

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC113/13-14
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(15)B

**Public Works Subcommittee of the Finance Committee
of the Legislative Council**

**Minutes of the 14th meeting
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Tuesday, 27 May 2014, at 9:00 am**

Members present:

Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kiwok, BBS, MH, JP (Chairman)
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Hon James TO Kun-sun
Hon CHAN Kam-lam, SBS, JP
Hon Emily LAU Wai-hing, JP
Hon TAM Yiu-chung, GBS, JP
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP
Hon WONG Kwok-hing, BBS, MH
Hon Cyd HO Sau-lan
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, JP
Hon CHAN Kin-por, BBS, JP
Hon IP Kwok-him, GBS, JP
Hon Alan LEONG Kah-kit, SC
Hon Albert CHAN Wai-yip
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP
Hon James TIEN Pei-chun, GBS, JP
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP
Hon Charles Peter MOK
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, JP

Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen

Members absent:

Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau
Hon CHAN Han-pan
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan

Public officers attending:

Mr YEUNG Tak-keung	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) ³
Mr CHAN Chi-ming	Deputy Secretary for Development (Works) ²
Mr Thomas CHAN Chung-ching, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands) (Acting)
Ms Anissa WONG, JP	Permanent Secretary for the Environment
Ms Jasmine CHOI Suet-yung	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)
Mr WONG Kam-sing, JP	Secretary for the Environment
Ms Christine LOH Kung-wai, JP	Under Secretary for the Environment
Mr Howard CHAN Wai-kee, JP	Deputy Director (2) Environmental Protection Department
Mr CHENG Tak-kuen	Assistant Director (Nature Conservation and Infrastructure Planning) (Acting) Environmental Protection Department
Professor Sophia CHAN Siu-chee	Under Secretary for Food and Health
Ms Angela LEE Chung-yan	Principal Assistant Secretary for Food and Health (Health) ²
Mr LEUNG Kam-pui	Chief Technical Adviser (Subvented Projects) Architectural Services Department
Dr C C LUK	Cluster Chief Executive (Hong Kong West Cluster) Hospital Authority
Mr Donald LI	Chief Manager (Capital Planning) Hospital Authority

Clerk in attendance:

Ms Sharon CHUNG

Chief Council Secretary (1)6

Staff in attendance:

Mr Jimmy Y T MA, JP

Legal Adviser

Mr Andy LAU

Assistant Secretary General 1

Mr Bonny LOO

Assistant Legal Adviser 3

Mr Fred PANG

Senior Council Secretary (1)8

Mr Frankie WOO

Senior Legislative Assistant (1)3

Ms Christy YAU

Legislative Assistant (1)7

Action

The Chairman reported that 17 Capital Works Reserve Fund items of \$38,606.5 million had been endorsed by the Public Works Subcommittee ("PWSC") in the 2013-2014 session so far, of which \$34,855.6 million was related to capital works projects. He advised that together with the five agenda items carried over from the meeting on 21 May 2014, there were 10 funding proposals on the agenda for the meeting, which, if endorsed, would involve a total funding allocation of \$29,901.1 million. Of these proposals, nine were for upgrading nine capital works projects to Category A respectively and one was to increase the approved project estimate of a Category A item. If these proposals were approved, the cumulative number of items approved by PWSC in the 2013-2014 session would be 27, while the total amount of funding approved would be \$68,507.6 million, of which \$64,756.7 million was related to capital works projects.

2. The Chairman advised that, according to the Administration, excluding the 10 items on the agenda for the meeting, it was anticipated that 19 more items, involving a proposed funding allocation of about \$15,820 million, would be submitted to PWSC for consideration in the current legislative session.

3. Mr Albert CHAN requested for written information about the figures reported by the Chairman.

(Post-meeting note: The relevant extracts of the Chairman's speaking note, together with information provided by the Administration about the Capital Works Reserve Fund items endorsed/submitted/to be submitted in the current legislative session were circulated to members on 29 May 2014 vide LC Papers Nos. PWSC84/13-14(01)

and (02).)

4. Mr Albert CHAN said that members had expressed grave concerns on the rising expenditure on public works projects in recent months. He further requested that the Administration should provide a comparison of the actual expenditures on public works projects of the past year and the year before, and an analysis on whether the rising construction cost had an impact on the costs of such projects.

(Post-meeting note: The Administration's written response was forwarded to members vide LC Paper No. PWSC92/13-14(01) on 4 June 2014.)

5. The Chairman reminded members that in accordance with Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure ("RoP") of the Legislative Council ("LegCo"), they should disclose the nature of any direct or indirect pecuniary interests relating to the funding proposals under discussion at the meeting before they spoke on the item. He also drew members' attention to Rule 84 of RoP on voting or withdrawal in case of direct pecuniary interest.

Head 705 – Civil Engineering

PWSC(2014-15)7 177DR Development of integrated waste management facilities phase 1

6. The Chairman said that the Subcommittee had completed the discussion on the funding proposal under the agenda item, i.e. PWSC(2014-15)7, at the meeting on 7 May 2014. The Subcommittee would commence the process of voting on whether the proposed motions forwarded by members under Paragraph 32A of the PWSC Procedure ("32A") on the agenda item should be proceeded forthwith.

Motions proposed under Paragraph 32A of the PWSC Procedure

7. The Chairman advised that, in view of some members' requests for written information about his decision made at a previous meeting on the admissibility of motions proposed under 32A, he had instructed the Clerk to issue on 26 May 2014 LC Paper No. PWSC82/13-14, which included a reply to Mr Gary FAN's letter dated 21 May 2014. In the reply, he had set out the considerations and principles that he had taken in making the aforesaid decision. He said that, pursuant to Paragraph 27 of the PWSC Procedure, the Chairman's decision on a point of order shall be final. However, he would welcome members' discussion on the matter in other occasions.

8. Mr Gary FAN said that in a letter dated 20 May 2014 from the Chairman to him, the Chairman had advised that he had ruled out the 26 proposed motions proposed by him having made reference to the LegCo President's ruling made on 17 April 2014 on the Committee stage amendments proposed by 14 Members to the Appropriation Bill 2014 ("the President's ruling of 17 April 2014"). He understood that the Chairman had drawn reference from paragraphs 13 and 16 of President's ruling, in which Rule 57(4) of RoP was quoted. However, in the Chairman's reply of 26 May 2014, the Chairman advised that Rule 57(4) only applied to amendments to bills and he had made reference to paragraphs 11, 12, 14 and 17 of the President's ruling when determining the admissibility of the 26 proposed motions. Noting that in these paragraphs, the President had stated that the constitutional powers and functions that he should exercise and discharge, including presiding over meetings, were prescribed in Article 72 of the Basic Law ("BL 72"), Mr FAN queried whether it was appropriate for the Chairman to make reference to these paragraphs and apply BL 72 to the business of the Subcommittee. He sought Legal Adviser's views on the issue. He added that the President's ruling of 17 April 2014 had not just referred to BL 72 but also Rule 92 of RoP. For the consideration of the admissibility of the motions proposed by members at PWSC meetings, the Chairman should strictly comply with 32A.

9. At the invitation of the Chairman, Legal Adviser gave his views on the issues raised by Mr Gary FAN. He said that in the Chairman's reply of 26 May 2014, the Chairman highlighted that like the LegCo President, the Chairman of the Subcommittee had the responsibility to ensure the orderly, fair and proper conduct of meetings. The functions that the President should discharge in presiding over meetings had all along been mirrored by Chairmen of the committees of LegCo, including the Finance Committee ("FC"). Referring to an information paper entitled "The Secretary General's note to the Chairman of the Finance Committee", issued vide LC Paper No. FC51/09-10 on 14 January 2010, Legal Adviser said it was mentioned in paragraph 12 that it was the responsibility of the FC Chairman to chair meetings of FC in accordance with RoP and the FC Procedure. Although not explicitly provided, in line with the guiding principles set out in the handbooks for chairmen of committees, the responsibilities of a committee chairman should include ensuring that the business on the agenda was transacted in a proper and efficient manner.

10. The Chairman advised that the underlying principles for his decision on the 26 motions proposed by Mr Gary FAN as set out in his letters to Mr FAN on 20 and 26 May and explained at the meeting on 21 May were basically the same. He reiterated that the decision was final and welcomed members to discuss the matter with him in other occasions.

11. Mr Albert CHAN said that as the Chairman's decision on the 26 proposed motions would have an effect on how the meeting should proceed, the Chairman should invite Legal Adviser to provide his views on the decision from a legal perspective and allow members to discuss it in light of the legal advice.

12. Mr IP Kwok-him said that the decision made by the Chairman on the admissibility of proposed motions shall be final. To avoid delaying the proceedings of the Subcommittee, members should not further discuss the decision. The Chairman should address members' queries over his decision outside the meeting.

13. Ms Emily LAU said that the Chairman's approach to the handling of the 26 motions proposed by Mr Gary FAN, which were regarded by the Chairman as sequential, was different from the approach adopted in the past for dealing with proposed motions. Moreover, the Chairman's reply of 26 May 2014 had not fully addressed members' queries over his decision on the admissibility of the 26 proposed motions. As such, she had suggested in a meeting among the Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen of FC, PWSC and the Establishment Subcommittee ("ESC") on 26 May 2014 that the Chairman should, with the assistance of the Secretariat, provide a paper to explain the basis on which he had made the decision and how it was related to BL 72. As the Chairman had not accepted her suggestion to provide a paper, he should expect that members would keep on raising queries at the meeting over his decision.

14. The Chairman reiterated that he welcomed members to give their views on his decision on the admissibility of the 26 proposed motions outside the meeting. For instance, the meeting of the Chairmen and Deputy Chairmen of FC, PWSC and ESC on 26 May 2014 was one of the platforms to discuss the matter. The Chairman considered that he had provided a clear response to members' concerns on the matter in his letter to Mr Gary FAN dated 26 May 2014. He had nothing to supplement.

15. Mr Gary FAN opined that, as the Chairman would exercise his power at the current meeting to decide on the admissibility of other motions to be proposed by members, he should address members' concerns about his decision on the 26 proposed motions. The Chairman reiterated that it was not appropriate to discuss his decision at the current meeting. If a member further spoke on it without his permission, he would direct him/her to withdraw from the meeting. He said that the meeting should proceed with the unfinished items on the agenda.

Voting on 87 motions proposed by members

16. The Chairman advised that Mr Albert CHAN had forwarded to him 14 proposed motions on the agenda item at the meeting on 21 May 2014 and had subsequently withdrawn one of them (proposed motion numbered 0006), as it was a duplicate of another proposed motion. On the day before the meeting, he had received another 46 proposed motions from Mr CHAN and eight from Mr Gary FAN. He considered that these 67 proposed motions were directly related to the agenda item. For each of them, he would put to vote on whether it should be proceeded forthwith. Shortly before the current meeting, he had received nine more proposed motions from Mr Gary FAN. He had yet to peruse these motions.

17. The Chairman said that in deciding the admissibility of a motion proposed under 32A, he had struck a proper balance between respecting the right of individual members to propose motions to express views on an agenda item and ensuring the proper functioning of the Subcommittee. However, if motions proposed by member(s) were considered only serving the purpose of protracting the consideration process and were not reasonably related to the functions of the Subcommittee, or would prevent the Subcommittee from properly discharging its functions, he would take appropriate action to ensure the orderly, fair and proper conduct of the meeting.

18. The Chairman appealed to members to complete the process of expressing views under 32A as soon as possible. He said that, after the Subcommittee had completed considering the proposed motions forwarded to him, it would then proceed to vote on whether the funding proposal to upgrade the public works project under the agenda item, i.e. 177 DR, should be recommended for FC's approval.

19. The Chairman put to vote the question that proposed motion numbered 0001 be proceeded forthwith. Mr Albert CHAN requested a division. The division bell was rung for five minutes before members' voting on the question. Of the 19 members present, 18 members voted. Six members voted for, 12 voted against the question and no one abstained. The question was voted down by a majority of members.

20. Mr IP Kwok-him moved that in the event of further divisions being claimed in respect of any motions or questions under the same agenda item, the Subcommittee would proceed to each of such divisions immediately after the division bell had been rung for one minute. The Chairman put the motion to vote. Mr Albert CHAN requested a division and the division bell was rung for five minutes before members' voting on the motion. Of the 19

members present, 18 members voted. Sixteen members voted for, two voted against the motion and no one abstained. The Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

21. The Chairman took turn to put to vote the questions that proposed motions numbered 0002 to 0005 and 0007 to 0059 be proceeded forthwith. As requested by members, the division bell was rung for one minute before members' voting on individual questions. All questions were voted down by a majority of members.

[At 11:04 am, at the request of Mr Gary FAN, the Chairman ordered that the meeting be suspended for five minutes. The meeting was resumed at 11:14 am.]

22. The Chairman took turn to put to vote the questions that proposed motions numbered 0060 to 0068 be proceeded forthwith. As requested by members, the division bell was rung for one minute before members' voting on individual questions. All questions were voted down by a majority of members.

23. The Chairman advised that in addition to the nine proposed motions (numbered 0069 to 0077) received from Mr Gary FAN at the meeting, he had received nine new proposed motions from Mr Albert CHAN (numbered 0078 to 0086) and two (numbered 0087 to 0088) from Dr Fernando CHEUNG. He ruled that these motions were in order. The Chairman said that earlier on at the meeting, he had appealed to members to complete the process of expressing views on the agenda item under 32A as soon as possible. He had in fact given ample time for members to give views on the agenda item and strived to strike a balance between respecting the right of individual members to propose motions and ensuring the efficient and orderly conduct of the Subcommittee. He observed that some of the proposed motions forwarded to him were similar in content in that they urged the Administration to set certain conditions in the works contracts for integrated waste management facilities phase 1, though the conditions mentioned in different motions were not the same. He believed members would agree that he should not accept any more new motions. After the Subcommittee had completed the process of considering the remaining 20 proposed motions, he would put the proposal under PWSC(2014-15)7 to vote.

24. The Chairman took turn to put to vote the questions that proposed motions numbered 0069 to 0088 be proceeded forthwith. As requested by members, the division bell was rung for one minute before members' voting on individual questions. All questions were voted down by a majority of members.

25. The Chairman said that the meeting had considered all the motions proposed by members on agenda item 1, i.e. the proposal under PWSC(2014-15)7. He put the item to vote. At the request of Dr Fernando CHEUNG, the Chairman ordered a division. The division bell was rung for one minute.

[At the juncture, a person climbed over the railing of the public gallery and sat on a projector, shouting down into the conference room. The Chairman ordered that the meeting be suspended for security staff to remove the person from the dangerous position. The division bell was stopped. The meeting was resumed at 12:07 pm.]

26. The Chairman said that the Subcommittee would resume the consideration of the funding proposal under PWSC(2014-15)7. He put the item to vote. The division bell was rung for one minute again. Of the 21 members present, 20 members voted. Fourteen voted for, six voted against the proposal and no one abstained. The voting result was as follows:

For:

Mr CHAN Kam-lam
Mr WONG Kwok-hing
Mr IP Kwok-him
Mr Frankie YICK
Mr Charles MOK
Miss Alice MAK
Dr CHIANG Lai-wan
(14 members)

Mr TAM Yiu-chung
Mr CHAN Hak-kan
Mr Michael TIEN
Mr MA Fung-kwok
Mr LEUNG Che-cheung
Dr Elizabeth QUAT
Mr Tony TSE

Against:

Ms Emily LAU
Mr WU Chi-wai
Dr Kenneth CHAN
(6 members)

Mr Albert CHAN
Mr Gary FAN
Dr Fernando CHEUNG

Abstain:

(0 member)

27. The Chairman declared that the item was endorsed by the Subcommittee.

**Head 708 –Capital Subventions and Major Systems and Equipment
PWSC(2014-15)8 70MM Redevelopment of Queen Mary Hospital,
phase 1**

28. The Chairman advised that the proposal was to upgrade part of 70MM to Category A at an estimated cost of \$1,592.8 million in money-of-the-day prices for the preparatory works for the redevelopment of Queen Mary Hospital ("QMH"), phase 1. The Panel on Health Services had been consulted on the proposal on 17 February 2014 and Panel members in general supported the funding proposal. The gist of the Panel's discussion had been tabled at the meeting.

Timeframe for the redevelopment of Queen Mary Hospital

29. Dr Fernando CHEUNG expressed support for the redevelopment of QMH. He said that according to the Administration's paper, the phase 1 redevelopment of the hospital would be carried out in stages, namely, preparatory works and main works, which were expected to be completed in September 2017 and 2023 respectively. He queried why it would need to take about a decade for the Administration to complete the two stages of works and asked whether the time for completing the works could be shortened.

30. Under Secretary for Food and Health ("USFH") explained that before embarking on the main works, the Hospital Authority ("HA") would need to carry out the proposed preparatory works to, among others, temporarily decant the existing facilities and equipment in the Clinical Pathology Block ("CPB"), the University Pathology Block ("UPB") and the Housemen Quarters ("HQ") to the vacated Senior Staff Quarters ("SSQ"). The Administration would commence the works shortly after obtaining FC's funding approval for the preparatory works. As part of the preparatory works, CPB, UPB and HQ would be decanted to make way for the provision of a new hospital block comprising more than 30 storeys. The construction of the new block would be carried out under the stage of main works construction, which was expected to be completed by 2023. She added that the present funding proposal covered the preparatory works. Funding for the main works would be sought separately at a later stage.

31. Chief Manager (Capital Planning), Hospital Authority ("CM(CP)/HA"), advised that as the redevelopment of QMH would be taken forward when the hospital remained in operation, it was necessary for HA to first carry out the proposed decanting works before proceeding to the demolition and construction works. He assured members that although there were limited opportunities to shorten the timeframe for the works, HA

would make the best efforts to expedite the project as far as practicable.

32. Mr WONG Kwok-hing said that he fully supported the funding proposal. He cautioned that if the funding for the redevelopment project could not be secured timely, the project might have to be re-tendered, hence driving up its cost. He appealed to members to support the proposal.

33. Ms Emily LAU said that the redevelopment of QMH, in operation for more than 75 years, had been long called for. As the hospital's buildings were aged and its facilities were outdated, members of the public had expressed a strong request for the redevelopment. She shared the view of Dr Fernando CHEUNG that the time for completing the phase 1 redevelopment was too long and urged the Administration to expedite the works.

34. Mr IP Kwok-him said that LegCo Members belonging to the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong supported the funding proposal. As the facilities of QMH were old and outdated, the redevelopment project should be taken forward as early as possible for the betterment of the residents of the Hong Kong Island. He appealed to members to support the proposal. Taking in view that the hospital's existing buildings were located in an area of unfavourable topography and the proposed works had to be carried out when the hospital was providing services to the public, he said it was inevitable that the redevelopment project would take a relatively long time. Mr IP asked whether HA had the confidence that the project could be completed on schedule and within budget. Cluster Chief Executive (Hong Kong West Cluster), Hospital Authority ("CCE(HKWC)/HA"), replied that HA would make careful planning for and monitoring of the project with a view to ensuring its timely delivery and keeping the cost under control.

Public consultation

35. While expressing support in principle for the redevelopment of QMH, Dr Kenneth CHAN said that he had received views from local residents that they had not been given adequate information on the proposed redevelopment project during the consultation stage. To ensure the smooth implementation of the project, the Administration should address in a timely manner the concerns of local residents over the possible nuisances arising from the proposed works. He enquired about the progress of the work of the Administration in engaging local groups and the relevant district councils to address such concerns.

36. USFH replied that the Administration had consulted the Culture Leisure & Social Affairs Committee ("CLSAC") of the Central and Western District Council and the Community Affairs and Tourism Development Committee ("CATC") of the Southern District Council on the proposed works in November 2013. Members of CLSAC and CATC supported the proposed project. HA had taken the initiative to brief members of the relevant district councils on local residents' concerns and had engaged consultants to explore feasible solutions. Of the two residential developments near the SSQ site, residents of Radcliffe were concerned on the short distance between their residence and the proposed location of a temporary mortuary to be provided as part of the proposed works. As mitigation measures would be taken and there were no other sites suitable for providing the mortuary, HA would maintain the original proposal.

37. CCE(HKWC)/HA supplemented that representatives of QMH and the two residential developments had met many times since September 2013 to discuss the measures to address the residents' concerns. He advised that as the proposed mortuary was completely enclosed, the activities inside it would not be visible to members of the public from outside. Moreover, ceremonies and rituals would be held indoors. The vehicles used to deliver corpses to the proposed mortuary would look the same as other hospital vehicles. The mortuary would have a natural and pleasant appearance. He assured members that HA would continue to communicate with local communities on the matter.

38. Dr Kenneth CHAN added that local residents did not object to the proposed mortuary but had suggested that it should be a two-storey building provided at a location farther away from the residential developments. He urged the Administration to actively pursue the suggestions.

Cost estimation and control

39. Ms Emily LAU was concerned whether project cost overrun would occur and enquired about the measures to control the cost of the proposed works. CM(CP)/HA replied that as HA had completed the tender assessment for the proposed preparatory works, the tender price was already known. Moreover, the project cost estimate had included adequate provision for price adjustment to cover market fluctuation in the costs of construction and hospital equipment. In light of past experience, HA believed that the present project cost estimate was adequate. He added that the provision for price adjustment was calculated in accordance with the Government's forecast of price adjustment factor which was determined based on the trend rate of change in the prices for public sector building and construction output. In response to Ms LAU's enquiry on whether the cost

estimate was meant to be the ultimate budget ceiling for the project, CM(CP)/HA advised in the affirmative.

40. Mr James TIEN said he was a resident of the Hong Kong Island and had used the services provided by QMH. He opined that, though the hospital was installed with advanced equipment and technology, its buildings and facilities were outdated. Considering that there was currently a shortage of manpower supply in the construction industry and that the projects to be delivered under the Administration's initiatives to increase housing supply would generate a large demand for construction manpower, he was concerned whether the redevelopment of QMH could be completed on schedule and within budget. He enquired whether the Administration had conducted an assessment on the impact of the construction manpower shortfall on the project.

41. CM(CP)/HA replied that as compared with most of other projects undertaken by HA, the number of construction workers required for the preparatory works of the redevelopment of QMH was relatively small. Moreover, since HA had specified in the tender document the scope of the proposed works and the responsibilities of the contractor, the contractor was required to bear the risk of manpower shortfall. As such, the cost of the proposed project was under control.

42. Mr James TIEN enquired whether the design for the proposed works had been finalized. He was concerned that changes to the design in future might result in an increase in the cost of the works. CM(CP)/HA replied that HA had completed the detailed design for the proposed works. The relevant tender document had been prepared according to the design. Adjustments to the design, if necessary, would be kept to the minimum.

43. Mr Albert CHAN enquired whether foundation works would be carried out as part of the proposed project. Considering that QMH was located at the mid-levels and its redevelopment would include the construction of a new hospital block of more than 30 storeys, Mr CHAN cautioned that if foundation works were included, the Administration would need to conduct proper and adequate site investigation and take into full account the ground conditions at the construction site when working out the relevant cost estimate. In reply, CM(CP)/HA advised that the foundation works associated with the construction of the new hospital block would be carried out in the next stage of the phase 1 redevelopment. As regards the proposed preparatory works, the main part was decanting and conversion works, while piling/foundation works of a small scale involving a proposed funding provision of \$9.6 million would be conducted in a car park.

Impact of the proposed works on historic buildings

44. Miss Alice MAK asked the Administration to provide details about how it would carry out the proposed works with care to protect the three historic buildings/structures located in the vicinity of the project site. Citing the case of the Shatin to Central Link in which part of the construction works had been halted due to the discovery of a well and other relics dating back to the Song Dynasty, she cautioned that to ensure the smooth implementation of the proposed works, HA should take early steps to assess the impact of the project on heritage resources and take remedial measures as appropriate. CM(CP)/HA replied that the works contractor would be required to take measures to ensure that these historic buildings/structures might not be adversely affected by the proposed works. Only after obtaining the consent of HA and the Antiquities and Monuments Office could the contractor commence the proposed works. He explained that unlike the case of the Shatin to Central Link in which the heritage assets were discovered within the works area, the three historic buildings/structures were located outside the boundary of the works site and hence would not cause a great impact on the progress of the proposed works.

Accessibility of the hospital site

45. Miss Alice MAK enquired how the proposed redevelopment project would address the limited accessibility of the hospital site, which was currently served by one access road only. CM(CP)/HA advised that a new access point from Pok Fu Lam Road to the new hospital block would be provided to enhance the overall accessibility of the hospital.

[The Chairman ordered that the meeting be extended to 1:00 pm.]

Allocation of resources among hospital clusters

46. Mr Albert CHAN expressed support in principle for the proposal to enhance the buildings and facilities of QMH. He opined that there were all along complaints about the inadequate allocation of HA's medical service manpower and resources to the New Territories West ("NTW") Cluster as compared to the Hong Kong West Cluster ("HKW"). He considered that the problem would be aggravated upon the completion of the redevelopment of QMH. Mr CHAN said that experienced doctors of Tuen Mun Hospital had expressed worries that the manpower resources for the hospital would continue to deteriorate and the future of the hospital would be gloomy, hence adversely affecting its medical services. He enquired about the Administration's plan to improve the facilities and services of Tuen Mun Hospital.

47. The Chairman said that the question raised by Mr Albert CHAN was not related to the agenda item. However, he would exercise his discretion to invite the Administration to answer the question. USFH replied that the Food and Health Bureau had maintained close collaboration with HA on the operation of each hospital cluster, such as monitoring the waiting time for medical services, and the need for improvement works, etc. As regards the NTW Cluster, HA was planning to provide additional operating theatres to shorten the waiting time for surgical operations. Moreover, the Administration had set up a committee to conduct an overall review of the operation of HA. The review would look into, among others, the issue about distribution of resources among hospital clusters and would take into account public views on the matter.

48. Mr Albert CHAN requested the Administration to provide a comparison between hospitals of the HKW Cluster and the NTW Cluster upon the completion of the redevelopment of QMH in respect of medical facilities, healthcare manpower support and service delivery. He remarked that the comparison would facilitate the public to understand the difference between the resources allocated to the two clusters. While undertaking to provide the information requested by Mr CHAN, USFH advised that HA had all along allocated resources carefully to each hospital cluster in view of their individual circumstances and specific needs. In determining the allocation of resources to a cluster, HA took into account many factors such as the population growth and the demand for healthcare services in the catchment area of the cluster, specific services available in the cluster, etc. She opined that a direct comparison as suggested by Mr CHAN might not be appropriate.

(Post meeting note: The Administration's written response was forwarded to members vide LC Paper No. PWSC105/13-14(01) on 23 June 2014.)

Redevelopment and expansion of public hospitals

49. Dr Fernando CHEUNG shared other members' concerns on the allocation of HA's resources among clusters and enquired about the timetable to expand or redevelop Tuen Mun Hospital and North District Hospital. He opined that the existing demand for the service of Tuen Mun Hospital, which had been in operation for more than two decades, had exceeded its capacity. There was also a need to convert North District Hospital to a general hospital. Noting that under the 2014-2015 Government Budget, the Financial Secretary had proposed to spend \$55 billion on the projects to expand or redevelop existing hospitals and to construct new hospitals, he enquired about the Administration's overall plan in this respect.

50. USFH replied that the Administration had briefed the Panel on Health Services at a meeting in July 2013 on the redevelopment and expansion plans of public hospitals. In planning the redevelopment or expansion of existing hospitals, the Administration would take into account the future population growth and demographic changes in different districts, the demand for healthcare services, etc. The Chairman advised that Dr CHEUNG might consider pursuing the subject at the relevant Panel. At the request of Dr CHEUNG, the Administration would provide the plan, including the relevant timetables, of HA, for the redevelopment and/or expansion of existing public hospitals in Hong Kong to meet the changing healthcare needs of the public.

(Post meeting note: The Administration's written response was forwarded to members vide LC Paper No. PWSC105/13-14(01) on 23 June 2014.)

Medical service manpower planning

51. Mr Michael TIEN said that the Administration should give due regard not only to enhancing the hardware facilities of hospitals but also the manpower support. He was concerned about the shortage of medical and nursing staff in HA. While acknowledging the need to redevelop QMH, he opined that the existing manpower allocated to the NTW Cluster was seriously inadequate and the Administration should accord priority to increasing the manpower resources for the cluster.

52. USFH admitted that there was a shortage of medical service manpower in HA. To strengthen the manpower of the medical profession in Hong Kong, the Administration had put in place a series of measures including increasing the number of medical student places by 100 since 2012 so that the number of local medical graduates would start to go up after 2017-2018. The Administration was also in discussion with the Medical Council of Hong Kong to explore the feasibility of increasing the number of its Licensing Examination per year from one to two, with a view to facilitating those overseas-trained Hong Kong residents to return to practise in Hong Kong. She advised that HA worked out its annual plans to allocate new manpower resources such as medical graduates to individual clusters with reference to the need of the hospitals. For instance, if the staffing for the NTW Cluster was inadequate, HA would deploy more manpower to the cluster.

53. Mr Michael TIEN enquired whether in determining the deployment of manpower resources to a cluster, HA would take into account not only the

demand for healthcare services in the catchment area of the cluster but also the cost of investment in the hardware facilities of the hospitals. He was of the view that the scale of facilities provided in a cluster should not be a factor determining the allocation of manpower resources. USFH advised that HA was reviewing the current approach to allocation of manpower and other resources to clusters. Under the existing mechanism, HA would take into account a set of factors in allocating resources, such as the population size and the demand for healthcare services in the catchment area of a cluster, etc.

54. Mr Michael TIEN further enquired about the measures to be put in place by HA to retain and attract doctors to work in those public hospitals located at remote areas such as NTW. USFH replied that the issue would be one of the subjects to be considered in the review. The Chairman suggested that Mr TIEN might pursue the matter at the meetings of the relevant Panel.

55. The Chairman put the item to vote. At the request of Mr WONG Kwok-hing, the Chairman ordered a division. Of the 19 members present, 18 members voted. Eighteen voted for, no member voted against the proposal and no one abstained. The voting result was as follows:

For:

Mr James TO	Mr CHAN Kam-lam
Ms Emily LAU	Mr TAM Yiu-chung
Mr WONG Kwok-hing	Ms Cyd HO
Mr CHAN Kin-por	Mr IP Kwok-him
Mr Alan LEONG	Mr Albert CHAN
Mr Michael TIEN	Mr Frankie YICK
Mr WU Chi-wai	Mr Charles MOK
Dr Kenneth CHAN	Miss Alice MAK
Dr Fernando CHEUNG	Dr CHIANG Lai-wan

(18 members)

Against:

(0 member)

Abstain:

(0 member)

56. The Chairman declared that the item was endorsed by the Subcommittee.

57. Members noted that the Administration planned to submit the funding proposals endorsed at the meeting on 21 May 2014 and the current meeting to FC on 27 June 2014, i.e. 164DR, 177DR and 70MM. The Chairman

consulted members on whether any of the three items would require separate voting at the FC meeting. Mr Albert CHAN and Dr Kenneth CHAN requested that 164DR and 177DR be voted on separately at the FC meeting. Mr Albert CHAN continued that as regards 70MM, he might request the same after considering the supplementary information on the proposal to be provided by the Administration after the meeting.

Any other business

58. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12:58 pm.

Council Business Division 1
Legislative Council Secretariat
26 June 2014