

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)1227/07-08
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/PL/HA

Panel on Home Affairs

**Minutes of special meeting
held on Monday, 26 November 2007, at 9:30 am
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building**

- Members present** : Hon CHOY So-yuk, JP (Chairman)
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, SBS, JP
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon LI Kwok-ying, MH, JP
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, BBS
Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP
Hon TAM Heung-man
- Members absent** : Hon Albert HO Chun-yan (Deputy Chairman)
Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong, GBS
Hon WONG Yung-kan, SBS, JP
Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP
Hon Andrew CHENG Kar-foo
Hon Daniel LAM Wai-keung, SBS, JP
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, SBS, JP
- Public Offices attending** : Home Affairs Bureau
Mr TSANG Tak-sing
Secretary for Home Affairs

Mrs Agnes Allcock
Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs (2)

Miss Janet WONG
Principal Assistant Secretary (Recreation & Sport)

Mr PANG Chung
Hon Secretary General
Sports Federation & Olympic Committee of Hong Kong,
China

Clerk in attendance : Miss Flora TAI
Chief Council Secretary (2)2

Staff in attendance : Ms Joanne MAK
Senior Council Secretary (2)2

Ms Anna CHEUNG
Legislative Assistant (2)2

Action

- I. Further discussion on support for the Sports Federation & Olympic Committee of Hong Kong, China to bid for the hosting right of the 2011 International Olympic Committee Session**
[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)245/07-08(02), CB(2)422/07-08(01), CB(2)439/07-08 and CB(2)587/07-08(01)]

Briefing by Secretary for Home Affairs (SHA)

SHA briefed the Panel on the arrangements for the Sports Federation & Olympic Committee of Hong Kong, China (SF&OC) to bid for the hosting right of the 2011 International Olympic Committee (IOC) Session and the position of the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) regarding the proposed bid. His speaking note was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(2) 439/07-08 on 27 November 2007.

2. Hon Secretary General (Hon SG) of SF&OC supplemented with the following points -
- (a) it was very likely that the host city of the 2018 Olympic Winter Games would be elected and announced at the 2011 IOC Session. As many cities would bid for the hosting right of the 2018 Olympic Winter Games, the 2011 IOC Session could attract wide international media coverage; and

Action

- (b) as the National Olympic Committee (NOC) and the respective city to host the 2011 IOC Session would be elected and announced at the 2008 Beijing IOC Session, this would be an advantage to Hong Kong in bidding for the hosting right of the 2011 IOC Session.

Discussion

3. Mr Albert CHAN queried why SF&OC could not fund the hosting of the event and Hong Kong people had to foot the bill. He considered that SF&OC should explore all possible sources of funding, instead of relying on the Government. Mr Tommy CHEUNG said that the Liberal Party supported the proposed bid. He, however, sought clarification whether SF&OC would contribute financially to the hosting of the 2011 IOC Session. The Chairman asked whether SF&OC could meet the shortfall if the total cost exceeded the budget of \$200 million as estimated in paragraph 8 of the supplementary paper provided by the Administration at members' request made at the Panel meeting held on 9 November 2007 [LC Paper No. CB(2)422/07-08(01)].

4. In response to members' enquiries about the funding arrangements, SHA explained that SF&OC had confirmed that, due to its limited resources, it was unable to contribute financially to the hosting of the 2011 IOC Session. Mr Timothy FOK, as President of SF&OC, advised members that SF&OC was recognised by IOC as the NOC of Hong Kong. IOC entrusted the hosting right of the IOC Sessions only to its affiliated NOCs, but required that the governments of the respective NOCs should provide support to the hosting of the IOC Sessions. Hon SG of SF&OC supplemented that SF&OC itself was supported financially by the Government. If SF&OC was requested to make any financial contribution to the hosting of the 2011 IOC Session, the money would come from the Government anyway.

5. Mr Timothy FOK invited members to note that, based on the available information, the hosting of the 2005 IOC Session had benefited the economy in Singapore a lot, particularly the tourist and certain business industries. He appealed to members for their support for the proposed bid. He added that he gathered that the Singapore NOC was going to bid again for the right for Singapore to host the 2011 IOC Session.

6. Professor Patrick LAU asked whether commercial sponsorship could be accepted by a NOC in hosting an IOC Session. SHA said that, if the estimated cost exceeded the budget, consideration would be given to meeting the shortfall by fund raising or private donation.

7. Noting that the expenditure budget for the organisation of MC6 was \$256 million whereas the estimated budget for the organisation of the 2011 IOC Session was not more than \$200 million, Ms Emily LAU asked why there was a difference in expenditure.

Action

8. Principal Assistant Secretary (Recreation & Sport) (PAS(R&S)) responded that SF&OC had advised that, while the scale and format of an IOC Session would resemble the ministerial conferences of WTO, as IOC and participants of the IOC Sessions would take up the costs of some expenditure items, it was estimated that the expenditure for hosting the 2011 IOC Session would be less than the budget for organising MC6.

9. Ms Emily LAU noted from paragraph 6 of the Administration's supplementary paper that the financial obligations to be borne by IOC and participants of the IOC Sessions, as advised by SF&OC, would "broadly" include the items set out therein. Ms LAU said that, while she supported the hosting of international conferences in Hong Kong, SF&OC should provide more definite information as to whether the Administration would end up paying for all the expenditure items. She expressed doubt whether Hong Kong would gain any concrete benefits, if there would not be any financial contributions made by IOC and participants of the 2011 IOC Session.

10. Ms Emily LAU further said that the Administration should also provide information on the tangible and intangible benefits generated to Hong Kong from hosting the Sixth Ministerial Conference of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and International Telecommunication Union (ITU) TELECOM WORLD 2006 for members' reference in order to facilitate their consideration. Mr James TIEN also considered that information on the costs and benefits to the host cities of previous IOC Sessions would be of useful reference to members. At the request of the Chairman, SHA undertook to provide the requisite information as far as possible for members' reference.

Admin

Admin

(Post-meeting note: the supplementary information provided by the Administration on the tangible and intangible benefits generated to Hong Kong from hosting the Sixth Ministerial Conference of WTO and ITU TELECOM WORLD 2006 was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(2)587/07-08.)

11. Ms Emily LAU asked whether SF&OC or the Administration would be responsible for administering the use of the funds allocated, if the SF&OC's bid for the hosting of the 2011 IOC Session was successful. SHA responded that the Administration would be responsible for the use of the funds, which would be subject to the well-established financial monitoring mechanisms to ensure the cost-effectiveness and accountability in the use of the public funding.

12. Ms Emily LAU further asked when the Administration would consult the Panel on the financial proposal of the estimated financial implications to support SF&OC in hosting the event and the timing of seeking funding approval from the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council (FC).

13. The Chairman invited members to note the key steps with the bidding

Action

process as set out in paragraph 12 of the Administration's supplementary paper. PAS(R&S) highlighted that, if SF&OC was pre-selected by IOC in mid/late December 2007, the Administration would seek FC's approval in principle of the estimated financial implications to support SF&OC in hosting the event before the end of February 2008. If the SF&OC's bid was successful which would be known in August 2008, the Administration would consult the Panel again and submit a more detailed budget to FC for approval.

Admin

14. Referring to paragraph 6 of the Administration's supplementary paper, Mr James TIEN asked about the expenditure items to be borne by the Government, if IOC and participants of the 2011 IOC Session were to bear the costs of the six items set out therein. He requested that, when the Administration submitted its funding proposal to seek FC's in-principle approval in early 2008, it should provide a detailed breakdown on the various expenditure items of the proposed budget. SHA agreed to provide the requisite information as far as possible.

15. Mr Albert CHAN also requested the Administration to provide information on the expenditure items borne by the governments of the respective host NOCs of the past IOC Sessions, and the costs involved. He said that the information should be provided before the funding proposal was submitted to FC for its in-principle approval.

Admin

16. Hon SG of SF&OC said that, in response to members' enquiry at the Panel meeting held on 9 November 2007, SF&OC had written to the Korean Olympic Committee (host NOC of the 1999 IOC Session) and the Singapore NOC (host NOC of the 2005 IOC Session) on 10 November 2007, and to the NOC of Guatemala (host NOC of the 2007 IOC Session) on 16 November 2007 for information regarding the hosting of the IOC Sessions, specifically the financial planning and expenditure pattern in organising an IOC Session. He informed members that, as at 22 November 2007, only the Singapore NOC had replied to SF&OC that it would need some time to provide the information. He undertook to provide the information requested by Mr CHAN when available.

17. Referring to paragraph 9 of the Administration's supplementary paper, Mr LI Kwok-ying asked whether the estimated budget had taken into account the manpower resources, especially on the part of HAB, required for hosting the event. He pointed out that, according to the experience of the Singapore, hosting IOC Sessions would be manpower-intensive. SHA said that a lot of manpower resources would be needed for hosting the 2011 IOC Session and the estimated manpower cost had been taken into account in working out the current proposal. He added that the Administration would work out the detailed manpower requirement at a later stage.

18. In response to Mr WONG Ting-kwong's question about the views of Chinese Olympic Committee (COC) on hosting the 2011 IOC Session in Hong

Action

Kong, SHA said that COC was supportive of the idea and it considered that it should be up to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region Government to decide on it. Mr WONG said that the Democratic Alliance for the Progress and Betterment of Hong Kong supported the proposed bid for hosting of the 2011 IOC Session as it would raise Hong Kong's international profile and promote the community's general interest in sports.

19. Mr WONG Ting-kwong further asked whether other NOCs were going to bid for the right to host the 2011 IOC Session. Hon SG of SF&OC said that this would be known on 29 November 2007 but he noted that some Asian NOCs including Singapore NOC had expressed interest. He added that the NOC and the respective city to host the 2011 IOC Session would be elected and announced at the 2008 Beijing IOC Session on 8 August 2008.

20. Miss TAM Heung-man asked whether the current proposal would include the implementation of measures to promote the community's interest in sports. SHA responded that, to tie in with the Beijing 2008 Olympic and Paralympic Games, and the 2008 Olympic and Paralympic Equestrian Events to be staged in Hong Kong, the Administration would mobilise support from relevant government bureaux and departments, as well as non-governmental organisations and community groups in relevant sectors to publicise and promote Olympism and Olympic knowledge.

21. Professor Patrick LAU expressed support for the proposed bid and urged the Administration to render full support in the lobbying work. He suggested that the Administration should demonstrate to IOC the competitive edge of Hong Kong in terms of convention and tourist facilities and its other attractive characteristics. Miss TAM Heung-man expressed a similar view. SHA responded that, if the Panel supported the proposed bid, SF&OC would surely make its best endeavour in lobbying for the bid.

22. Mr Albert CHAN said that, while he supported the hosting of international conferences in Hong Kong, the Administration should not be interested in organising high-profile international events only. He considered that the Administration should also consider organising international conferences on human rights and poverty issues in Hong Kong.

23. Summing up the views expressed by members at the meeting, the Chairman concluded that the Panel supported in principle SF&OC to express to IOC its interest in hosting the 2011 IOC Session. She requested that the Administration should provide the supplementary information requested by members before submitting the proposal to seek the FC's in-principle support.

24. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 10:33 am.

Admin