

立法會

Legislative Council

LC Paper No. CB(2)1427/10-11
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/PL/HA

Panel on Home Affairs

Minutes of meeting
held on Friday, 10 December 2010, at 8:30 am
in the Chamber of the Legislative Council Building

- Members present** : Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP (Chairman)
Hon KAM Nai-wai, MH (Deputy Chairman)
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHEUNG Man-kwong
Hon Mrs Sophie LEUNG LAU Yau-fun, GBS, JP
Dr Hon Philip WONG Yu-hong, GBS
Hon WONG Yung-kan, SBS, JP
Hon Miriam LAU Kin-yee, GBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH
Hon CHEUNG Hok-ming, GBS, JP
Prof Hon Patrick LAU Sau-shing, SBS, JP
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai, BBS, JP
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che
Hon Tanya CHAN
- Members attending** : Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun
Hon CHAN Kin-por, JP
- Members absent** : Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon Timothy FOK Tsun-ting, GBS, JP
Hon CHAN Hak-kan
Hon WONG Sing-chi
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun
Hon WONG Yuk-man

Public Officers : Agenda item IV
attending

Home Affairs Bureau

Mr TSANG Tak-sing, JP
Secretary for Home Affairs

Home Affairs Department

Mrs Pamela TAN KAM Mi-wah, JP
Director of Home Affairs

Mr David LEUNG Chun-wing, JP
Deputy Director of Home Affairs (2)

Agenda item V

Home Affairs Bureau

Mr TSANG Tak-sing, JP
Secretary for Home Affairs

Mrs Avia LAI WONG Shuk-han
Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs
(Culture)²

Hong Kong Maritime Museum

Mr Anthony Hardy
Chairman of Board of Director

Dr Stephen Davies
Museum Director

Mr Richard Wesley
Museum Director Designate

Ms Catalina CHOR
Executive Manager and Curator

Agenda item VI

Home Affairs Bureau

Mr TSANG Tak-sing, JP
Secretary for Home Affairs

Mr Jack CHAN Jick-chi
Deputy Head, Asian Games Bid Team
Home Affairs Bureau

Mr Jonathan McKinley, JP
Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs (2)

Clerk in attendance : Mr Thomas WONG
Chief Council Secretary (2)2

Staff in attendance : Ms Yvonne OA-YANG
Council Secretary (2)2

Miss Monique TSEUNG
Legislative Assistant (2)2 (Acting)

Action

I. Confirmation of minutes
[LC Paper No. CB(2)455/10-11]

The minutes of the special meeting held on 20 October 2010 were confirmed.

II. Information paper(s) issued since the last meeting

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

LC Paper No. CB(2)252/10-11(01) -- Paper entitled "Alternative Option of Venue Planning for 2023 Asian Games Bid" provided by the Administration

Action

LC Paper No. CB(2)382/10-11(01) -- Administration's written response on the proposed creation of one permanent Chief Systems Manager (D1) post in the Leisure and Cultural Service Department

LC Paper No. CB(2)442/10-11(01) -- Report on the duty visit to study the development of cultural software and preservation of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Japan and the Republic of Korea

III. Items for discussion at the next meeting

[Appendixes I and II to LC Paper Nos. CB(2)465/10-11]

3. Members noted that the following items would be discussed at the next regular meeting on 14 January 2011:

- (a) Community Care Fund;
- (b) Implementation of the outstanding leisure and cultural services projects ("LCS projects") of the former Municipal Councils ("ex-MCs"); and
- (c) Monitoring of private recreational leases.

4. Noting that a subcommittee had been formed under the Panel to follow up the matter on item (b) but was dissolved in December 2007, Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming asked whether a similar subcommittee should be set up, as he noted that some LCS projects committed by ex-MCs had been shelved. The Chairman advised that the matter might be discussed at the next regular meeting.

5. Miss Tanya CHAN asked whether representatives of the Lands Department would join the discussion on item (c). The Chairman advised that her enquiry would be conveyed to the Administration.

Clerk

(Post-meeting note: At the Administration's request and with the Chairman's concurrence, the discussions on items (b) and (c) above were deferred to the regular meetings in February 2011 and March

Action

2011 respectively, while an item on "Measures to enhance the support to and prospects of elite athletes" was added to the regular meeting in January 2011.)

IV. Matters relating to property management

[LC Paper No. CB(2)465/10-11(01) - (04)]

(a) Regulation of property management companies and manpower support for District Offices to promote building management

6. At the Chairman's invitation, Secretary for Home Affairs ("SHA") briefed members on the Administration's proposal to establish a statutory licensing regime for the property management industry to monitor the operation of property management companies ("PMCs") and the manpower support for Home Affairs Department ("HAD") to implement initiatives for building management [CB(2)465/10-11(01)]. He hoped that the Administration could make a decision on the regulatory framework within the first half of 2011.

Licensing regime

7. Mr WONG Kwok-hing was of the view that the interests of small property owners would not be protected in the absence of a licensing regime for the property management industry. He suggested that not only PMCs but also their property managers and staff of an equivalent grade should be licensed, as they usually represented PMCs and were given powers to manage buildings. On whether PMCs' project officers should also be licensed, he suggested that the Administration should consult owners' corporations ("OCs") and PMCs. SHA responded that the Administration was considering the need to license not only PMCs but also their staff at the managerial level. He considered Mr WONG's suggestions reasonable.

8. Mr WONG Yung-kan said that the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong supported the regulation of PMCs, as the quality of their service varied currently. He urged the Administration to set clear and specific requirements for professional qualifications for practitioners of property management. He expressed particular concern about the quality of service of small PMCs which managed small or stand-alone buildings. SHA responded that such PMCs would need to meet the minimum regulatory requirements to ensure the quality of their services. The Administration would publicize such

Action

requirements and provide training courses for OCs to enhance their awareness in property management.

9. Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming said that he supported the adoption of a multi-tier licensing regime for PMCs. Given that property management problems were multi-faceted and intricate, he asked whether the Administration had evaluated the extent to which the consultation would address the existing problems of the industry and strengthen the arguments for a statutory regulation. He also enquired about the criteria for deciding which tier a PMC might belong to, such as whether a PMC would be classified in accordance with its size, capital or staff's professional qualification.

10. SHA responded that the Administration's current thinking was that under a multi-tier licensing regime, practitioners meeting basic requirements would be eligible for a lower-tier licence, while a upper-tier licence would be granted to those who could meet higher requirements. On Mr CHEUNG Hok-ming's enquiry on whether a penalty (such as downgrading or revoking the licence) would be imposed on PMCs which failed to meet the required standards, SHA responded that the licensing authority would have the obligation to do so.

11. Ms Cyd HO opined that different types of buildings had different requirements for property management services, and it would be impossible for small PMCs to have a full complement of staff equipped with the expertise and experience in every aspect of such services. She considered that the proposed licensing regime should provide flexibility to accommodate small PMCs. She enquired whether, apart from officers of manager-grade or above, technical personnel of PMCs would also be required to meet certain qualification requirements.

12. In response, SHA said that the proposed licensing regime would require PMCs' key personnel, such as staff of manager-grade or above, to meet the requirements for professional qualifications and experience. He added that PMCs' technical personnel, such as registered contractors and engineers for the maintenance of lifts and escalators, were already subject to statutory regulation. DDHA(2) said that PMCs played a coordinating role in building management, including hiring security staff, cleaners and technicians, and would be required to ensure compliance with the regulatory standards. He added that the Administration would consider prescribing licensing requirements by way of subsidiary legislation to supplement the regulatory framework under the primary legislation.

Action

Regulation of OCs without PMCs

13. Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che expressed concern that the proposed licensing regime would drive out small and medium sized PMCs and force property owners to engage large PMCs which charged high management fees. He suggested that as some OCs managed their buildings without engaging PMCs, the Administration should advise such OCs how they could fulfill their statutory obligations on the one hand and comply with requirements which were only advisory in nature on the other.

14. DDHA(2) responded that a multi-tier licensing regime for different types of PMCs might help avoid market monopoly and the Administration would carefully study the issue by deliberating the public views. He said that with reference to the seven-level Qualification Framework under the purview of the Education Bureau, the Administration would consider what constituted the basic competence requirements for property management and gauge the public expectations of OCs which did not engage PMCs.

15. Noting that some OCs managed their buildings without engaging PMCs, the Chairman sought clarification on whether the proposed licensing regime would result in a requirement for such OCs to engage PMCs. He opined that subject to their capability, such OCs should continue to be allowed to manage their buildings, as this would facilitate mutual help among neighbours. Sharing the Chairman's concern, the Deputy Chairman was worried that if such OCs would be mandatorily required to engage PMCs, the management of their buildings might be affected and extra management expenses incurred.

16. SHA responded that the Administration had no intention of imposing mandatory requirement for OCs to engage PMCs, but was concerned about old tenement buildings which did not engage PMCs and did not have OCs or any form of resident organizations. The lack of management of these buildings had not only brought about hygiene problems but also posed hazards to the residents and public. The Administration would assist these buildings through other means. He pointed out that the proposed licensing regime should keep the property management market vibrant and enhance the quality of services.

Survival of small and medium sized PMCs

17. The Deputy Chairman expressed support in principle for a licensing regime for PMCs but was worried that it might drive out small

Action

and medium sized PMCs and lead to monopoly of big PMCs. Owners of old private single tenement buildings might find it unaffordable to engage a big PMC. He asked the Administration to elaborate on how the proposed licensing regime would operate, and how to ensure the continued availability of various types of PMCs on the market.

18. Dr LAM Tai-fai shared the concern about the survival of small and medium sized PMCs which had ample property management experience but would only be qualified to obtain a low-tier licence under the proposed licensing regime. He asked whether measures would be put in place to support them so that they would not be driven out of the market.

19. SHA responded that safeguarding the interests of small and medium sized PMCs would be key to maintaining the market vibrant and the services affordable to owners. He said that due regard would be given to their interests in the design of the regulatory framework.

20. Mr James TO opined that while self-regulation of the property management industry did not work properly, the Administration should not over-regulate the industry. He considered that the proposed licensing regime should cater for different needs of different types of property owners and buildings. He was concerned that too stringent licensing requirements for PMCs might result in an increase in management fees for owners, in particular those of old tenement buildings. He suggested that the Administration could make reference to certain relevant regulatory schemes such as that for security guards as well as the registration system for money changers, which were only required to comply with certain rules after notifying the Administration within one month of commencing business.

21. Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che reckoned that the Administration would provide the number of PMCs which had a direct or indirect relationship with property developers and their names if available, so that owners might consider whether or not to engage them.

Transition period

22. Mrs Sophie LEUNG expressed doubt on whether the policy objectives stated in paragraph 3 of the Administration's paper regarding more choices of property management services and no significant increase in management costs would be achievable. She opined that before the introduction of any mandatory licensing regime, a transition period should be allowed for the industry. SHA responded that as the

Action

matters involved were complicated, the Administration was willing to hear the views of the stakeholders and the public.

23. In response to Dr LAM Tai-fai's enquiry on the transitional arrangements for PMCs, SHA said that as small and medium sized PMCs might not have adequate qualified housing management personnel, the Administration would consider providing a transition period for them to adapt to the new regulatory framework. He said that a lead time of about three years might be required for practitioners to obtain the necessary qualifications and for PMCs to gear up in terms of operation, manpower and capital requirements.

Public's views

24. Mr WONG Kwok-hing suggested that the Panel hold a meeting to invite the stakeholders, including OCs, PMCs and District Council ("DC") members, to give views on the consultation document. His suggestion was echoed by the Deputy Chairman.

25. Summing up, the Chairman said that members were generally in support of holding a meeting to receive views from deputations on the regulation of the property management industry. The Clerk was requested to fix a date for the meeting in February 2011.

Clerk

(Post-meeting note: A special meeting of the Panel was scheduled for Friday, 18 February 2011, at 10:45 am to hear views from deputations on regulation of the property management industry.)

(b) Matters relating to procurement of third party risks insurance by Owners' Corporation

26. SHA briefed members on the Building Management (Third Party Risks Insurance) Regulation (Cap. 344B) ("the Regulation"), which required mandatory procurement of third party risks insurance by OCs and would take effect on 1 January 2011.

Procurement of insurance

27. Noting that about 40 000 private buildings were managed by PMCs and as at October 2010, only 15 571 buildings with OCs had procured insurance, Mr WONG Kwok-hing enquired about the situation of the remaining buildings. DDHA(2) responded that under the Regulation, only buildings with OCs would be required to procure insurance. As it

Action

was a common practice for PMCs engaged by OCs of large private estates to procure public liability insurance policies for owners, the actual number of buildings that had been insured should be more than 15 571 buildings.

28. On Mr WONG Kwok-hing's enquiry on whether OCs which had procured insurance would be required to display a copy of their insurance policy in a prominent place for public inspection, DDHA(2) responded in the affirmative.

Compliance with the mandatory requirement

29. The Deputy Chairman said that many OCs with insurance were confused about whether the insurance coverage was in compliance with the Regulation and if not, the transitional arrangements which would be needed. He asked whether joint-name insurance policies procured by OCs in conjunction with PMCs were permissible under the Regulation. He criticized the Home Affairs Department ("HAD") for failing to provide sufficient assistance to OCs in understanding the mandatory requirement. He urged the Administration to issue FAQs to small property owners to explain the requirement. Dr LAM Tai-fai shared the Deputy Chairman's concerns.

30. DDHA(2) responded that the Hong Kong Federation of Insurers ("HKFI") had recently issued a circular to its members on the implementation of the mandatory requirement. HAD had all along maintained contact with OCs, and would liaise with HKFI once it noticed questions raised by owners and OCs over the operation of the mandatory requirement. HAD and HKFI had also jointly organized public forums for property owners, and HAD would continue to liaise with HKFI to issue relevant information to property owners. He also pointed out that no additional insurance premium should be charged for renewal of policies or joint-name policies if there was no increase in risk exposure.

31. Mr CHAN Kin-por considered that the Deputy Chairman's remarks were unfair to HAD, as HAD had made a lot of preparatory work for the implementation of the mandatory requirement in the past two years. HKFI had issued a circular to its members on how to implement the mandatory requirement, and would convene a meeting for insurers to explain how the technical problems could be resolved. He said that insurance premium should not be increased if no additional insurance risks would be covered.

Action

OCs without insurance coverage

32. Dr Priscilla LEUNG expressed concern that many OCs might have to be dissolved if they were unable to procure insurance. She noted that it would be a defence for Management Committee ("MC") members of an OC if they could demonstrate that they had already exercised due diligence to procure insurance. Nevertheless, she considered that such demonstration would involve immense tasks in the court proceedings and it was uncertain whether the court would be convinced. She urged the Administration to identify OCs of old buildings which were unable to procure insurance, and to assist them in convincing the court that they had already made their best endeavor to procure insurance.

33. DDHA(2) responded that with the Panel's support in 2008, the Administration had granted a two-year grace period for the implementation of the mandatory requirement, which should have commenced on 1 January 2009. In the past two years, the Administration had visited individual OCs without insurance coverage, identified their problems and offered assistance to them. The main problems of OCs were that they had not completed the required building maintenance works or removed unauthorized structures from their buildings. The Administration would continue to assist such OCs in procuring insurance.

34. In response to Dr Priscilla LEUNG's enquiry on whether the Administration could undertake not to prosecute OCs without insurance coverage in the first year of implementation of the mandatory requirement, DDHA(2) said that the spirit of the Regulation was not to penalize owners but to enhance their awareness in building safety and to assist them in procuring insurance. In case an OC was required to carry out building maintenance works, which might take more than one year, before being qualified to procure insurance, it would not be prosecuted.

35. In response to enquiries from the Chairman, Dr Priscilla LEUNG and Dr LAM Tai-fai about the resignation of MC members of OCs which were unable to procure insurance and might need to bear legal liability, DDHA(2) said that such OCs had been advised to notify HAD if they were unable to procure insurance. HAD would refer their cases to HKFI, which would circulate them to its members to evaluate their qualification to procure insurance. HAD would also provide them with a list of insurance companies authorized by HKFI as insurers of third party risks insurance for buildings. During the referral process, HAD would be able to collect sufficient evidence to ascertain whether such OCs had already made their best endeavor to procure insurance.

Action

36. In response to the Chairman's enquiry about the coverage of third party risks insurance, DDHA(2) said that the mandatory requirement was designed to cover claims related to bodily injuries and/or death of a third party. The insurance would not cover claims related to damage to third party property.

V. Relocation and expansion of the Hong Kong Maritime Museum

[LC Paper No. CB(2)465/10-11(05) and (06)]

37. At the Chairman's invitation, SHA briefed members on a proposed capital works project for the expansion of the Hong Kong Maritime Museum ("HKMM") and its relocation to Central Pier 8. The Administration supported HKMM's proposed project, as it would help preserve and promote Hong Kong's maritime history and traditions, and provide a new tourist attraction.

38. SHA further advised that the total estimated cost of HKMM's proposed project was about \$100 million in money-of-the-day prices. HKMM had undertaken to share part of the capital cost. After the amount to be borne by HKMM was confirmed, the Administration would seek the funding approval of the Public Work Subcommittee and Finance Committee of the Legislative Councils ("LegCo") for the project.

39. At SHA's invitation, HKMM's Executive Manager and Curator gave a powerpoint presentation on HKMM's proposed project.

Discussion

Admission fees

40. Mr WONG Kwok-hing expressed support for HKMM's proposed project. Noting that it would be partly borne by the public purse, he asked about HKMM's admission fees after its relocation and in particular whether the elderly, the disabled and students would enjoy free admission.

41. Museum Director of HKMM ("MD/HKMM") responded that the admission fees for the new HKMM would be \$30 for adults and \$15 for children, the disabled and students. The admission fee for adults would represent a discount of 60% to 70% of the actual operation cost of HKMM. Unlike the publicly-funded museums managed by LCSD, HKMM needed to avoid running a deficit and therefore could not offer free admission to all visitors. He added that the admission fees might be

Action

reviewed depending on the audience's reception. The new HKMM would be willing to drop the admission fees or offer concessions if it performed well.

42. Mrs Sophie LEUNG considered HKMM's proposed admission fees acceptable. Ms Miriam LAU opined that HKMM should keep the admission fees low, say at \$10, and even offer free admission.

Regulation of and support for private museums

43. Mr WONG Kwok-hing asked whether the Administration would regulate HKMM and other private museums, such as whether government officials would attend the board meetings of HKMM. SHA responded that as HKMM would be partly funded by the public purse, it would be subjected to certain degree of monitoring by the Administration. For instance, HKMM had to submit capital works project reports by qualified professionals, and the auditor's reports and performance reports on HKMM would be made available to LegCo and the public.

44. Mrs Sophie LEUNG suggested that the Administration might appoint independent individuals instead of government officials to the board of HKMM to exercise oversight. She considered that HKMM might submit its annual reports and financial statements to LegCo.

45. SHA responded that the Administration was willing to provide funding support to HKMM, as it had been managed professionally. The Administration would exercise appropriate oversight of HKMM and strike a balance between its respect for HKMM's autonomy and its responsibility to monitor it.

46. Ms Miriam LAU opined that it might be inappropriate for the Government to directly interfere with HKMM's operation. Declaring that she was a member of the Hong Kong Maritime Industry Council ("HKMIC"), she suggested that HKMM be treated as a target organization entitled to receive support from HKMIC and HKMM might report to it.

47. Ms Cyd HO welcomed the provision of land and financial support to HKMM by the Administration. Noting that many small private museums showcasing the collective memories of Hong Kong were running with difficulties, she hoped that the Administration would announce a set of clear and objective criteria for supporting private museums, so that the public could understand the kind of museums which

Action

would be eligible to receive land and financial support from the Government.

48. Noting the proposed reinstatement of the existing HKMM premises at Murray House at Stanley and museum office and storage space at Ma Hang Estate to bare shell conditions, Ms HO urged the Administration to consider inviting other private museums to take over the premises, so as to minimize wastage of the existing decorations within the premises.

49. With reference to the museum hopping tours in certain overseas places and noting the scattering of private museums in various locations in Hong Kong, Ms HO asked whether the Home Affairs Bureau could coordinate the offer of a concessionary pass with which visitors could visit all museums conveniently.

50. SHA responded that the Administration would consider formulating a comprehensive policy for private museums. However, at present, given the unique nature and operational needs of individual private museums, the Administration would examine and process their requests for support on a case-by-case basis. He added that the existing premises for HKMM at Stanley was privately owned and would be used for other purposes after HKMM's relocation.

Operating cost

51. Mrs Sophie LEUNG said that she welcomed the development of quality private museums such as HKMM's proposed project, as it was closely linked with Hong Kong's development and would become a tourist attraction on the waterfront in Central. Referring to the Administration's estimated total cost of \$101.5 million for HKMM's proposed project, she was worried whether it was adequate to cover the costly internal renovation of the museum.

52. SHA responded that the Administration was discussing with the board of HKMM on the relocation, refurbishment and funding arrangement for its proposed project. He noted that the Trust of HKMM was also raising fund. He believed that HKMM would have sufficient funding to proceed with the proposed project.

53. Ms Miriam LAU supported HKMM's proposed project because HKMM's existing location was too far away from Central and too small to accommodate maritime exhibits (like vessels) which were usually of a considerable size. She did not share the view that the Government had subsidized HKMM considerably. She said that as the maritime industry

Action

had all along been closely linked with Hong Kong's economic, cultural and historical developments, the Government should give more support to HKMM's development, which, in her view, would be welcomed by the public. Noting the proposed level of public funding insufficient to cope with the operating cost of the new HKMM, she asked whether the new HKMM could be operated in a sustainable and commercially viable manner. MD/HKMM responded that if HKMM could not earn enough income, it would either go bankrupt or need a lifeline.

54. Miss Tanya CHAN asked whether the proposed catering service in the new HKMM would increase its income, and whether publicity initiatives would be launched and a real vessel would be displayed outside the new HKMM to attract more visitors.

55. MD/HKMM pointed out that catering would not be a big source of income for the new HKMM, although it could attract visitors. He said that as publicity in Hong Kong was extremely expensive, the best HKMM could afford would not be much. He also said that a two-month intensive study would be conducted by the Hong Kong Polytechnic University as from January 2011 to examine if the new HKMM could berth a historic ship. However, he urged members not to expect too much, as Central Pier 8 might only accommodate the berthing of a historic ship limited to the size of a Star Ferry and not, for example, the replica of a Swedish East India sailing vessel. HKMM also needed to study with the Administration the adequacy of the related waterfront facilities and the accessibility of the ship to visitors including the disabled.

VI. Outcome of the public consultation on the bid for hosting the 2023 Asian Games

[LC Paper No. CB(2)465/10-11(07) and (08)]

56. To allow sufficient time for discussion on the agenda item, the Chairman decided to extend the meeting for 15 minutes beyond the appointed ending time of the meeting at 10:30 am.

57. At the Chairman's invitation, SHA reported on the findings of the public consultation exercise on Hong Kong's potential bid to host the Asian Games in 2023. He pointed out that for large-scale international sports events, the common international practice nowadays was for organizers to make a decision on the host cities many years ahead. For the 2019 and 2023 Asian Games, the Government was informed that the Olympic Council of Asia intended to decide the hosting cities in Tokyo in July 2011. What mattered in considering which city was to host the

Action

Games was not whether it already had all the requisite conditions when submitting the bid; if a city had the capacity to host the Games, it would be given 10 to 12 years to create the conditions. It would not be in line with the international practice if Hong Kong had to meet all the required conditions before bidding for the Games.

Long-term sports policy

58. Mr WONG Kwok-hing said that the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions ("HKFTU") supported the bid because the Administration had been positive in solving the problem of "different pay for the same job" within the Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("LCSD") and in ensuring that the bid would not affect the development of sports facilities at the community level. He asked whether the Government would formulate a comprehensive and long-term policy on sports development, such as promoting sports for all and strengthening the support for elite athletes, regardless of whether Hong Kong would mount or win the bid.

59. SHA responded that promoting long-term sports development was the Government's established policy objective, and the Government was determined to do so. Regardless of whether Hong Kong would mount or win the bid, the Administration would implement the plans to build sports venues and facilities stated in the public consultation document, and would continue to pursue the policy objectives of promoting sport for all and supporting athletes.

60. Mr CHEUNG Man-kwong considered it inconsistent of HKFTU and Mr WONG Kwok-hing in objecting to the Government's proposals (including the potential bid to host the Games) in the first place on many occasions to gain benefits and public support but then shifted to support the Government. He reminded members to be cautious with what they said.

61. In response, Mr WONG Kwok-hing said that Mr CHEUNG's remarks were groundless. Rather than making an about turn on the bid, HKFTU had all along believed that the bid should be considered carefully, and had explained why it ultimately supported the bid. He reiterated that HKFTU had not taken any advantage of the public opinions.

62. Dr LAM Tai-fai was worried that the Administration's support for the bid was simply for the sake of bidding and not for the long-term sports development that would benefit the whole community. He opined that the Administration was still unable to adequately explain its policy

Action

on long-term sports development, such as how to help student athletes to pursue education without giving up their sporting career, and how to support retired athletes and non-elite ones who did not have the support from the Hong Kong Sports Institute. He also raised concern about how sports for all and athletes' performance level could be promoted in view of the shortage of sports facilities. While supporting the Government's broad direction for promoting sports at schools and districts, he believed that the public would prefer to see specific and concrete measures put in place to promote sports.

63. Admitting that sports facilities, such as football pitches, were currently insufficient at the community level, SHA said that this should not affect the objective of hosting the Games in 2023, as more such facilities would be built in future.

64. Miss Tanya CHAN opined that the Civic Party had made its stance clear that the bid should not be mounted until the Administration had enhanced its support for sports development. She considered that the Administration all along had only introduced sports measures but had not formulated a sports policy. She cautioned that mounting the bid without clear public support would create conflicts. She urged SHA to make clear whether the bid would be mounted. SHA responded that the Administration would comprehensively consider all the relevant factors, including the findings of the public consultation exercise, and make the decision through the established procedures.

65. Ms Cyd HO opined that the bid would not achieve the goal of promoting sports, as the Games would make it more difficult for members of the public to book the venues. She urged the Administration to enhance the sports facilities at schools and review the school curriculum to facilitate the promotion of sports.

66. Ms Miriam LAU said that the Liberal Party ("LP") had urged the Administration to address the following concerns: first, whether hosting the Games would bring short-term and long-term economic benefits to Hong Kong; second, whether adequate venues and facilities would be available for athletes' training and whether there was any long-term commitment to promoting sports education; and third, how to avoid turning the sports venues into white elephants. She said that the second concern should be of utmost importance. She noted the Administration's written response to LP's concerns but hoped that the Administration could provide more information to LP to facilitate its consideration of the bid.

Action

Public opinions on the bid

67. Mr CHEUNG Man-Kwong opined that despite the Administration's efforts during the public consultation exercise, the public sentiment against the bid did not reverse. He described the Administration's paper as striving to play up the positive findings and downplaying the voices against the bid. He pointed out that even the questionnaire survey conducted by the Chinese University of Hong Kong ("CUHK"), which in his view was pre-emptive in its design, showed that slightly more than 50% of the respondents were still against the bid. According to the Democratic Party's latest survey, 33% of the respondents supported and 50% opposed the use of the direct cost of \$6 billion to host the Games, and 24% supported and 55% opposed the hosting of the Games with the indirect cost of \$30 billion for the construction of sports venues. He said that the public might support hosting the Games when the Administration had delivered its promises on sports development but not in 2023.

68. Ms Cyd HO criticized the Administration for conducting biased opinion polls and considered that the public opinions so collected did not represent the majority of the public. She suggested that the Administration could conduct a consultative referendum to ascertain whether the majority of the public would support spending tens of billions of dollars to host the Games.

69. The Deputy Chairman opined that some questions in the survey commissioned by the Administration were biased and would render the findings distortive. In particular, he was disappointed that the question on whether to support hosting the Games with the estimated cost of \$30.1 billion had not been included in the questionnaire. He asked whether the Administration would put on hold the bid. SHA responded that the questionnaire was designed by professionals and he himself was not involved.

Support for the bid

70. Mrs Sophie LEUNG expressed support for the bid. She was worried that should Hong Kong abandon the bid this time, it would face increasingly fierce competitions from the rising neighbouring cities (especially South Asian cities) to bid for the Games in future. Regardless of whether the bid would be mounted or successful, she hoped that the Administration would continue to provide more sports venues and promote sports among youngsters, and LCSD would engage more government officials who liked and understood sports to formulate and

Action

implement the relevant policy and measures. The Administration should also co-ordinate various bureaux (including the Education Bureau) to promote sports, such as making the curriculum and mindset of teachers more favourable to sports at primary and secondary schools.

71. Dr Priscilla LEUNG said that the issue of whether or not the bid should be supported should not be mingled with others such as poverty alleviation. She opined that the bid would be worthy of support if it could lead the popularization of sports. She urged the Administration to attach importance to the enhancements to the sports facilities, sports education and quality of physical education teachers at schools.

72. To conclude, the Chairman reminded members that the main objective of the discussion was to be briefed on the outcome of the Administration's public consultation exercise on the bid. He advised that the Administration would further consult the Panel when it had any decision on the bid.

VII. Any other business

73. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 10:45am.