

立法會
Legislative Council

LC Paper No. PWSC133/13-14
(These minutes have been seen
by the Administration)

Ref : CB1/F/2/1(19)B

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

**Minutes of the 18th meeting
held in Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex
on Tuesday, 24 June 2014, at 9:00 am**

Members present:

Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kiwok, BBS, MH, JP (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
Dr Hon LEUNG Ka-lau
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-kiwok, SBS, JP
Hon Charles Peter MOK
Hon CHAN Han-pan
Hon CHAN Yuen-han, SBS, JP

Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, JP
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, JP
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, JP
Hon Christopher CHUNG Shu-kun, BBS, MH, JP
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen

Member attending:

Hon CHAN Chi-chuen

Members absent:

Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, BBS, MH, JP (Deputy Chairman)
Dr Hon Kenneth CHAN Ka-lok

Public officers attending:

Mr YEUNG Tak-keung	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) ³
Mr WAI Chi-sing, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Works)
Mr Thomas CHOW Tat-ming, JP	Permanent Secretary for Development (Planning and Lands)
Mr TSE Chin-wan, JP	Deputy Director (1) Environmental Protection Department
Ms Jasmine CHOI Suet-yung	Principal Assistant Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) (Works)
Mr HON Chi-keung, JP	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr Robin LEE Kui-biu	Deputy Head of Civil Engineering Office (Port and Land) Civil Engineering and Development Department
Ms Amy CHEUNG Yi-mei	Assistant Director (Territorial) (Acting) Planning Department
Mr David LAM Chi-man	Chief Town Planner (Strategic Planning) (Acting) Planning Department

Clerk in attendance:

Ms Sharon CHUNG

Chief Council Secretary (1)6

Staff in attendance:

Mr Andy LAU

Assistant Secretary General 1

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 21 Capital Works Reserve Fund items of 58,856.9 million had been endorsed by the Public Works Subcommittee ("PWSC") in the 2013-2014 session so far, of which \$55,106.0 million was related to capital works projects. He advised that together with the four unfinished agenda items carried over from the meeting on 18 June 2014, there were 13 funding proposals on the agenda of the meeting, which, if endorsed, would involve a total funding allocation of \$16,372.6 million. Of these proposals, 12 were for upgrading twelve 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 34, while the total amount of funding approved would be \$75,229.5 million, of which \$71,478.6 million was related to capital works projects.

2. 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)11 768CL Strategic studies for artificial islands in the Central Waters

3. The Chairman said that the Subcommittee had commenced discussion on the item, i.e. PWSC (2014-15)11, at the previous meeting on 18 June 2014 and it would continue the deliberation. He advised that he would put the item to vote after the Subcommittee had finished the discussion on it.

Purpose and cost of the strategic studies

4. The Subcommittee noted that the estimated cost of the proposed strategic studies for developing artificial islands in the central waters ("the proposed study") was \$226.9 million. Mr Alan LEONG was of the view that compared with the funding of \$15 million approved by the Finance Committee ("FC") in June 2000 to carry out a territorial development strategic study entitled "Hong Kong 2030: Planning Vision and Strategy" ("the Hong Kong 2030 Study"), the cost of the proposed study was substantial. He asked the Administration to clarify whether after spending such a large sum of public monies on the proposed study, the Administration would proceed to develop artificial islands in the central waters.

5. Director of Civil Engineering and Development ("DCED") said that the study area of the proposed study was over 200 square kilometres. According to the Administration's internal broad-brush assessments, there was good potential to develop artificial islands in the central waters while the number, location and extent of the artificial islands would be examined under the proposed study. Assistant Director (Territorial) (Acting), Planning Department ("AD(Territorial)(Acting)/PlanD"), advised that the expenditure incurred in the Hong Kong 2030 Study was much lower than that of the proposed study because a large part of the former Study had been conducted by the staff of PlanD through redeployment of internal resources.

6. Mr Albert CHAN opined that the proposed study, covering the engineering feasibility aspect, was more than a conceptual study. He stressed that instead of getting down to feasibility studies on individual sites, the Administration should first conduct a territory-wide strategic land planning study before recommending potential sites for developing artificial islands. It should also consult the public on the recommendation. Considering that the Administration would certainly proceed to construct artificial islands after completing the proposed study, he criticized that the Administration had not followed its established planning procedures.

7. DCED advised that the proposed study would focus on strategic issues. It would preliminarily assess, among others, the impact of the development of potential artificial islands on water flow, navigation channels, anchorages, etc. After the preliminary extent and location of artificial islands had been determined, separate detailed planning and engineering studies would follow.

8. AD(Territorial)(Acting)/PlanD explained, that when formulating the territorial development strategy under the Hong Kong 2030 Study, the Administration had taken into account other relevant studies, including the

Planning and Development Studies on North East and North West New Territories. She advised that the Administration planned to update the territorial development strategy under the Hong Kong 2030 Study shortly. The findings of other relevant studies such as the "Study on the Strategic Development Plan for Hong Kong Port 2030" currently undertaken by the Transport and Housing Bureau as well as the proposed study would provide inputs to the update.

9. Mr Alan LEONG enquired whether the Administration would go through the statutory town planning procedures after completing the proposed study and before commencing the construction of artificial islands. He was concerned about the consequence if the Town Planning Board ("TPB") eventually did not agree to the proposed land use plan for the development of artificial islands. In reply, AD(Territorial)(Acting)/PlanD assured members that the Administration would proceed with its land development proposals in accordance with the established procedures including seeking TPB's agreement to a draft outline zoning plan. In response to Mr LEONG's enquiry about the timetable for submitting the relevant planning proposals in respect of artificial islands to TPB, DCED advised that, as the proposed study would take a few years to complete, the timetable was not available for the time being. The Chairman remarked that the Administration would need to consult the public after the location of potential artificial islands had been identified.

10. The Subcommittee noted that the proposed funding included a provision of \$147.3 million for consultants' fees. Mr Tony TSE and Dr Fernando CHEUNG enquired about the number of consultants to be engaged by the Administration to carry out the proposed study. Mr TSE said that in view of the multi-disciplinary nature of the study requirements, it was not appropriate for the Administration to commission one single consultancy firm to take charge of all parts of the proposed study. At the request of Mr TSE, the Administration would provide: (a) whether the consultancy firm to be appointed for the proposed study was required to possess all the expertise on the various areas to be covered by the study; and if no, the criteria for the selection of the firm; and (b) if the consultancy firm to be appointed was allowed to engage other consultants for the proposed study, i.e., the consultancy firm to be appointed being the main consultant, the types of expertise or professional knowledge the main consultant was expected to have.

Admin

11. Mr Gary FAN said that although the funding proposal was subject to FC's approval, the Administration had already launched the relevant tender invitation on 9 April 2014 with a closing date on 23 April 2014. In response to his enquiry on whether the aforesaid arrangement was in compliance with

the established procedures, DCED advised in the affirmative. He explained that the tender invitation was an exercise to identify bidders who would express interest in conducting the proposed study. The Administration was not required to compensate them even if FC did not approve the funding proposal.

12. Noting that the proposed funding included a provision of 29 million for carrying out site investigation, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen enquired about the details of the works to be involved. Deputy Head of Civil Engineering Office (Port and Land), Civil Engineering and Development Department ("DH(CEO)(P&L)/CEDD"), replied that the proposed site investigation works included marine drilling, geological surveys, assessment on sediments, laboratory testing of soil samples, etc.

13. Dr Fernando CHEUNG enquired about the area covered by the works to be undertaken when carrying out the proposed study and whether the works would involve dredging of seabed. Mr Gary FAN raised concern about the scale of dredging works. DCED replied that a plan showing the study area of the proposed study was at Enclosure 1 to the Administration's paper, i.e. PWSC(2014-15)11. Details about the area at which works would be undertaken as part of the proposed study were yet to be confirmed. He advised that taking seabed soil samples was the main purpose of the site investigation works. Large-scale works including dredging would not be carried out under the proposed study.

14. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen said that according to the Administration's plan, it would complete the proposed study in August 2017. He enquired why the Administration had proposed in paragraph 12 of the discussion paper to phase the expenditure until 2018-2019. DH(CEO)(P&L)/CEDD explained that part of the proposed funding, about \$10 million, would be used for finalizing the account of the proposed study.

Reclamation as a strategy to enhance land supply

15. The Subcommittee noted that the Administration had conducted a two-stage public engagement ("PE") exercise for the "Enhancing Land Supply Strategy: Reclamation outside Victoria Harbour and Rock Cavern Development" ("ELSS"). Referring to Enclosure 2 to the Administration's paper, which stated that according to the views collected in the Stage 2 PE, land reserve and residential development were the most supported land uses for artificial islands in the central waters between Lantau and Hong Kong Island, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen queried whether, apart from collecting comments on land use options for potential reclamation sites, the Administration had asked the public to give views on whether they supported

reclamation as a strategy to increase land supply.

16. DCED replied that during the Stage 1 PE, the public had been consulted on the need and different methods of increasing land supply, including reclamation outside Victoria Harbour. The Administration sought public views subsequently during the Stage 2 PE on, among others, possible land uses for the potential reclamation sites as well as the areas of concern to be addressed in future studies. DH(CEO)(P&L)/CEDD supplemented that the public views collected during the Stage 2 PE was in the form of responses to open-ended questions on the land uses of potential near-shore reclamation sites and artificial islands in the central waters, as well as the aspects of these sites that the Government should pay attention to when carrying out future studies.

17. Mr Gary FAN said that a considerable number of respondents in the various surveys conducted during the Stage 1 PE did not support increasing land supply through reclamation. He queried how the Administration had reached the conclusion, as stated in paragraph 5 of the discussion paper, that there had been broad support for a six-pronged approach for increasing land supply, including reclamation.

18. DH(CEO)(P&L)/CEDD responded that during the four-month Stage 1 PE, the Administration had collected more than 40 000 feedback including about 8 500 from feedback questionnaires, about 1 470 from a territory-wide telephone poll and about 30 000 qualitative feedback from other channels, including 33 signature campaigns/petitions. The Social Sciences Research Centre of the University of Hong Kong had been engaged as an independent research consultant for the collection, compilation, analysis and reporting of the views expressed by stakeholders and members of the public. A specific question about the six-pronged approach including re-zoning, resumption, redevelopment, reclamation outside Victoria Harbour, rock cavern development and re-use of ex-quarry sites for increasing land supply was asked in the telephone poll. Of the respondents for the telephone poll, over 50% supported and 30% were neutral and less than 17% objected to the six-pronged approach for enhancing land supply. In respect of reclamation outside Victoria Harbour, there were about 34% of respondents showing support in the telephone poll and about 46% did not support this initiative. The results of the questionnaire survey were the opposite, with about 49% of feedback showing support for reclamation outside Victoria Harbour and about 42% not supporting this initiative. The surveys indicated that the views on reclamation outside Victoria Harbour were mixed while there was a broad support for a six-pronged approach for increasing land supply. As regards the qualitative feedback, most of the views were collected from signature campaigns/petitions organized by the local communities, opposing

reclamation at some specific locations, such as Wu Kai Sha, Tsing Lung Tau, etc. It reflected that these opposing views were mainly site-specific.

Need for developing artificial islands

19. With reference to the Administration's position that one of the purposes for exploring ways to develop the central waters was to accommodate new population, Ms Cyd HO remarked that the current fertility rate and the replacement rate in Hong Kong were low. She opined that, to ascertain whether it was necessary for Hong Kong to create land through reclamation, the Administration needed to first engage members of the public in formulating a population policy. Ms HO commented that, to facilitate public discussion on whether the initiative to develop artificial islands in the central waters should be supported, the Administration should make clear to the public the future land uses of the islands, whether the new land resources would be reserved for providing housing, the proposed public-private housing ratio, etc.

20. DCED replied that according to the Census and Statistics Department, Hong Kong's population by 2041, which included 150 persons per day under the one-way permit quota for family reunion, was forecast to increase to about 8.47 million. The results of the PE exercise of ELSS had confirmed that the Administration should take action to increase land supply to cater for the projected population increase, and to improve the existing living environment of Hong Kong people. He said that in the past few decades, land formation through reclamation had helped address the need for land resources in Hong Kong. Currently, the total area of reclaimed land was about 68 square kilometres, representing only about 7% of the total land area in Hong Kong. The reclaimed land however provided housing units for 27% of the population as well as 70% of the total office floor area. As regards the land uses of the artificial islands, the issue would be examined in subsequent planning and engineering studies.

21. Ms Cyd HO held the view that land policy should be formulated taking into account the population policy, which should cover, among others, setting a target on the number of immigrants allowed, the arrangements for entry of Mainland residents for family reunion, etc. She cautioned the Administration that the initiatives to increase land supply, if not well coordinated across different policy bureaux, would not achieve the purpose of easing the housing problem faced by the grassroots.

22. The Chairman remarked that as a matter of principle, policy matters should be discussed at the relevant Panel meetings. The Subcommittee's discussions should focus on the funding proposal. However, he would

exercise his discretion to invite the Administration to respond to Ms HO's views. DCED replied that population policy was not under the purview of CEDD. However, he said that developing artificial islands was a long-term measure to increase land supply and this was important to Hong Kong. Considering that the central waters had good potential for such development, the Administration had therefore proposed to take an early step to carry out the proposed study.

23. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan opined that to improve the living conditions faced by some residents in the urban areas, such as those currently residing in subdivided units in Kowloon West, there was a need to increase housing land supply over the territory. If housing development would be provided on artificial islands in the central waters, more Hong Kong people would be able to live close to the urban areas. Moreover, developing artificial islands in the central waters would provide opportunities for enhancing the connectivity of various parts of the territory, including the outlying islands.

The proposed location for developing artificial islands

24. Mr Albert CHAN opined that, without first carrying out a territory-wide strategic planning study, it was difficult for the Administration to convince the public that the central waters was a suitable location for developing artificial islands. He did not subscribe to the view that artificial islands should be located close to Shek Kwu Chau, where integrated waste management facilities, which would affect the new population on the artificial islands, were planned to be provided. He considered it desirable to relocate the existing container facilities in the urban areas to Lung Kwu Tan, Tap Shek Kok, etc. and make use of the vacated land for housing and commercial developments. Recalling that in the 1980s, there had been suggestions from the private sector that land should be reclaimed in the central waters to accommodate the airport and container facilities, or near Northeast Lantau to develop a container port, Mr CHAN enquired whether the Administration would give consideration to these suggestions when undertaking the proposed study.

25. DCED replied that the Administration would consider the suggestions received from the public when conducting the proposed study, taking into account relevant factors including technical feasibility and public acceptability. He reiterated that the precise location of the proposed artificial islands had yet to be studied. AD(Territorial)(Acting)/PlanD advised that the Administration had considered the reclamation proposals mentioned by Mr Albert CHAN. The Port and Airport Development Strategy completed in the 1980s had included a long-term proposal to develop port facilities near eastern Lantau. The relevant outline zoning plan

was then amended to incorporate the proposal. However, the proposed container terminal use was later considered incompatible with the strategic planning intention of tourism and recreational uses in northeast Lantau where the Hong Kong Disneyland was situated.

26. Mr Gary FAN said that in its paper submitted to the Islands District Council in April 2013 about ELSS, the Administration had not mentioned the location of the artificial islands. In January 2014, it was announced in the Policy Address that the Administration would initiate studies on various reclamation sites including the central waters. He enquired when the Administration had decided that the central waters was a potential site for developing artificial islands. Recalling that at the meeting of the Panel on Development on 7 April 2014, the Administration had advised that Kau Yi Chau was suitable for creating an artificial island with a land area of around 600 to 800 hectares, Mr FAN queried why Kau Yi Chau had never been mentioned during the PE of ELSS and whether the Administration had cheated the public by not disclosing the proposed location. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that he could not find any of the 25 possible reclamation sites put forward by the Administration during the Stage 1 PE that were located at Kau Yi Chau.

27. DH(CEO)(P&L)/CEDD replied that the 25 illustrative examples of possible reclamation sites had been put forward by the Administration to facilitate discussion of site selection criteria in response to public requests during the Stage 1 PE. The Administration had made clear that those examples did not constitute a list of selected sites but served as illustrations to facilitate public discussion on the initial site selection criteria for reclamation. He added that these examples were divided into four categories, comprising artificial islands, reclamation to connect islands, reclamation upon artificial or disturbed shorelines and reclamation on sites close to natural but not protected shorelines. As the precise boundaries and area of these sites could not be ascertained, their locations were only represented by symbols such as rectangles, circles and triangles in the presentation materials of the Stage 1 PE. He advised that 6 of those 25 locations were within the central waters and that an example of connected islands linking Peng Chau and Hei Ling Chau was located in the vicinity of Kau Yi Chau. Although there was a good potential to develop artificial islands at Kau Yi Chau and its nearby area, residents of Peng Chau had expressed strong views against the connected island scheme as they considered that the Administration should not develop reclaimed land near their community. He said that the Administration would continue to take into account public views when carrying out the proposed study.

28. DH(CEO)(P&L)/CEDD continued that after taking into account the views received during the Stage 1 PE that impacts on the environment and the local communities were considered the most important site selection criteria, the Administration had chosen five potential near-shore reclamation sites and artificial islands in the central waters for consultation in the Stage 2 PE. He explained that there was a great potential of developing artificial islands in the central waters. However, unlike the five potential near-shore reclamation sites, there were still various technical issues to be resolved for artificial islands. Therefore, the extent and location of reclamation could only be ascertained in the strategic studies. As such, the region of central waters, instead of specific locations, was indicated for consultation in the Stage 2 PE. During the Stage 2 PE, members of the public had given their views on land uses at the proposed locations and the aspects that the Administration should pay attention to when carrying out further studies.

29. Mr Gary FAN was concerned whether the Administration would develop artificial islands in places other than Kau Yi Chau. He asked if the Administration would select the waters near Peng Chau or Hei Ling Chau for developing artificial islands if the results of the proposed study showed that these options were not feasible or not supported by the local communities. Mr FAN referred to an article authored by the Permanent Secretary for Development (Works) ("PS/DEV(Works)") and published in Ming Pao on 24 April 2014, in which it was stated that the Administration all along had not proposed that Cheung Chau and Lamma Island were suitable locations for developing artificial islands and that Kau Yi Chau was not the only possible location. He sought clarification on whether the Administration had not ruled out the possibility of constructing artificial islands in various locations in the central waters, such as the areas south of Cheung Chau and north of Lamma Island.

30. In reply, PS/DEV(Works) explained that the Administration would explore the possibility of developing more than one artificial island in the central waters. It had been roughly estimated that the total area of potential artificial islands could be more than 1 000 hectares. The purpose of the proposed study was to explore the possible locations of artificial islands and the reclamation extent. Before completing the study, the Administration would not rule out any possible sites within the study area. As regards the article mentioned by Mr FAN, he said he did not recall having written the article.

(Post-meeting note: With the concurrence of the Chairman, a letter (Chinese version only) dated 6 July 2014 from PS/DEV(Works) about his reply to Mr Gary FAN's enquiry made at the meeting on the article published in Ming Pao on 24 April 2014 had been circulated to

members vide LC Paper No. PWSC119/13-14(01). In the letter, PS/DEV(Works) clarified he did confirm to Hon Gary FAN during a subsequent discussion between them at the meeting that the article had been written by him.)

Land uses of the artificial islands

31. Noting that the Administration would develop in the central waters an East Lantau Metropolis ("ELM") to accommodate a new core business district, Dr Helena WONG cast doubt on whether the initiative could help address the current housing shortage problem such as the housing need of residents living in subdivided units. Mr Gary FAN was concerned whether the concept of ELM was in line with the visions of reclamation that had been mapped out in the Stage 2 PE digest, namely, using reclaimed land as land reserve, providing decanting sites, allowing comprehensive planning, handling surplus fill materials and enhancement of the environment. He questioned whether the ELM development was proposed merely to echo the 2014 Policy Address.

32. In reply, DCED advised that land use options in respect of artificial islands would be considered at a later stage after completing the proposed study. According to the views received during the PE exercise, while land reserve and residential development were the supported land uses for potential artificial islands in the central waters, other major supported land uses included commercial, industrial, Government/institution or community, open space and utilities. DCED explained that if housing units would be provided on the islands, it would be appropriate to reserve land for commercial and industrial developments to generate employment opportunities for local residents, hence saving their need to travel to other areas to work. In response to Dr Fernando CHEUNG's enquiry about the proportion of land on the islands to be earmarked for housing development, DCED advised that the matter would be studied after the extent and precise location of the artificial islands were known.

33. Ms Cyd HO and Dr Fernando CHEUNG queried whether the Administration had consulted the public on the development of ELM and whether there had been any in-depth public discussion on the initiative to develop artificial islands in the central waters. Dr CHEUNG enquired when the concept of ELM was first conceived and what the justifications to take forward the initiative were. DCED responded that the projected population of Hong Kong would increase to about 8.47 million by 2041. For more than a decade, the Administration had not undertaken any projects to develop new towns. Reclamation had proven to be a possible and desirable way to increase land supply as it would provide great flexibility and solution space

for the Administration to plan large-scale developments, such as new towns, on a new piece of land and to meet the socio-economic needs of Hong Kong.

34. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that as development of a new town required a vast piece of land, it was not necessarily the best land development option to cater for the development needs of Hong Kong. Pointing out that about half of the reclaimed land near Chok Ko Wan in North Lantau had been still left vacant for years, he queried whether it was appropriate for the Administration to undertake a new reclamation project in the central waters. In reply, DCED said that development of sizable land would be an effective way to accommodate a large population. As regards the reclaimed land near Chok Ko Wan, DCED explained that it was reserved for possible further development of Hong Kong Disneyland.

Feasibility of development of artificial islands

35. Mr Christopher CHUNG queried whether there would be adequate supply of fill materials for the construction of artificial islands. He cautioned the Administration that the use of marine sand for reclamation should be avoided as dredging works would damage the marine ecology. In response, DCED said that the Administration had to deliver about 10 million tonnes of surplus public fill to Taishan each year due to the limited capacity of the public fill reception facilities at Tseung Kwan O and Tuen Mun. The Administration would strive to make use of public fill, i.e. inert construction and demolition wastes, generated by construction as fill materials for reclamation. The location, extent and implementation programme of reclamation for developing artificial islands would be explored in the proposed study. Details of sources of fill materials would be further examined in future studies.

36. In response to Mr James TIEN's remarks that the public expenditure to be incurred in a project to construct artificial islands would be huge in the light of the recent surge in construction prices and the limited number of professionals experienced in such projects, DCED advised that the Administration had gained useful experience in a number of projects to develop artificial islands, such as the construction of the airport island and the Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities ("HKBCF") island. He advised that, compared with other alternative ways to increase land supply, such as resumption of land, which would involve making compensation to land owners, the cost for constructing artificial islands was not high.

Land development on outlying islands

37. Mr Gary FAN said there were concerns that development of artificial islands in the central waters would increase the number of visitors coming to Lantau, hence creating pressure on the tourist facilities in the area and affecting the daily life of the local residents. He enquired whether the Administration would take into account such concerns when considering the land uses of the artificial islands and whether residents of Lantau would be consulted on the matter. In response, DCED reiterated that the land uses of the artificial islands and the types of facilities to be provided on them would be included in the relevant planning and engineering studies to be conducted at a later stage and the public would be duly consulted.

38. Mr CHAN Han-pan said that he supported the Administration taking measures to increase long-term land supply. Considering that there would likely be more developments in outlying islands such as Lantau, Peng Chau, Discovery Bay, etc. following the construction of artificial islands in the central waters, he stressed the importance for the Administration to protect the natural environment and maintain the existing lifestyle of the affected residents in these outlying islands. DCED replied that when carrying out the proposed study, the Administration would take into account the need to strike a balance between development and conservation, as well as to minimize the impact of development on the local communities.

39. Dr Fernando CHEUNG opined that, as the study area of the proposed study covered various outlying islands including Peng Chau, Lamma Island and Cheung Chau, the proposed study should pay due regard to the concerns of the residents in these islands and include a social impact assessment. DCED responded that stakeholder engagement would be carried out under the proposed study. After ascertaining the location and extent of reclamation for developing artificial islands, the Administration would further consult the affected communities under the subsequent planning and engineering studies.

40. Dr Helena WONG said some residents living in outlying islands had complained that they had not been consulted during the two stages of PE for ELSS. She queried about the adequacy of the public consultation undertaken by the Administration on the initiative to provide artificial islands in the central waters. She was concerned about the effectiveness of the PE and consultation exercises conducted by the Administration in collecting public views. DH(CEO)(P&L)/CEDD replied that he himself had visited Peng Chau to receive local views on the potential reclamation sites put forward, including the connected island scheme linking Peng Chau and Hei Ling Chau near Kau Yi Chau, during the PE exercises. The residents of

Peng Chau had expressed strong views against the connected island scheme. He said that their views would be considered in the proposed study.

41. Noting that the study area of the proposed study would include Hei Ling Chau, Mr Albert CHAN said that the usage of the existing Hei Ling Chau Typhoon Shelter was low and opined that the Administration should review the issue in the proposed study. He suggested that consideration might be given to providing fish culture zones at the site for developing new fish species. DCED responded that the Administration would study the use of the site of the typhoon shelter at a later stage having regard to public views to be received. In response to Dr Fernando CHEUNG's enquiry on whether there was any reclamation plan to provide a super prison at Hei Ling Chau, DCED advised that the matter was outside the scope of the proposed study.

Public consultation under the proposed study

42. Noting that a provision of \$6.6 million had been earmarked for conducting public consultation exercises under the proposed study, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen was concerned about the adequacy of the funding. He enquired how and what local stakeholders would be consulted and, in particular, whether the residents of Hong Kong Island West would be included.

43. DH(CEO)(P&L)/CEDD replied that as part of the proposed study, the Administration would consult relevant District Councils and local stakeholder groups, such as those representing the fisheries and marine industries. The consultation activities would include meetings, collection, analysis and reporting of views expressed by stakeholders. Part of the funding would be used to finance the production of briefing and powerpoint presentation materials, animation, physical models, etc. He believed that the provision of \$6.6 million for conducting the planned public consultation activities under the proposed study should be sufficient. DH(CEO)(P&L)/CEDD continued that in May 2014, the Administration had briefed members of the Central and Western District Council on the proposal to develop artificial islands in the central waters. After the preliminary location and extent of artificial islands had been ascertained, the Administration would proceed to carry out planning and engineering studies, which would include holding public forums and consultation exercises at the district level to collect views. In response to Dr Fernando CHEUNG's enquiry about the timetable for the public consultation exercises, DCED advised that as the proposed study would take a few years to complete, the timetable for the public consultation exercises was not available at this stage.

44. Referring to the statement in the Administration's paper that the Administration had briefed members of the Panel on Development at various meetings on the selection criteria for reclamation sites and development of artificial islands in the central waters, Mr James TIEN asked the Administration to clarify whether the proposed study was supported by members of the Panel. DCED replied that as mentioned in paragraph 17 of the paper, at the meeting of the Panel on Development on 7 April 2014, members generally supported the Administration's submission of the funding proposal on the proposed study to PWSC for consideration.

The study area

45. Mr Albert CHAN opined that the proposed study area should cover the whole Rambler Channel, instead of part of it, to look into the water pollution problem along the channel in a holistic manner. Noting that the proposed study area covered various parts of Victoria Harbour, he said it was disappointing that the Administration had not examined and sought preliminary legal advice on whether reclamation in such areas for providing transport links to/from the potential artificial islands would be in compliance with the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (Cap. 531). He enquired whether legal advice could be made available for members' reference when the funding proposal was considered at the relevant FC meeting.

46. DCED replied that the proposed study would examine, among others, the impact of developing artificial islands in the study area, which mainly covered the central waters. The Administration would study the potential impact, if identified, on the peripheral environment of the study area. He advised that, to explore the various options to connect the potential artificial islands with other parts of the territory, it was necessary to set a large study area. He assured members that, when carrying out the proposed study, the Administration would give due regard to the need to satisfy the principle of "overriding public need" for reclamation. Legal advice would be sought if reclamation within Victoria Harbour was proposed.

47. Mr WU Chi-wai said that the Revised Concept Plan for Lantau ("the Revised Plan") released in 2007 had included an ecologically-oriented and culturally-based conservation, recreation and green tourism initiative to capitalize on the natural, cultural and heritage resources of Lantau, complement the major tourist attractions and enhance the local economy. Moreover, the provision of a marine park in the Southwest Lantau waters proposed by the Administration in 2002 and supported by the Country and Marine Parks Authority had remained as part of the nature conservation strategy in the Revised Plan. He opined that the proposed study should adopt the proposals of the Revised Plan as given constraints. Otherwise, he

was concerned that the proposed study would pave the way for developing South Lantau and the landing sites for the future transport links to/from the artificial islands would be provided at environmentally sensitive areas in Lantau. He held the view that, if the Administration would take out South Lantau from the study area and limit the latter to the central waters near Kau Yi Chau, it would be easier to forge a consensus within the Lantau Development Advisory Committee ("LantauDAC") on the proposed study and to allay public worries.

48. DCED replied that, since the release of the Revised Plan in 2007, there had been land development projects underway or newly proposed, such as the construction of an artificial island to accommodate HKBCF, development of the third runway of the Hong Kong International Airport, etc. While the Revised Plan would be a good reference point for the proposed study, adopting the Revised Plan as constraints would reduce the flexibility for exploring different development options and public consultation to be conducted as part of the study. PS/DEV(Works) advised that, according to the Administration's internal broad-brush assessments, certain locations in the central waters had the potential for creating artificial islands, however, the number, extent and location of artificial islands were to be determined in the proposed study. To facilitate the Administration to formulate transport connectivity options between potential artificial islands and other parts of the territory, the study area needed to have a sufficiently large coverage. He clarified that the proposed study was aimed at developing artificial islands in the central waters rather than developing Lantau.

49. The Chairman said the Administration had assured members that the Revised Plan would serve as a starting reference point for the proposed study. As such, it should be clear that the Administration would not disregard the conservation initiatives proposed in the Revised Plan. Mr WU Chi-wai remained of the view that to adopt the Revised Plan as a planning constraint and to make reference to it in the proposed study were two different things. At the request of Mr WU, the Administration would provide information to the Subcommittee about the latest development of the proposal on designating the Southwest Lantau Marine Park.

Admin

50. Ms Emily LAU was concerned whether the public expenditure incurred in formulating the Revised Plan would become a wastage if the Administration did not implement the conservation initiatives proposed in the plan merely because of some new development projects in Lantau. PS/DEV(Works) responded that the Administration had taken forward in stages the initiatives proposed in the Revised Plan where practicable. The Administration had made clear that the Revised Plan would form the basis for discussion on the development of Lantau by LantauDAC. He advised that

Action

Admin

before completing the relevant consultation with LantauDAC and the public on the proposed study, it was not appropriate to impose planning constraints on the development of artificial islands. At the request of Mr Gary FAN, the Administration would provide information about the progress of implementation of the conservation initiatives proposed under the Revised Plan.

Connectivity of the artificial islands

51. Mr Christopher CHUNG said that while he supported the Administration taking initiatives to increase housing land supply, the location of the artificial islands was an important issue to be considered in the proposed study. The question on how well the islands should be connected with other parts of the territory would hinge on whether the former would be located close to Hong Kong Island or Lantau. Mr James TIEN was concerned whether, if there were to be residential developments on the artificial islands, the residents would need to travel to other parts of the territory to work. He was of the view that, if employment opportunities would be provided on the islands, the sizes of the islands had to be very large. DCED replied that the location of the artificial islands and their connectivity with other parts of the territory were important issues to be examined in the proposed study. He advised that if a large piece of reclaimed land could be created near East Lantau, which was geographically close to Hong Kong Island, it would have great potential to provide both residential and commercial developments.

Motion on adjournment of discussion on PWSC(2014-15)11

52. Mr Albert CHAN proposed a motion to adjourn the discussion on PWSC(2014-15)11, i.e. 768 CL - Strategic Studies for Artificial Islands in the Central Waters pursuant to Paragraph 33 of the PWSC Procedure.

53. The Chairman said that the Subcommittee would proceed to deal with Mr Albert CHAN's motion. Each member could speak once on the motion, and the speaking time should not be more than three minutes. He then invited members to speak on the motion.

54. Mr Albert CHAN said while he acknowledged the need to carry out studies to explore various reclamation options for providing land for residential and commercial developments, he considered that the Administration should not take forward the proposed study before completing a territory-wide strategic planning study. Moreover, he opined that the proposal to develop artificial islands in the central waters had been worked out in a top-down approach without carrying out proper public consultation.

The Administration had yet to ascertain the use of the land on the proposed artificial islands, including whether or not it would accommodate the existing container terminals, the relocation of which would lead to the release of a vast piece of land in the urban areas for residential and commercial developments. As such, he moved that the discussion on the item be adjourned.

55. Dr Fernando CHEUNG expressed support for the motion. He opined that, of the six-pronged approach to increase land supply, the option of reclamation had aroused the strongest opposing voices. According to the results of the surveys conducted during the PE exercise, a great majority of the respondents opposed to reclamation. Dr CHEUNG opined that members of the public in general would not accept any project creating reclaimed land of more than a thousand hectares. Moreover, the Administration had not made clear when and how the initiative to develop ELM had been worked out. The Administration had neither consulted the public on the initiative.

56. Mr Gary FAN said that he supported the motion proposed by Mr Albert CHAN. He remarked that a considerable number of conservation initiatives under the Revised Plan had not yet been implemented by the Administration. Moreover, having regard to the fact that the Administration had changed within a short time its population forecast from 8.9 million by 2039 to about 8.47 million by 2041, he considered that these figures were provided by the Administration merely to give the public a wrong impression that there was an acute shortage of land resources and to justify its action to develop land indiscriminately. He said that there was no public consensus on expending public monies on developing artificial islands. Plenty of views objecting to increasing land supply through reclamation had been received during the PE exercise. He considered that, as reclamation projects involving a total of 1 500 hectares were already in progress or under planning in the Hong Kong waters, it was not appropriate for the Administration to commission a new study on a large-scale reclamation.

57. Mr TAM Yiu-chung said that he did not subscribe to those views objecting to the funding proposal. He opined that there was a genuine need to provide more land to cater for the housing demand of Hong Kong people, in particular the young generation. He commented that the subject matters of the questions raised by some members at the meeting, such as population policy, were not under the purview of the attending Government officials. Moreover, some members had repeatedly asked the same questions at the meeting. He requested that the Chairman should put the item to vote immediately if Mr Albert CHAN's motion was negated.

58. Mr WONG Kwok-hing appealed to members to support the proposed study. He echoed the view of Mr TAM Yiu-chung that there had been a long discussion on the item. He said that there were views which criticized the Administration for not actively searching land to cater for the public's demand for housing on one hand, but objected to the Administration's land development projects on the other. He expressed disappointment and regrets on these views and considered that these people had paid no regard to the public's livelihood.

59. Mr CHAN Kin-por said that he objected to the motion. He opined that compared with other ways to increase land supply, such as resumption of existing land, reclamation had its merits. In his view, if the Administration would provide not only housing but also commercial developments on artificial islands, employment opportunities could be generated for the residents living on the islands, hence saving their need to travel to other places to work. He commented that some of the views objecting to the funding proposal expressed at the meeting were not based on facts. He requested that the Subcommittee should make a decision on the item as early as possible.

60. Mr WU Chi-wai said that Members belonging to the Democratic Party considered it important to strike a balance between development and conservation. He reiterated that, to forge a consensus on the initiative to develop artificial islands in the central waters and to allay public worries that such development would adversely affect the environment in Lantau, the initiatives in the Revised Plan, including the conservation, recreation and green tourism initiatives to capitalize on the resources of Lantau, should be adopted as constraints in the proposed study. He said that, in order to allow time for the Administration to consider his views, he supported the motion.

61. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, the Administration said that it had no response to make to the motion.

62. In response to members' views on the motion, Mr Albert CHAN clarified that he saw the need to increase land supply in Hong Kong. However, the Administration should do so by developing under-utilized land such as the Fanling Golf Course, the firing ranges in Tuen Mun, etc. He stressed the importance to ensure an optimum use of land resources. Mr CHAN reiterated that he had proposed the motion having regard to the fact that the Administration would deviate from the established planning procedure if it proceeded to carry out the proposed study. Moreover, development of artificial islands in the central waters might contravene the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance.

63. The Chairman put to vote the question that the discussion on the item PWSC(2014-15)11 be then adjourned. At the request of Mr Albert CHAN, the Chairman ordered a division. Of the 25 members present, 24 members voted. Nine voted for, 15 voted against the motion and no one abstained. The voting result was as follows:

For:

Mr James TO

Ms Cyd HO

Mr Albert CHAN

Mr Gary FAN

Dr Helena WONG

(9 members)

Ms Emily LAU

Mr Alan LEONG

Mr WU Chi-wai

Dr Fernando CHEUNG

Against:

Mr CHAN Kam-lam

Mr Abraham SHEK

Mr CHAN Hak-kan

Mr IP Kwok-him

Mr Frankie YICK

Mr CHAN Han-pan

Dr Elizabeth QUAT

Mr Christopher CHUNG

(15 members)

Mr TAM Yiu-chung

Mr WONG Kwok-hing

Mr CHAN Kin-por

Mr Michael TIEN

Mr MA Fung-kwok

Miss Alice MAK

Dr CHIANG Lai-wan

Abstain:

(0 member)

64. The Chairman declared that the motion was negatived. The Subcommittee resumed the discussion on PWSC (2014-15)11.

65. The Chairman said that members had asked many questions on the item and, as already pointed out by him at the meeting, some of these questions were repeated ones. He called upon members to avoid repeating the questions that had been asked previously.

Impact of reclamation on the environment and ecology

66. Taking in view that there were other reclamation projects under planning in the Hong Kong waters such as reclamation at Shek Kwu Chau, construction of the third runway, etc., Dr Helena WONG enquired about the cumulative environmental impact of these projects on the water quality and the marine ecology, including the living environment for Chinese White Dolphins ("CWDs"). Sharing similar concerns, Mr Gary FAN enquired

whether the proposed study would assess the impact of the development of artificial islands on the marine ecology, water flow and water quality in other parts of the Hong Kong waters than the central waters. Considering that *finless porpoises* were mostly found in the southern waters of Hong Kong and the study area of the proposed study would cover South Lantau, he was concerned about the impact of the study on this rare species.

67. DCED responded that a strategic environmental assessment would be carried out under the proposed study. To enable the Administration to assess the impact of artificial islands on the ecology, water flow and water quality, the study area encompassed a sufficiently large area of more than 200 square kilometres. He said that artificial islands would not be constructed in ecologically sensitive areas within the study area. If necessary, appropriate measures to mitigate the environmental impact would be recommended in the study. DCED explained that the strategic environmental assessment would mainly investigate the environmental impact of artificial islands in the central waters and keep in view any adverse impact on the Hong Kong waters outside the study area. He continued that CWDs were mainly found in the western waters of Hong Kong. To assess the impact of reclamation projects planned to be conducted at various locations such as Sunny Bay, Siu Ho Wan and Lung Kwu Tan on CWDs, the Administration was conducting a cumulative environmental impact assessment ("CEIA") for the western waters as a separate exercise.

68. Mr Gary FAN enquired whether the proposed study would consider the impact of the proposed development and infrastructure on the heritage resources in Hong Kong Island West. DH(CEO)(P&L)/CEDD advised that the strategic environmental assessment to be carried out as part of the proposed study would include an assessment on heritage impact.

69. Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr Gary FAN referred to the court judgement on the judicial review case regarding the EIA reports on the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge Hong Kong Link Road and HKBCF project, and enquired whether the proposed study would include an assessment on environmental carrying capacity and baseline assessment. DCED replied that the funding proposal included a provision of about \$30 million for carrying out a strategic environmental assessment to evaluate the environmental implications. After ascertaining the extent and location of the artificial islands, the Administration would carry out planning and engineering studies, which would include, among others, a statutory EIA.

70. The Subcommittee noted that a fisheries impact assessment would be conducted under the proposed study. Mr Christopher CHUNG said that as reclamation in the central waters might adversely affect the water flow and

the marine ecology, and hence the livelihood of those engaged in the fisheries industry, the Administration should look into the matter when carrying out the proposed study and formulate appropriate measures to minimize the impact on the operation of the fisheries industry.

71. Mr Albert CHAN opined that apart from carrying out a fisheries impact assessment, the Administration should identify the habitats of fish fry and assess the impact of reclamation on them. DCED replied that assessments on the marine ecology and water flow would be carried out under the proposed study. As part of the fisheries impact assessment, the Administration would conduct on-site surveys on fishing grounds and assess the impact of reclamation on capture fisheries. He welcomed members' suggestions on the matters to be examined under the assessment.

72. Mr Albert CHAN was concerned whether the development of artificial islands would create adverse impact on the living environment of the corals in the area. He said that the coral reef in the vicinity of Peng Chau was once of significant value to the economy of the area. The proposed study should look into the measures to recover the reef and ensure its sustainability. DH(CEO)(P&L)/CEDD replied that the findings of some preliminary on-site surveys conducted in the central waters about two years before had indicated that there was a coral coverage of less than 5% with low biodiversity near Kau Yi Chau. The impact of developing artificial islands in the central waters on the corals would be examined as part of the strategic environmental assessment under the proposed study

73. In response to the enquiries of Dr Fernando CHEUNG and Mr Gary FAN on whether the proposed study would assess the impact of the development of artificial islands in the central waters on navigation channels and anchorages, and recommend measures to mitigate the impact, DCED replied in the affirmative. The Chairman remarked that according to the Administration's paper, the scope of the funding proposal covered studies on port operations and marine traffic and safety.

Motion on adjournment of further proceedings of the Subcommittee

74. The Chairman advised that a motion to adjourn further proceedings of the Subcommittee under Paragraph 33 of the PWSC Procedure had been received from Mr Gary FAN. The Chairman said that each member could speak once on Mr FAN's motion, and the speaking time should not be more than three minutes. He then invited members to speak on the motion.

75. Mr Gary FAN read out the motion and said that the Administration should only proceed with a land development project on which public

consensus had been obtained. He opined that as the majority of the respondents to the various surveys conducted during the PE exercise had indicated opposition to increasing land supply through reclamation, the Administration should make appropriate changes to the funding proposal to address public concerns.

76. Mr Albert CHAN said that he supported Mr Gary FAN's motion. He opined that those who had previously supported the Governments of previous terms to control land supply in Hong Kong but now criticized the views objecting to the Administration's land development projects should be blamed. He reiterated that, to address the shortage of housing land in a short term, the Administration should make use of under-utilized land, such as that currently used by the Chinese People's Liberation Army Forces Hong Kong, for housing development.

77. Dr Fernando CHEUNG expressed support for the adjournment motion. He opined that the Administration had proposed the initiative to develop ELM in a top-down approach. Considering that development of artificial islands would involve an unprecedented scale of reclamation, he held the view that the Administration should have conducted adequate public consultation on the subject. At present, whether the public would support the development of artificial islands of a large scale remained a question. He cautioned the Administration about the financial consequence in the event that it had secured FC's approval for the proposed funding of over \$226 million but did not proceed to construct the islands after completing the proposed study. Dr CHEUNG considered it unacceptable to create new land through reclamation to satisfy private interests at the expense of the quality of the natural environment. He held the view that the reclaimed land would eventually be used for developing private housing unaffordable to most Hong Kong people.

78. Dr Helena WONG said that she supported the adjournment motion. She was concerned that the implementation of reclamation projects at various locations in Northwest Lantau and Tuen Mun would endanger the lives of CWDs. To protect the marine resources and hence the sustainable development of Hong Kong's inshore fishing industry, and to avoid further increasing the overall scale of reclamation, the Administration should temporarily shelve its plan to develop artificial islands in the central waters. She considered it unrealistic to expect that the land on the artificial islands would be reserved for providing public housing units for Hong Kong people currently living in subdivided units.

79. Ms Cyd HO expressed support for the adjournment motion. While expressing appreciation for the explanation by the attending Government

officials from CEDD on the technical issues related to the funding proposal, she said that they were however unable to address members' doubts about the need for artificial islands in the context of the formulation of a population policy. As the information provided by the Administration at the meeting was not comprehensive enough to address members' concerns, the funding proposal should not be supported. She subscribed to the view that priority development areas should be the under-utilized land in the urban areas, such as the site at which the United Services Recreation Club was currently situated.

80. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan said that she objected to the adjournment motion. She opined that, to facilitate future discussions on whether artificial islands should be developed in the central waters, the Administration needed to first carry out the proposed study, not only to find out whether such development would have adverse impact on the marine ecology, the fisheries industry, etc., but also to explore the transport connectivity options for the islands. Considering that there had been a long discussion on the item at the Subcommittee's meetings and the questions raised by members should have substantially covered the issues related to the proposal, she requested that the Chairman should put the item to vote as soon as possible.

81. Mr CHAN Kam-lam expressed objection to the motion. He did not agree to the views that the housing units to be provided on the artificial islands would not be affordable to most Hong Kong people. He opined that the purpose of increasing land supply was to facilitate the provision of more housing units, hence lower property prices. As regards the criticism that the measures adopted by the Governments of the previous terms to control housing land supply had led to the present soaring property prices, he held the view that, to ensure a healthy and stable property market, it was reasonable for the Administration to adjust its land supply strategy from time to time according to the prevailing market situation.

82. The Chairman directed that the meeting be extended to 1:00 pm if the motion was negated.

83. Mr Gary FAN shared the view that the Administration should adjust its land supply policies in view of the changing economic situation to avoid causing adverse impacts on the society. He reiterated that, as reclamation projects involving a total of 1 500 hectares of new land were already in progress or under planning in the Hong Kong waters, it was not appropriate to embark on a new study to examine the feasibility of a large-scale reclamation project.

84. Noting the Administration's indication that it had no response to make to the adjournment motion, the Chairman put to vote the question that further proceedings of the Subcommittee be then adjourned. At the request of Mr Gary FAN, the Chairman ordered a division. Of the 21 members present, 20 members voted. Seven voted for, 13 voted against the motion and no one abstained. The voting result was as follows:

For:

Ms Emily LAU
Mr Albert CHAN
Mr Gary FAN
Dr Helena WONG
(7 members)

Ms Cyd HO
Mr WU Chi-wai
Dr Fernando CHEUNG

Against:

Mr CHAN Kam-lam
Mr WONG Kwok-hing
Mr CHAN Kin-por
Mr Michael TIEN
Mr MA Fung-kwok
Dr Elizabeth QUAT
Mr Tony TSE
(13 members)

Mr TAM Yiu-chung
Mr CHAN Hak-kan
Mr IP Kwok-him
Mr Frankie YICK
Miss Alice MAK
Dr CHIANG Lai-wan

Abstain:

(0 member)

85. The Chairman declared that the motion was negatived.

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

Motions proposed under Paragraph 32A of the Public Works Subcommittee Procedure

86. The Chairman said that the meeting would proceed to handle the motions proposed by members under Paragraph 32A of the PWSC Procedure. He advised that he had received 10 motions from Mr Albert CHAN at an earlier time of the meeting and that the motions were directly related to the agenda item, i.e. PWSC(2014-15)11.

87. 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. The question was voted down by a majority of

members.

88. The Chairman advised that he had received five proposed motions from Mr Gary FAN and would peruse them in due course.

89. Mr TAM Yiu-chung 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. Dr Fernando CHEUNG requested a division and the division bell was rung for five minutes before members' voting on the motion. Based on the voting result, the Chairman declared that the motion was carried.

90. The Chairman took turn to put to vote the questions that proposed motions numbered 0002 - 0003 be proceeded forthwith. As requested by members, the division bell was rung for one minute before members' voting on individual questions. Both questions were voted down by a majority of members.

(Post-meeting note: A soft copy of the terms of the three proposed motions had been circulated to members by email on 24 June 2014.)

91. The Chairman advised that the next meeting would be held at 8:30 am on 25 June 2014 to continue the consideration of the motions proposed by members under Paragraph 32A of the PWSC Procedure.

Any other business

92. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 1:00 pm.