

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. FC179/12-13  
(These minutes have been  
seen by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/1/2

**Finance Committee of the Legislative Council**

**Minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting**  
**held at Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**  
**on Friday, 25 January 2013, at 3:15 pm**

**Members present:**

Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, SBS, JP (Chairman)

Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP (Deputy Chairman)

Hon LEE Cheuk-yan

Hon James TO Kun-sun

Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP

Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung

Dr Hon LAU Wong-fat, GBM, GBS, JP

Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP

Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, SBS, JP

Hon Frederick FUNG Kin-kee, SBS, JP

Hon Vincent FANG Kang, SBS, JP

Hon WONG Kwok-hing, MH

Dr Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP

Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP

Hon Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen, GBS, JP

Hon WONG Ting-kwong, SBS, JP

Hon Ronny TONG Ka-wah, SC

Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan

Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, JP

Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP

Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP

Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, JP

Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau

Hon CHEUNG Kwok-che  
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, BBS  
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye, GBS, JP  
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP  
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC  
Hon LEUNG Kwok-hung  
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip  
Hon WONG Yuk-man  
Hon Claudia MO  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP  
Hon NG Leung-sing, SBS, JP  
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin  
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming  
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH  
Hon YIU Si-wing  
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai  
Hon MA Fung-kuok, SBS, JP  
Hon Charles Peter MOK  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Hon CHAN Han-pan  
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok  
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP  
Hon Kenneth LEUNG  
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, JP  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki  
Hon KWOK Wai-keung  
Hon Dennis KWOK  
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, JP  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Hon IP Kin-yuen  
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP  
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, JP  
Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH  
Hon TANG Ka-piu  
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP  
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kuok, BBS, MH, JP  
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan  
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP

Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen

**Members absent:**

Hon Albert HO Chun-yan  
Dr Hon LAM Tai-fai, SBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP  
Hon SIN Chung-kai, SBS, JP

**Public officers attending:**

Professor K C CHAN, GBS, JP	Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury
Ms Elizabeth TSE Man-ye, JP	Permanent Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)
Ms Esther LEUNG, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) 1
Ms Elsie YUEN	Principal Executive Officer (General), Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau (The Treasury Branch)
Ms Doris CHEUNG, JP	Deputy Secretary for Labour and Welfare (Welfare) 1
Ms Wendy LEUNG	Principal Assistant Secretary for Labour and Welfare (Welfare) 1
Miss Winnie YING	Secretary General, Community Investment and Inclusion Fund Secretariat
Mrs Elina CHAN	Labour and Welfare Bureau Principal Assistant Secretary for Labour and Welfare (Welfare) 3
Mrs Anna MAK	Deputy Director of Social Welfare (Services)
Miss Cecilla LI	Assistant Director of Social Welfare (Elderly)
Mr Simon KONG	Senior Architect Social Welfare Department

**Clerk in attendance:**

Mr Andy LAU

Assistant Secretary General 1

**Staff in attendance:**

Mr Derek LO

Chief Council Secretary (1)5

Mr Daniel SIN

Senior Council Secretary (1)7

Mr Ken WOO

Council Secretary (1)5

Mr Frankie WOO

Senior Legislative Assistant (1)3

Ms Christy YAU

Legislative Assistant (1)7

---

**Item No. 1 – FCR(2012-13)65**

**HEAD 141 – GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT : LABOUR AND WELFARE BUREAU**

**Subhead 700 General non-recurrent**

**Item 016 Community Investment and Inclusion Fund**

The meeting continued the deliberation on the item FCR(2012-13)65 regarding the proposed increase in the approved commitment by \$200 million for the Community Investment and Inclusion Fund (CIIF) which was carried over from the meeting held on 11 January 2013.

Concern for the political affiliations of members of CIIF Committee and sub-committee

2. Mr Albert CHAN pointed out that some members of the CIIF Committee and the Assessment and Evaluation Sub-committee were also members of the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong (DAB), and some were District Council members who were connected with applicants for CIIF. Mr CHAN queried the Administration's criteria of appointment to these two committees and the mechanism to ensure fairness and impartiality of the vetting process.

3. Deputy Secretary for Labour and Welfare (Welfare)1 (DSLW(W)1/LWB) said that the Administration would appoint suitable members to the CIIF Committee on the basis of their merits, including their experience in mobilizing local community, knowledge in social capital as well as their willingness in committing their time in promoting the work of CIIF and serving as mentors to project operators supported by the Fund. Political background was not a factor

of consideration.

4. DSLW(W)1 explained that the Assessment and Evaluation Sub-committee was responsible for the assessment of CIIF applications. Recommendations from the Sub-committee would be submitted to the CIIF Committee for approval. Members were required to submit a written declaration on any interests with respect to an application or a project, and they would not be involved in the relevant assessment or deliberation for funding approval.

5. Mr Albert CHAN criticized that the composition of the CIIF Committee and the Assessment and Evaluation Sub-committee without a member from the pan-democratic camp was clearly skewed towards certain political parties. Dr Helena WONG said that the Administration's response failed to explain why the composition of the CIIF Committee and the Assessment and Evaluation Sub-committee would bias towards pro-establishment political parties. She criticized that the Administration had not committed to rectifying the imbalance. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen made a similar comment.

6. Mr TAM Yiu-chung considered Mr Albert CHAN's comments unfair. He said that DAB did not nominate members for appointment to the CIIF Committee or its sub-committee. Mr TAM enquired about the mechanism the Administration had adopted in identifying and appointing members to advisory and statutory bodies, and, in particular, whether the Administration would seek nominations from political parties or organizations during the process.

7. Mr Abraham SHEK said that it was up to any political party to nominate members to the Administration for appointment to the CIIF Committee. Dr KWOK Ka-ki queried if the Administration would indeed consider nominations from political parties.

8. DSLW(W)1 said that the objective of CIIF was to foster cross-sector collaboration in promoting social inclusion and building social capital. The current membership of the CIIF Committee comprised people with wide community networks, academics, and those from the social welfare, medical and business sectors. Persons with hands-on experience with past CIIF projects would also be considered. While the Administration would consider recommendations from members, DSLW(W)1 reiterated that appointments would be made on the basis of individual merits without regard to the political background of the candidates.

9. Mr LEUNG Chi-cheung said that not all the members had pro-establishment background. He pointed out that Mr David CHAN

Wai-ming, a CIIF Committee member, was, in fact, on good terms with Mr Albert CHAN Wai-yip who supported him in the previous District Council election. Mr Albert CHAN clarified that Mr David CHAN Wai-ming in fact supported Mr CHAN Hang-pan in the elections.

10. Mr Albert CHAN Wai-yip declared that he was an adviser to the Tung Wah Group of Hospitals (which was also involved in implementing some CIIF projects). Mr CHAN said that one of the members of the Assessment and Evaluation Sub-committee was a District Council member and a key member of the Hong Kong Outlying Island Women's Association as well as a DAB member. He considered it biased and unfair for the CIIF Committee to consider applications from the Hong Kong Outlying Island Women's Association. Mr CHAN asked whether the Administration would withdraw the injection application.

11. Mr Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun said that most of the organizations receiving funding under CIIF were not related to the pro-establishment camp. He said that organizations such as the Salvation Army, Tung Wah Group of Hospitals or the Richmond Fellowship of Hong Kong had also received funding approval for several of their applications. He queried whether these organizations had performed better than others or whether the CIIF Committee had been biased towards them.

12. Dr Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung clarified that in the past three years, the Richmond Fellowship of Hong Kong received approval for one CIIF application only.

13. DSLW(W)1 advised that about 70% of the organizations receiving funding approval for implementation of CIIF projects were social welfare organizations, and the rest included local residents' groups, educational, medical or business organizations.

14. Dr Helena WONG said that it was members' duty to monitor the Administration's use of public resources and to safeguard against abuse. She added that there was a case for doubt as many of the 250-odd CIIF projects were operated by pro-establishment bodies, and, at the same time, pro-establishment members were represented in CIIF Committee and the Assessment and Evaluation Sub-Committee. There were no members of other parties in the two committees. Dr WONG suggested that the Administration should reform the composition of the CIIF Committee and its sub-committee.

15. In elaborating her point, Dr Helena WONG pointed out that a member of the CIIF Committee, Ms CHAU Chuen-heung, was both a DAB member and

an important member of the Hong Kong Outlying Islands Women's Association. The Association and many of its allied organizations had applied for funding from CIIF to implement social inclusion projects.

16. Dr Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung queried whether the Administration had instituted a system to avoid conflict of interest of CIIF members. He said that, according to the Administration's earlier response, a member of the CIIF Committee or sub-committee could continue to deliberate on an application after having declared his or her interest. Dr Fernando CHEUNG expressed concern that some political organizations were channelling resources from CIIF to financing their operations in the community. He said that the Administration should redress this problem.

17. DSLW(W)1 and Principal Assistant Secretary for Labour and Welfare (Welfare)1 (PAS(W)1/LWB) responded that there was a clear mechanism for declaration of interest by members of the CIIF Committee. If a member was connected with the applicant, he or she would be required to submit a written declaration to the Chairman of the CIIF Committee and would not be allowed to influence the decisions of other members in assessing the application. PAS(W)1 said that if the CIIF Secretariat was aware of the connection between a member and an applicant, the Secretariat staff would also take the initiative to remind the member to declare interest.

18. Dr Helena WONG asked specifically if Ms CHAU Chuen-heung had lodged a declaration of her political affiliation and connection with the Outlying Islands Women's Association and had abstained from assessing the applications from the Outlying Islands Women's Association or its allied organizations. DSLW(W)1 confirmed that Ms CHAU had duly declared interest and was not involved in any discussion of the applications from the Association.

19. Dr Helena WONG commented that if a member affiliated with many applicants withdrew from deliberation on an application because of a conflict of interest, appointing such member to the CIIF Committee or its sub-committee would not be meaningful. DSLW(W)1 said that as there were 18 members in the CIIF Committee, other members in the Committee could contribute to the deliberation in case a member withdrew due to conflict of interest.

20. Mr Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun criticized Dr Fernando CHEUNG as being unfair in concluding that the CIIF Committee was politically biased purely on the basis of the background of the project applicants over the last three years. He said that if a comparison had to be made, all of the projects considered since the creation of CIIF should be taken into account.

21. Dr Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung welcomed it if the Administration took forward Mr CHUNG Shu-kan's suggestion to analyse all the CIIF projects so as to ascertain whether certain political organizations had a higher chance of getting CIIF funding. Mr Christopher CHUNG Shu-kan said that such investigation was unnecessary. He reiterated that every organization, regardless of their political affiliation and political position, had the right to apply for CIIF funding, and that each CIIF project should be evaluated on its own merits.

22. Mr Alan LEONG said that CIIF was created against a background of the Administration's gradual withdrawal of social work teams providing community development services. While CIIF had supported many worthwhile community projects, they were indeed conducive to attracting more local support for a political party in an election. It was therefore important to avoid conflict of interest in the assessment process of CIIF applications.

23. Mr Alan LEONG asked if the Administration would appoint members of credible organizations (such as the Equal Opportunities Commission or the Hong Kong Council of Social Service) to the CIIF Committee and its sub-committee. DSLW(W)1 said that the Administration would consider Mr LEONG 's suggestion.

24. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung said that the composition of the CIIF Committee and the Assessment and Evaluation Sub-committee reflected a bias towards DAB, and suggested a case of conflict of interest. He said that the Administration should appoint more politically neutral members from the social welfare service sector to maintain a better balance.

25. Dr Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung asked whether the Administration would review the criteria of selecting members for appointment to the CIIF Committee and its sub-committee, and adopt further precaution in the application assessment process to avoid conflict of interest.

26. DSLW(W)1 reiterated that candidate's political affiliation was not a factor of consideration for appointment. The Administration encouraged people from different sectors to participate in the work of CIIF, including people from the academic and business sectors.

#### Evaluation of effectiveness of CIIF projects

27. Dr Helena WONG acknowledged the merits of some of the CIIF projects, but she commented that the Administration had not provided detailed assessment on their performance. She asked whether the Administration had



set objective indicators for measuring the cost-effectiveness of the projects, and how many projects met the targeted performance.

28. DSLW(W)1 said that the CIIF Secretariat was closely monitoring the progress and performance of CIIF projects. Project operators were required to submit quarterly progress reports, and were required to evaluate the effectiveness and sustainability of the projects. After the funding support for the projects had expired, the CIIF Secretariat would keep track on their sustainability development for two years by conducting questionnaire surveys. Secretary General, CIIF Secretariat (SG/CIIF) said that the performance of CIIF projects was published on the CIIF website. Majority of the CIIF projects had met the expected targets, and about 10% of the projects were below targets. Independent evaluations had been conducted by tertiary institutions, which indicated that the CIIF projects had been effective in bonding, bridging and linking social capital, including building social network across sectors, fostering mutual care and help amongst heterogeneous groups.

29. Dr KWOK Ka-ki commented that CIIF served a useful purpose of complementing the existing Government services. However, he claimed that the CIIF Committee and its sub-committee were dominated by pro-establishment members who would channel funds to connected organizations on projects or activities that helped tout votes for their candidates that these parties backed in times of elections. Dr KWOK said that the Administration should disclose the amount of funds that had been provided to pro-establishment organizations on CIIF activities all these years.

30. DSLW(W)1 said that there were clear guidelines for processing CIIF applications, which were available on the CIIF website. DSLW(W)1 explained that the criteria in assessing an application included how the project could help build social capital in the community, the effectiveness of the project (including the methodology in service delivery) and the capability of the applicants. Many local organizations with different backgrounds might be involved in each CIIF project.

31. Mr LEUNG Chi-cheung said that CIIF projects had important contributions to the local communities. In Tin Shui Wai, for example, many CIIF projects had been implemented to serve new arrivals, ethnic minorities and primary school students from low income families. Community groups including schools, mutual aid committees and social welfare organizations were involved. Mr LEUNG said that these services were not politically motivated and were not implemented for exchange of political interests as some members claimed. He criticized members' accusation as being unfair to these project organizers and urged members not to judge the CIIF and its projects from a

political perspective. Mr CHAN Hang-pan made a similar comment. Mr LEUNG Chi-cheung suggested that the CIIF Secretariat should organize visits for Legislative Council Members so that they could gain first hand knowledge about the work of CIIF.

32. Mr Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung comment that, according to records, two pro-Mainland groups, namely, the Hong Kong Outlying Islands Women's Association and the Kwun Tong Resident Association, seemed to be particularly favoured in CIIF funding over the past three years. Dr Fernando CHEUNG asked if these organizations did excel over other applicant organizations or they were directly connected with members of the CIIF Committee or the Assessment and Evaluation Sub-committee.

33. DSLW(W)1 said that the CIIF Committee would examine each application on its own merits and in accordance with established criteria, such as whether the objective of the proposed project was clear, the expected performance, and the applicant's track records in executing previous CIIF projects. She explained that, everything being equal, organizations that had performed effectively in a previous CIIF project would score better than other applicants during the assessment process. SG/CIIF supplemented that the CIIF Secretariat would not deter applicants from conducting second or third phases of projects that were proven to be successful.

34. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung queried how the Administration supervise the performance of an organization. DSLW(W)1 responded that members of the CIIF Committee would participate as mentors of CIIF projects and conduct regular visits to the organizations. In response to further queries from Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung, DSLW(W)1 said that CIIF Committee members would not be designated as mentors to those organizations with which they had direct connections. She added that the performance of CIIF projects and their effectiveness would be examined by all members of the CIIF Committee.

35. Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung asked the Administration to provide a list of members of the CIIF Committee and its sub-committee who had been involved in supervising, or as a mentor to, CIIF-funded projects operated by Kwun Tong Resident Association and the Hong Kong Outlying Islands Women's Association.

*[Post-meeting note: The information was issued to members on 1 March 2013 vide LC Paper No. FC113/12-13.]*

36. Mr WONG Yuk-man criticized that the CIIF Committee was inefficient in approving funding and the success rate of applications was also low.

Mr WONG queried the justification for approving the proposed injection into CIIF with the current level of efficiency and whether the level of funding sought was really necessary. DSLW(W)1 said that about \$25 million would be allocated for each batch of applications. The proposed injection of \$200 million was estimated to be sufficient for CIIF to operate until 2018. She explained that when CIIF was first launched, the community was not familiar with the concept of social capital and so the applicants were asked to refine the project proposals so as to meet the Fund's requirements. As a result, the rate of processing CIIF applications was relatively slow. DSLW(W)1 said that with the introduction of application workshops to potential applicants and strengthening of publicity on the Fund's application criteria, the progress of handling CIIF application had sped up in recent years.

37. Mr WONG Yuk-man commented that CIIF Committee members' lack of knowledge in social capital might have slowed down the Committee's efficiency. DSLW(W)1 responded that members of the CIIF Committee were knowledgeable about the concept of social capital or had experience in organising social capital/CIIF projects.

38. The Chairman said that the speaking time for members asking the third round of questions, including the Administration's reply, would be limited to three minutes.

39. Mr Alan LEONG asked whether the Administration would develop clearer and more objective criteria (with appropriate annotations) for vetting funding applications. Mr LEONG queried if the Administration would reinstate the neighbourhood-level community development social work teams.

40. DSLW(W)1 said that CIIF had been operating for ten years and many service organizations had accumulated knowledge in building up social capital. Numerous successful service models had been developed and publicized through the CIIF website. Other organizations could draw reference from these models in developing their own project proposals. The Administration had drawn reference from the experience and formulated sets of criteria in measuring the building up of social capital as well as in assessing project applications. SG/CIIF said that the CIIF application form had been revised to provide better guidance to applicants in developing project applications. Briefing sessions were also organized prior to inviting applications from CIIF.

41. The Chairman instructed that the speaking time for members who speak for the fourth time, including the Administration's reply, should not exceed two minutes.

### Mechanism for declaration of interest

42. Mr WU Chi-wai asked whether the current mechanism for declaration of interest had taken into account the recommendations made by the Director of Audit in his value-for-money report on CIIF issued in October 2010. DSLW(W)1 advised that the Administration had taken follow-up actions on all of the 49 recommendations from the Director of Audit.

43. Mr WU Chi-wai said that the Director of Audit's Report had indicated cases where members' personal interests were not registered in their declaration. He asked what remedial measures had been taken when the CIIF Secretariat was aware of the discrepancy. SG/CIIF said that a two-tier mechanism for declaration of interest had been introduced. Any declared connection between a member and an applicant would be recorded. The Secretariat staff would check if the same declaration had been made by the member when receiving another project proposal from the same applicant. The CIIF Secretariat would remind members if there was any omission.

44. Mr WU Chi-wai said that only a number of the performance indicators in respect of a CIIF project were disclosed on the CIIF website. Mr WU and the Chairman asked if the Administration would post all of the performance indicators and the evaluation of individual projects on the website for public inspection. SG/CIIF said that indicators of measuring project effectiveness were clearly specified in the final performance report and the CIIF website had already provided information on the performance of the CIIF projects as a whole in building social capital. Mr WU suggested that the Administration should consider providing the details of individual projects rather than a broad summary of CIIF performance.

45. The Chairman instructed that the speaking time for the fifth round of questions should not exceed one minute.

46. Dr Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung said that CIIF was a tool to promote social capital and should not be abused by any political group for exchange of political interest or for electioneering purpose. Members of the Finance Committee (FC) had the duty to ensure that public funding was used properly.

### Voting result

47. These being no further question on the proposal, the Chairman put the item to vote. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. Of the 49 members who were present and voted, 44 members voted for and five

voted against the item. The voting results of individual members were as follows –

*For:*

Mr CHAN Kam-lam	Ms Emily LAU Wai-hing
Mr TAM Yiu-chung	Mr Abraham SHEK Lai-him
Mr WONG Kwok-hing	Dr Joseph LEE Kok-long
Mr Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung	Mr Andrew LEUNG Kwan-yuen
Mr Ronny TONG	Ms Starry LEE
Mr CHAN Hak-kan	Mr CHAN Kin-por
Dr Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun	Dr LEUNG Ka-lau
Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che	Mr WONG Kwok-kin
Mr IP Kwok-him	Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-ye
Mr Alan LEONG	Mr NG Leung-sing
Mr Steven HO Chun-yin	Mr WU Chi-wai
Mr YIU Si-wing	Mr MA Fung-kwok
Mr Charles Peter MOK	Mr CHAN Han-pan
Dr Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok	Mr LEUNG Che-cheung
Ms Alice MAK Mei-kuen	Mr KWOK Wai-keung
Mr Dennis KWOK	Mr Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung
Dr Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung	Dr Helena WONG Pik-wan
Mr IP Kin-yuen	Dr Elizabeth QUAT
Mr Martin LIAO Cheung-kong	Mr POON Siu-ping
Mr TANG Ka-piu	Dr CHIANG Lai-wan
Ir Dr LO Wai-kwok	Mr CHUNG Kwok-pan
Mr Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun	Mr Tony TSE Wai-chuen

(44 members)

*Against:*

Mr LEUNG Kwok-hung	Mr Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Mr WONG Yuk-man	Mr CHAN Chi-chuen
Mr Kenneth LEUNG	

(5 members)

48. The Chairman declared that the Committee approved the funding proposal.

**Item No. 2 – FCR(2012-13)66**  
**LOTTERIES FUND**  
**HEAD 341 – NON-RECURRENT GRANTS**

49. The Chairman advised that the item sought the Committee's approval of an allocation of \$72,720,000 from the Lotteries Fund for meeting the construction costs of a new contract Residential Care Home for the Elderly (RCHE) with a Day Care Unit (DCU) and a new Day Care Centre for the Elderly (DE) in Long Ping, Yuen Long.

50. Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che, Deputy Chairman of the Panel on Welfare Services, reported that the funding proposal was discussed at the Panel meeting held on 12 November 2012. The Panel supported the proposal and Panel members had expressed concern about a number of issues, including the need to increase the number of RCHE places, service standards of private RCHEs, imbalance in nursing homes (NH) and care and attention (C&A) places, etc.

Construction time of the project

51. Mr TANG Ka-piu queried the long time required for completion of the proposed RCHE. He said that it was unreasonable that the project should take ten years before it would be commissioned. Mr TANG opined that the MTR Corporation (MTRCL), to whom the construction works were entrusted, should be more efficient than the Government in delivering the project. Ms Alice MAK Mei-kuen and Dr Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung expressed criticisms about the long construction period for the project.

52. Dr Fernando CHEUNG surmised that MTRCL deliberately scheduled the RCHE to be completed at a late stage so as not to affect the sales of the adjacent residential development. Ms Alice MAK asked to what extent the work schedule was under the Government's control and whether the Administration could commission the facility ahead of schedule by further compressing the construction time during the tendering stage.

53. Deputy Director of Social Welfare (Services) (DDSW(Services)) said that the construction period of each project depended on its complexity and the specific circumstances involved. DDSW(Service) said that the proposed RCHE was part of the West Rail Long Ping Station Development. Subject to funding approval from FC at this meeting, MTRCL would be required to complete construction of the facilities within 72 months.

54. Mr TANG Ka-piu said that the number of subsidized residential care places to be provided in the proposed RCHE was small in comparison with the

number of elderly persons awaiting services. He asked how many more subsidized and non-subsidized places would be provided in the 11 development projects where sites had been earmarked for provision of new RCHEs, and what the service ratio was. He also asked how the Administration planned to increase the facilities to meet demands, and whether new elderly care facilities would be included in public housing developments.

55. DDSW(S) responded that service ratio of NH and C&A places would be nine to one, and RCHEs would also be located within public housing development. The Social Welfare Department was in close liaison with the Housing Department on the appropriateness of including additional requirements for RCHEs in future public housing projects. DDSW(Service) said that apart from constructing new RCHE facilities to meet service demand, the Administration would also implement bought-place schemes and enhance subsidised services. The Administration would explore with non-governmental organizations to provide new facilities within their future redevelopment projects and to expand existing services further.

56. Mr WONG Kwok-hing said that elderly care services were insufficient to meet the huge demand and the expected construction period of the proposed RCHE was too long. Mr WONG noted that there were suggestions on using a vacant site adjacent to the government office building in Siu Sai Wan for providing elderly service facilities and asked if the Administration could look into the matter. DDSW(Service) advised that the subject site was reserved for a multi-user Government building which accommodated various government facilities, each with a different development timetable.

#### Concern about air quality and noise problems

57. Dr Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung noted that the proposed RCHE would be located between a bus terminus and residential development and expressed concern that RCHE users would be directly affected by the noise from the bus terminus. Dr CHEUNG noted that the Administration would install double-glazed windows in the facility to reduce noise impact, but it had not put forward measures to tackle the emission from buses at the bus terminus nearby. He asked how the Administration could ameliorate the impact of bus emission on the facility.

58. Mr CHEUNG Kwok-che opined that the Administration seemed to be short of effective remedial and mitigating measures to tackle the many problems with the proposed RCHE. Mr CHEUNG said that the Administration should re-evaluate the mitigating measures required when the construction of the RCHE facility was completed, for example, the scale of air-conditioning

installation that would be required taking into account the actual number of bus routes using the terminus. If full air-conditioning of the facility was required, sufficient subsidies on electricity charges should be provided for the RCHE operator.

59. Senior Architect (SA) said that the Environmental Protection Department had considered and accepted the environmental impact assessment study for the West Rail Long Ping Station Development. The subject bus terminus would only have two bus bays. The proposed RCHE was designed in such a way that the dormitory windows would not face the bus terminus. Mechanical ventilation and air conditioning system with built-in air filtering devices would be installed for the whole building to help regulate the air quality and flow.

60. Dr Fernando CHEUNG queried the purpose of installing double-glazed windows in the dormitories that were, in fact, not facing the bus terminus. He criticized that the Administration was not trying to address members' concerns about the noise and air quality of the RCHE facility.

61. DDSW(Service) said that the Administration would address members' concerns during detailed design of the facility. She supplemented that in identifying a suitable site for the RCHE development, the Administration would take into consideration the site area, accessibility, connecting transport services and the long term use of the site.

62. Dr Fernando CHEUNG asked the Administration to provide a paper to explain how the Administration would ameliorate the air quality and noise problems from the bus terminus which might affect the elderly users of the proposed RCHE, and why the proposed project required six years to construct.

*[Post-meeting note: The information was issued to members on 25 March 2013 vide LC Paper No. FC119/12-13.]*

#### Appointment to advisory or statutory bodies

63. Dr Helena WONG said that Members belonging to the Democratic Party would support the funding proposal. She noted that there was one DAB member in the Lotteries Fund Advisory Committee (LFAC). She also recognised another LFAC member as the President of the Kowloon Federation of Associations who was also a National Committee member of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference, as well as an executive member of the All-China Women's Association. Dr Helena WONG said that Members were concerned about the Government giving preference to people with strong



pro-establishment affiliation in appointment to advisory or statutory bodies, especially those with actual authority in the allocation and use of public resources. She said that the Administration should specify the political affiliation of members in the advisory or statutory bodies relevant to a funding application in future submissions to FC.

64. Principal Assistant Secretary for Labour and Welfare (Welfare)3 (PASLW(W)3) said that candidates' political affiliation was not a factor for appointment to LFAC. The Administration would select those with relevant experience and expertise that might contribute to the work of LFAC, and she said that it might be difficult to provide information on LFAC members' political affiliation as such information was not collected.

65. There being no further question, the Chairman put the item to vote. The Chairman declared that the Committee approved the funding proposal.

66. In view of the lack of time for the meeting, the Chairman said that the remaining items on the agenda would have to be carried over to the next FC meeting.

67. The meeting was adjourned at 5:17 pm.

Legislative Council Secretariat  
27 August 2013