓人議員：**

我想知道房屋署負責建築工程的同事原本可以處理多少個建屋單位？我看到似乎是35 000個單位……

**主席：**

是35 000個。

**李卓人議員：**

我不知道是否正確，想求證一下。如果是35 000個單位，而有四成是外判的話，即可處理的建屋量最多約只有7萬個單位。請問署長，這樣的計算方法是否正確呢？

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER, is that how you calculate?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I think, Madam Chair, it would be better to provide the document which has already been requested and allow members to look at that.

**主席：**

是否還有委員想提問？黃宜弘議員。

**Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong :**

Thank you, Madam Chairman. I appreciate that you must have taken a lot of measures to try to cope with the increased workload. If you look back today, can you say that you have actually done the right thing? Are there things that could be handled better, having hindsight, in coping with that increased workload?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Hindsight is 20/20, Madam Chairman, and hindsight allows us to see things like total changes in economic circumstance. There is one area, it is very specific, but I'll mention it. There was a period of three months when we began engaging staff on temporary terms or tried to engage on temporary terms for various grades and we found it impossible to get a market response and we reverted immediately to HA contract terms. We had found that the market demand for certain grades was quite high and competing offers within the rest of government were still there. So, for that brief period we had certainly an unhappy experience but we changed it straight away.

May I add one additional point, Madam Chairman? With reference to the particular cases, the cases were fully staffed. There was in general terms a lag between the creation of posts and recruitment. There was in general terms a very, very heavy workload but in these particular cases they were fully staffed.

**主席：**

鄧兆棠議員。

**鄧兆棠議員：**

主席，政府既然有40%的工程是外判，我想當中許多是涉及土地平整、設計、打樁、上蓋及設施等方面的工程。房屋署在責任與權力方面，有否清楚訂明？我知道房屋署有進行內部審核“internal audit”，在進行internal audit時，曾否發現在這些合約中，有一些被外判公司利用的法律漏洞？

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Madam Chair, one small detail. The 40 per cent figure which I gave refers specifically to the consultant architect contracts, not to other types of contract. As regards responsibilities and authority, I think that is very clear. Clearly, ultimately the Authority must be responsible for the quality of its product. The only area where there is I think a significant difference between what we do and what is in the private sector is the area we have already identified, that is, the waiver under the Buildings Ordinance, and the impact that has on our ability to take punitive action against contractors. In all other respects, I don't believe that there are any significant loopholes in law or contract.

**主席：**

鄧兆棠議員。

**鄧兆棠議員：**

我想問過往在進行內部審核時，曾否發現有些情況是署方在合約內所訂明的條件與外判所做的有衝突之處？

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I am not aware of them. I would be happy if the honourable Member could refresh my memory on precisely what he has in mind.\*

**Chairman:**

He is just asking a question. If you are not aware of them, the answer is you are not aware of them.

**主席：**

余若薇議員。

**Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee:**

Thank you, Madam Chairman. Mr MILLER, we have been looking at the question of peak production and you say that the reason for that, in addition to the increased supply of land, was slippage. Slippage of course came about as a result of delay and, in terms of construction, one very important consequence of delay is liquidated damages clause, which is obviously a very serious problem for contractors if they delay and there is an obvious risk that contractors would try to cut corners. It means obviously that site supervision is a very important consideration. Was this particular question of site supervision, slippage, liquidated damages clause, risk of cutting corners, discussed by the Housing Department or the Housing Authority and was this question, therefore, considered in connection with more stringent site supervision?

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

---

\* Director of Housing later advised that he was aware of a sub-standard concrete scandal in the 1980's, although he was not in the Housing Department at the time.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I could take that in several parts, Madam Chair. The manning scales, the quality assurance systems, the patterns of deployment, the responsibilities of individual staff at all levels in relation to project management, were established, reviewed and established and set out in 1992 as part of the general quality management push. There were no significant changes between that time and 1998, when the paper to which I have referred was discussed and, in general terms, those were minor modifications to manning.

The question of liquidated damages is rather a broader one. There is a reference in the reform consultative document to the equitable sharing of risk and I am on public record as saying that I think a fundamental weakness in the procurement system is that the way the contracts are structured is that the risk is not equitably shared. Since these events, contracts and the manner in which procurement is carried out for them in respect of piling contracts has been quite radically changed in order to ensure that the sort of problems to which I think the member alludes have been eradicated.

**主席：**

余若薇議員。

**Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee:**

Madam Chairman, I wasn't really interested in what happened after the problems were discovered. I was really more interested in the period before the problem was discovered. The question is really this, that there was slippage and associated with that is the question of liquidated damages clause and associated with that is the question that people may try to cut corners. My question, therefore, is was this problem foreseen by the Housing Authority or the Housing Department and was this question of more stringent site supervision looked into? I'm not asking about general quality assurances or enhancement programmes. I am asking a specific question as to whether site supervision or more stringent site supervision was an issue particularly looked into in connection with the slippage problem?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Madam Chairman, a very large part of the slippage has nothing to do with work on the ground. It is the preparatory period. But the answer to the second half of the question, no, site supervision was not specifically dealt with. The systems and the manning levels which were already there remained in place, except to the extent that following the business process review the Business Director/Development worked with staff, both professional and technical, in

looking at how best to deal with the surge in production. That, as I say, has translated into the strategic staffing paper which was presented in 1998 which I have already agreed to furnish members.

***Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee:***

May I ask one clarification, Madam Chairman?

***Chairman:***

Yes.

***Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee:***

I wanted to ask one clarification in relation to this site supervision point. The Honourable Raymond HO has already referred you to the document SC1-U0001 and included in that bunch of documents is a letter dated 26 April 1996 from the Hong Kong Housing Department Structural Engineers Association, addressed to Mrs Fanny LAW, who was then the Deputy Director. Included in that letter was a proposal and one of the proposals was the establishment of the resident engineer system, which you referred to earlier in your answers to the Honourable Raymond HO. You said in your answer to him that in fact there were 21 resident staff already. That gave me the impression that meant that prior to this proposal there were 21 resident staff and I'm not quite sure whether you were referring to resident engineers?

***Chairman:***

He was referring to resident engineers.

***Hon Audrey EU Yuet-mee:***

Does that mean that these 21 resident engineers were in existence prior to the proposal in 1996 and there wasn't any increase in the number of resident engineers as a result of this proposal in the letter of 1996? Or whether you are saying that the 21 staff resident engineers were increased after you received this proposal? I just wanted to clarify that?

***Chairman:***

Mr MILLER.

***Mr J A MILLER:***

As I explained in my earlier answer, I have only recently been made aware of this particular letter. But, having checked back through the records, I understand that project resident engineers were introduced in 1986 and they were

increased gradually to a level of 21, as far as I can trace the record. Posts were created for that purpose, particularly to deal with remote sites. Staff at around that time were concerned about travelling times and so on to remote sites and, in response to that, the then Administration had created these additional posts. But, other than those created up to 1995, no.

**主席：**

劉炳章議員。

**劉炳章議員：**

主席，在工程顧問外判的制度方面，由95至96年開始，房屋署以建築師為主導的方式外判顧問服務。過往數年，業界亦針對這制度向署方提出相當多的意見，其中一個最大的意見是由一間牽頭的顧問公司承包所有其他界別所提供的專業顧問服務，包括土力、機電、結構等，都由牽頭的顧問公司承包。過往曾有分包顧問公司投訴，被牽頭的顧問公司“食價”、拒絕付款，又或是在寫報告時以其他手段對其作出不利的安排等。我想請問苗學禮先生，在署方或建築小組委員會內，曾否討論這方面的問題？若有，則曾否提出改善的措施，我不是說現在的改善措施，而是當時即由95至96年開始……

**主席：**

即在4宗事件發生之前的一段時間。

**劉炳章議員：**

對。

**主席：**

苗學禮先生是否知道建築師方面有這些投訴？曾否討論過？

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I don't remember any specific or deliberate discussions of the point. I am more familiar with the complaint and, in particular, along with the previous chairperson of the Authority, I am very familiar with the fact that most of the complaints began after the events. There was a sort of odd period when we began consulting seriously with the industry on what might have gone wrong, when first of all there was a sort of embarrassed silence, and then gradually people

warmed up a bit and we began to get a lot of really quite constructive suggestions along with the complaints. But most of this, I am afraid, came after the event. I'm not sure why.

**Chairman:**

After the occurrence of the four incidents?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Yes. There seemed to be initially a reluctance to complain. I suspect that has more to do with the size of the client and a reluctance to criticise a very large client but, ultimately, people did warm up and they did begin to put forward very constructive suggestions which have been incorporated in the reform documents.

**劉炳章議員：**

主席，我大致上理解苗學禮先生的意思，在該4宗事件發生之前，署方沒有察覺到問題，反而在4該宗事件發生後，問題由“warm up”變成“heat up”，漸漸浮現出來。那麼，大致上的意思是當時可能……

**主席：**

我想苗學禮先生的意思是，這些事件發生後，經討論後帶出了這個問題，發現了有這方面的投訴。但在該4宗事件發生前，苗學禮先生並沒有察覺到這方面的投訴。苗學禮先生，你的答覆是否這樣？

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Yes.

**劉炳章議員：**

如果在該4宗事件發生前，你沒有察覺到這方面的投訴，而問題是存在的，這是否表示制度本身有問題呢？

**主席：**

我想這個問題可以稍後跟進。

**劉炳章議員：**

是，可以讓苗學禮先生稍後跟進。



**主席：**

何鍾泰議員。

***Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:***

Thank you, Madam Chairman. First of all, when Mr MILLER is ready to answer my last question, I would just like to suggest to him that if he could tell us whether or not when this open letter was put forward by the staff association whether or not the Human Resources Committee had a discussion on that open letter? Because that was actually released to the public. I hope Mr MILLER could answer that. Madam Chairman, can I ask a question which is a follow-up to the Honourable P.C. LAU's question?

**主席：**

讓他先回答這問題吧。

***Mr J A MILLER:***

I think, Madam Chairman, You gave me the liberty to take this away and discuss it? I do undertake...

***Chairman:***

We will leave that question also with you.

***Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:***

Referring to the Honourable PC LAU's question, I would like to add that long before the relevant piling site problems coming into sight, there were representations of the engineering professions to the Housing Department of the problem that the Honourable P.C. LAU mentioned. For instance, when the architectural firm was appointed, was given a project of the Housing Department, he would invite his own tenders asking various engineering firms or even firms of other disciplines to put forward tenders and he would select maybe the one which came up with the lowest price. Actually I personally accompanied some of the representations to your Mr YUEN. Could you go back and check...

***Chairman:***

Please leave your own experience with yourself. Please ask Mr MILLER a question.

***Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:***

I would like to ask Mr MILLER would he be able to go back and check whether or not such representations were discussed internally after they were made to their senior staff, whether we could have the record in, for instance, in 1998, 1999? Is it possible?

***Chairman:***

Before the occurrence of these four incidents?

***Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:***

Before the occurrence of the incidents.

***Chairman:***

I think the question again would be whether Mr MILLER is aware of representations or complaints being made by the engineers and, if Mr MILLER is aware or his department is aware, what steps have been taken to address those concerns or those complaints?

***Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:***

Yes.

***Chairman:***

Mr MILLER.

***Mr J A MILLER:***

I would be happy to try and research that. I am more familiar with representations by the building services contractors and engineers in relation to nominated subcontractors in superstructures, in fact where the representations were made directly to me.

***Chairman:***

Shall we put it this way? In the light of so many professionals, the architects and the engineers, all having expressed that they have made certain complaints in the past, can you go back and check whether any complaints have been received from professionals or the various disciplines of the professionals prior to the four incidents? Can you do a thorough research?

***Mr J A MILLER:***

Periodic representations have been made, Madam Chair, but, as I say, I'm not specifically aware of the one which the Honourable P.C. LAU raised. I am happy to research it.

**Chairman:**

I think you are aware of the type of complaints that we are talking about. In line with the complaints from the architects and the engineers, are there any other similar complaints from other professionals? If so, can we also have details of those complaints and how you dealt with those complaints?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I would be happy to provide that.

**Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:**

In fact we could refer to the period between the time when you started to outsource a substantial number of projects of the Housing Department and also the time when these housing site problems started.

**Chairman:**

So, between 95/96 and the coming to light of the four incidents?

**Ir Dr Hon Raymond HO Chung-tai:**

Yes.

**主席：**

陳婉嫻議員。

**陳婉嫻議員：**

主席，我再翻閱房屋署給我們的文件，我嘗試把問題問得清楚一點，希望署長可以回答。房屋署給我們的SC1-H0027號文件說：“建屋高峰期及多個工作高峰，這些在策劃、設計、招標、建築以至最後檢驗工作上的高峰在不同時間出現，我們因此要在數年間不斷增添資源，以應付增加的工作量”。接着文件又提及人力資源小組委員會增設超過670個各類專業等職位。正如李卓人議員剛才所提出的問題，我希望署長可以清楚告訴我們，在每段時期增設職位的分項數字。

**主席：**

委員已問過這個問題，署長會擬備一份文件。

**陳婉嫻議員：**

主席，接着我想研究一下第5段。署長說，曾為房屋署職員舉行多次工作坊，我覺得有點奇怪，剛才多位同事和我都提出一個問題，就是署長似乎並沒有感覺到職員在這方面有不同的意見，但結果卻是，我們似乎聽到有不同的意見。當然，我們要對署長公平一點，他在96年才上任，對95至97年間的情況可能並不清楚。我希望透過署長，把多次工作坊的內容送交我們審閱。我不希望出現一種情況，就是在這4宗事件發生後，署長才聽到一些意見，在此之前他卻似乎並沒有聽過。但很明顯的是，文件的第5段提到你曾舉行多次工作坊，而這顯然是針對工作量大增後，你考慮到員工的看法而舉行的。我希望你能將有關這些會議的文件送交我們參閱。而且我想提出一點，這些會議是在不同年份召開的，在這期間內署長因要調整工作量而要與員工商議，所以，我希望能取得這些文件。

**Chairman:**

Mr MILLER.

**Mr J A MILLER:**

The answer is yes.

**Chairman:**

You have done research in this area?

**Mr J A MILLER:**

I have to say these were informal workshops but they were specifically related to the recommendations arising from the Coopers & Lybrand business process review in which recommendations were being made for a fundamental change in the structure of the Construction and Development Branch, in particular, the move from what was called a discipline-based approach to a project management approach. There were considerable internal professional sensitivities about what was involved and they required talking through. These workshops did take place and, as I said in reply to an earlier question, it was interesting the degree to which the engineers were keen at the new opportunities presented by this.

The new structure was agreed on I think in April the following year in 1997 and then introduced in November 1997. I am happy to try and dig up the material. We may find it a bit sketchy because they were fairly informal occasions.

**主席：**

如有任何這方面的資料，請提交我們，好嗎？

**陳婉嫻議員：**

主席，我仍有問題。還有一份文件我想清楚了解當中內容。現時署長面對調整龐大建屋量的問題，他是透過不同的會議或不同的專責小組，如建築小組委員會及策劃小組委員會來control每個進展情況，並在檢討後再進行調整。我想請問，在這數年所作的調整中，各小組如何運作？我曾嘗試從兩個小組，即建築小組委員會及策劃小組委員會的工作性質來研究，並發現有些地方是重疊的。我有些擔心，當策劃小組委員會及建築小組委員會對“量”有不同的評估時——我不知道曾否出現這情況——你們會如何衡量？

主席，因為這涉及兩個小組委員會的不同職責，兩者雖有不同職責，卻有重疊的地方，而當中還有一點很重要，就是在調整“量”的時候，是透過房屋委員會屬下一些小組委員會來調整和監察的，而我注意到，這方面的工作是由策劃小組委員會和建築小組委員會負責的。我想請問，當這兩個小組委員會作出不同的評估時，署長會如何處理呢？

**主席：**

Mr MILLER，是由哪個小組委員會負責？是否只應由一個小組委員會負責？

**Mr J A MILLER:**

The Building Committee is specifically responsible for review of design, construction scheme design and so on, plus the tender board function of the Department. The Strategic Planning Committee embraces all of the chairmen of all of the subcommittees of the Authority and provides, if you like, a cabinet function. As part of that, it reviews the manner in which the various targets which are set for the Authority are being met and these involve more than just construction targets.

The one area in respect of land supply and construction where they have a very specific role, however, is that following the allocation of a site to the Authority by the central government. Following the initial viability study by the planning staff of the Department, we put the site to the Strategic Planning Committee for a decision as to whether or not that site should be accepted into

the programme. If, on the basis of the examination by planning staff, we feel that the site is not a viable site, then we feel it appropriate to advise the Authority not to accept it. That is the one area where we have a specific control by the Strategic Planning Committee, the acceptance of a site into the programme. Once it is accepted, once the basic outline of development for that site is agreed by the Strategic Planning Committee, it goes into the programme and the rest of the work is carried out essentially by the Building Committee.

**主席：**

陳婉嫻議員。

**陳婉嫻議員：**

主席，署長剛才提及地盤是否處於備妥可以建屋的階段，這點我是明白的。但我的問題是，當你面對如此龐大的建屋量，人力資源要配合，但又要在建屋量方面作出調整，即原本要興建5萬個單位，但卻無法達到時，對於如何作出調整，兩個不同的組織會否有不同的看法？我所說的是這個問題，而不是考慮地盤的問題，不是考慮政府所提供的地盤。我想說的是，當我們看到——根據SC1-H0033號文件，原本預計要興建5萬個單位，但事後發現無法落實，兩個小組委員會在進行監察時有否出現不同的看法？如何處理這些不同的看法呢？

**主席：**

苗學禮先生。

**Mr J A MILLER:**

No, Madam Chairman. Essentially, there was no difference in opinion between the two committees but the formal discussion of whether or not the targets were realistic in, for example, November in 1996 took place in the Strategic Planning Committee.

**主席：**

陳婉嫻議員。

**陳婉嫻議員：**

主席，我繼續跟進。我想問，如果這兩個小組委員會看到這個情況，他們有沒有渠道可與員工溝通？換言之，如果員工發現這是無法落實時，他們有沒有溝通的渠道呢？你身為署長，在這方面有沒有設法令他們有溝通的渠道呢？

**主席：**

Mr MILLER，如果他們想聽取意見，是否有渠道呢？以及過往有否發生這種情況？

**Mr J A MILLER:**

There haven't been, to my knowledge, any formal meetings of staff or staff associations with the formal committees of the Authority. There have been meetings by myself and the chairperson with representatives of staff.

**主席：**

陳婉嫻議員。

**陳婉嫻議員：**

主席，從我的角度，我仍覺得這問題很重要。雖然署長剛才說，在發生該4宗事件之前，他不感覺到有问题，但是，他亦提及曾召開工作坊。我所擔心的是，儘管員工在工作坊上已表達意見，然而，這些會議的主席能否準確地把這些意見向專責委員會(例如建築小組委員會)轉達呢？或許我是想解開這個疑團，即工作坊的主席能否反映意見？還是工作坊的主席只是聽而不接納員工意見？有否這些情況呢？會議紀錄中有否記載這些爭論呢？如何解決這些問題呢？署長又如何面對這些問題？這些都是我假設的，不知道是否存在，可能並不存在；或許員工和主席討論後，彼此瞭解情況，這樣便沒有問題了。我想問，有沒有出現一種情況，就是儘管大家曾有溝通，但到最後拍板時，主席覺得問題並不存在而不加以研究呢？

**主席：**

苗學禮先生。

**Mr J A MILLER:**

Again, I am not aware of representations of that form at that time. The committee of the Department within which the preparations in terms of manning and related supervision for the projects was discussed in detail was a working group chaired by the Business Director/Development, which continued following the business process review all the way through to the papers I have referred to already which were passed to the Building Committee and the Human Resources Committee in 1998.

**主席：**

我認為陳議員如再有問題，可待我們收到工作坊的會議紀錄後，才在日後具體地提出。

**陳婉嫻議員：**

好的。

**主席：**

何鍾泰議員，你已舉手輪候提問，但是，因為時間已是下午5時35分，請問你的問題是長還是短？抑或留待下次會議提問？

**何鍾泰議員：**

我想留待下次會議才提問，因為問題頗長。

**主席：**

好吧，這樣便留待下次會議提出。下次的公開研訊定於4月28日上午9時正開始。多謝苗學禮先生出席，現在正式邀請你在4月28日(星期六)上午9時再次出席公開研訊。

今天舉行的公開研訊暫時到此為止，接着還有內部商議，請委員到會議室C繼續進行討論。

**(研訊於下午5時37分結束)**