

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

Ref : CB2/PL/HA

LC Paper No. CB(2)409/18-19  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

**Panel on Home Affairs**

**Minutes of meeting**  
**held on Monday, 28 May 2018, at 8:30 am**  
**in Conference Room 2 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present** : Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP (Chairman)  
Hon YUNG Hoi-yan (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP  
Hon Claudia MO  
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS  
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Hon IP Kin-yuen  
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin  
Hon CHU Hoi-dick  
Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, JP  
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP  
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding  
Hon SHIU Ka-fai  
Hon SHIU Ka-chun  
Hon Tanya CHAN  
Hon HUI Chi-fung  
Hon LUK Chung-hung  
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH  
Hon Kenneth LAU Ip-keung, BBS, MH, JP  
Hon KWONG Chun-yu  
Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH  
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

**Member attending** : Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, BBS, JP

**Members absent** : Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP  
Hon AU Nok-hin

**Public Officers attending** : Item III

Mr LAU Kong-wah, JP  
Secretary for Home Affairs

Mr YEUNG Tak-keung, JP  
Commissioner for Sports

Mr Paul CHENG Ching-wan  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs  
(Recreation and Sport) 1

Item IV

Mr LAU Kong-wah, JP  
Secretary for Home Affairs

Ms Sandy CHEUNG Pui-shan  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs  
(Culture)2

Mr CHAN Shing-wai  
Assistant Director (Heritage and Museums)  
Leisure and Cultural Services Department

**Clerk in attendance** : Ms Joanne MAK  
Chief Council Secretary (2) 3

**Staff in attendance** : Mr Richard WONG  
Senior Council Secretary (2) 6

Mrs Fonny TSANG  
Legislative Assistant (2) 3

---

Action

**I. Information papers issued since the last meeting**

Members noted that no information paper had been issued since the last meeting.

Action

**II. Items for discussion at the next meeting**

[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1458/17-18(01) and (02)]

2. The Panel agreed to discuss the following items proposed by the Administration at the next regular meeting on 25 June 2018 at 8:30 am:

- (a) Community Care Fund; and
- (b) Major Sports Events Matching Grant Scheme and District Sports Programmes Funding Scheme.

**III. Injections to the Arts and Sport Development Fund (Sports Portion) & the Elite Athletes Development Fund**

[LC Paper No. CB(2)1458/17-18(03) and (04)]

3. At the invitation of the Chairman, the Secretary for Home Affairs ("SHA") briefed members on the proposed injections of \$1 billion into the Arts and Sport Development Fund ("ASDF ") (Sports Portion) and a total of \$6 billion into the Elite Athletes Development Fund ("EADF") as set out in the Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(2)1458/17-18(03)].

4. The Chairman declared that he was currently Director of the Hong Kong Sports Institute ("HKSI").

Discussion

5. Whilst expressing support for the above two funding proposals, Mr YIU Si-wing, Mr Holden CHOW, Mr Christopher CHEUNG and Mr Tony TSE raised concerns about the proposal that the future use of ASDF would not be limited to its investment returns, but the capital base could also be used. Mr YIU and Mr CHEUNG considered it more desirable if the Administration would continue to maintain the capital base of the fund intact in the long run and provide funding support to sports projects from the annual investment return. Mr CHOW and Mr TSE held the view that the Administration should provide an estimated timeframe for which the capital base would be sufficient if approval was given to the current funding proposal.

6. SHA and the Commissioner for Sports ("C for S") explained that as at the end of 2017-2018, the total balance of ASDF (Sports Portion) was

Action

around \$1.507 billion. However, in recent years, the amount of funding approved under ASDF (Sports Portion) per year had increased considerably, amounting to about \$115 million in 2017-2018. In view of the large demand for funding for sports projects, an injection of \$1 billion was proposed to increase the balance and provide a more sustainable funding source for sports projects. Besides, to increase the flexibility of the use of funds, the Administration would propose to the Finance Committee ("FC") that the future use of ASDF should not be limited to its investment returns, but the capital base could also be used so that the Administration could provide the necessary funding support for worthwhile sports projects when required. C for S added that the Administration did not see the need for another injection in the near future.

7. Mr LAU Kwok-fan considered it acceptable for SHA to have some flexibility in the use of funds. However, Mr Christopher CHEUNG pointed out that if the annual return rate of ASDF continued to be around 4%, even following the injection of \$1 billion, the investment income would still be insufficient to cover the estimated amount of \$140 million per year required to support the relevant sports projects. Mr CHEUNG and the Chairman asked whether the Administration would consider increasing the injection amount so as to ensure the sustainability of ASDF (Sports Portion). The Deputy Chairman suggested that the Administration should explore ways to increase the investment returns of the fund.

8. SHA and C for S said that ASDF was set up as a sub-fund under the Sir David Trench Fund for Recreation ("SDTFR") according to the Sir David Trench Fund for Recreation Ordinance (Cap. 1128), and the Director of Accounting Services was the statutory trustee of SDTFR responsible for managing the relevant investment and accounting work. As required by Cap. 1128, the SDTFR Investment Advisory Committee was set up to formulate investment strategies for SDTFR and its sub-funds and to advise on matters in relation to investment. To ensure that the efforts to promote art, culture and sports would not be disrupted by short-term fluctuations in the investment markets, SHA had the authority to use part of the capital base of ASDF if the investment return and the accumulated surplus were inadequate to meet the funding needs in a particular year.

9. Noting that the Administration had delved into the \$1.5 billion seed money of ASDF (Sports Portion) since end-2015, Ms Tanya CHAN queried whether that was in breach of Cap. 1128, particularly section 6(1) thereof which stipulated that "subject to the direction of the Chief Executive, the

Action

Admin

fund, other than the original capital sum, may be expended, applied and used for any object specified in section 5 but no part of the original capital sum shall be expended, applied or used for any such purpose without the prior approval of the Legislative Council". C for S explained that even though ASDF was set up as a sub-fund under SDTFR, the seed money of ASDF was not the "original capital sum" of SDTFR referred to in section 6(1) of Cap. 1128 and hence the use of the seed money of ASDF would not be subject to prior approval of the Legislative Council as required by section 6(1). At the request of Ms CHAN, SHA agreed to provide a written response to address the concerns.

*(Post-meeting note: the Administration's response was issued to members on 22 November 2018 vide LC Paper No. CB(2)309/18-19(01).)*

10. Noting that only four projects under the category of "Upgrading school and district-level programmes" received funding support from ASDF (Sports Portion) from 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2018, Mr Holden CHOW urged the Administration to ensure that more such programmes would receive funding support in the future so as to better promote community sport. Mr SHIU Ka-fai urged the Administration to ensure that there would be sufficient manpower resources so that applications from sports organizations for projects funded under ASDF (Sports Portion) could be handled expeditiously.

11. C for S responded that applications for funding under ASDF (Sports Portion) were usually initiated by sports organizations, and then processed by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("LCSD") prior to submission to SHA for approval. For example, LCSD normally took less than three months to assess applications for funding support for athletes' participation in major international games.

12. Regarding the proposed injection of a total of \$6 billion into EADF, Ms Tanya CHAN and Mr IP Kin-yuen questioned whether it was the most appropriate arrangement to set aside a seed capital of as much as \$12 billion for financing the development of elite sports. They also questioned whether there was proper monitoring of the use of the fund. They urged the Administration to examine the option of supporting sports development as part of the Government recurrent expenditure. Mr IP asked whether the management of EADF involved any additional administrative cost.

Action

13. C for S said that EADF was set up with the objective to provide a stable financial source of income to HKSI. Every year, the Administration consulted the Sports Commission on the annual plan and budget approved by the Board of Directors of HKSI. Subject to the advice of the Sports Commission, approval from SHA for funding allocation from EADF to HKSI would be sought. In 2018-2019, a funding of \$596 million was allocated through EADF to HKSI. As at the end of 2017-2018, the total balance of EADF was around \$6.19 billion, of which \$5.19 billion was deposited with the Hong Kong Monetary Fund and the remaining \$1 billion was deposited with local banks. The administrative costs and the additional workload arising from the operation of EADF were absorbed by the Home Affairs Bureau through redeployment of internal resources, and the investment return of the fund deposited with HKMA was linked to the performance of the Hong Kong Exchange Fund.

14. Mr LAU Kwok-fan considered that HKSI might be overly reliant on government funding, and urged the Administration to encourage more sponsorships/donations from the business sector/community. He also considered that the Administration should take measures to enhance the governance of "national sports associations" ("NSAs"), particularly in the selection of athletes to participate in international competitions.

15. The Deputy Chairman, Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr KWONG Chun-yu and Mr SHIU Ka-chun expressed a similar view that the Administration should also enhance its funding support for non-elite sports/athletes. The Deputy Chairman urged the Administration to provide more support to new sports, e.g. darts, floor curling, and rouliqiu. Mr LUK urged the Administration to provide cash subsidies to athletes who were representing Hong Kong in popular team sports (e.g. football, volleyball and basketball). Mr KWONG urged the Administration to provide more support to high-performing athletes in non-elite sports (e.g. diving), and to review the need for revising the existing criteria for elite sports/athletes.

16. C for S said that to support football development, ASDF (Sports Portion) had granted funding support for the Project Phoenix and the Hong Kong Football Association's Five-Year Strategic Plan. Besides, the Five-Year Development Programme for Team Sports had been launched in January 2018, covering eight team sports featured in the Asian Games, namely baseball, basketball, handball, hockey, ice hockey, softball, volleyball and water polo. Furthermore, ASDF (Sports Portion) provided funding support for athletes to prepare for and participate in major

Action

international games, and NSAs of different sports might apply for funding for their athletes to participate in competitions at World and Asian levels.

17. Mr LUK Chung-hung, Mr Christopher CHEUNG and Mr Vincent CHENG urged the Administration to ensure that adequate resources would be allocated to enhance the career development and retirement planning of elite athletes. SHA and C for S responded that HKSI had adopted a comprehensive approach in supporting athletes' development and provided various programmes to assist elite athletes in pursuing further studies in preparation for the transition to a second career. Besides, the Sports Federation & Olympic Committee of Hong Kong, China had established the Hong Kong Athletes Career & Education Programme in collaboration with the business sector, with a view to improving the education and career prospects for serving and retired athletes. Arrangements had also been made for retired elite athletes to work as coaches and programme coordinators in NSAs and in schools.

18. The Chairman concluded that members raised no objection to the submission of the above two funding proposals to FC for consideration.

**IV. Funding support to Intangible Cultural Heritage and museum initiatives**

[LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1448/17-18(01) and CB(2)1458/17-18(05)]

19. At the invitation of the Chairman, SHA briefed members on the two funding proposals set out in the Administration's paper [LC Paper No. CB(2)1448/17-18(01)].

Discussion

20. A In reply to Ms Tanya CHAN's enquiry, the Assistant Director (Heritage and Museums) ("AD(HM)") said that arrangements had been made for LCSD to lend some museum collections for display at offsite venues such as the Hong Kong International Airport, universities, the Hong Kong Maritime Museum and shopping malls for public viewing. LCSD was pleased to liaise with different organizations with regard to lending out museum collections for display. The Chairman and Mr SHIU Ka-chun suggested that the offsite venues should include government premises as well.

Action

21. Regarding the proposal of providing \$500 million to LCSD for the acquisition of museum collections and commissioning of art and cultural projects for exhibition and display, the Chairman asked about the amount of funding that the Administration was going to spend on the procurement of works by local artists.

22. SHA and AD(HM) said that under this funding proposal, part of the new funding would be used to acquire art, cultural and scientific items which were in line with LCSD collection policies. The artworks and artefacts to be acquired would become museum collections and would be selected for display in the exhibitions at LCSD museums and offsite venues. Besides, part of the new funding would be used to commission art and cultural projects by local artists for exhibitions and display to promote public's appreciation of arts and culture. Apart from showcasing at LCSD museums, these projects would also be featured in offsite exhibitions and display in other places (e.g. cultural venues, parks, leisure and recreational facilities, shopping malls) in various districts. Such arrangements were welcomed by the local artists.

23. Mr SHIU Ka-chun considered that LCSD should take this opportunity to review its museum collection policy. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen considered that the history of the 1967 riots and of the 4 June incident should be showcased at public museums. He asked about the criteria for historical events to be included in exhibitions of public museums.

24. AD(HM) said that about 75% of the new funding would be allocated to art, 15% to Hong Kong history and culture, and 10% to science and technology. LCSD had devised a set of procedures and assessment criteria for the acquisition of artefacts for museums, which had been publicized on respective museum websites. LCSD would also invite the Museum Expert Advisers to give independent advice on the proposed acquisition. As regards the criteria for including historical incidents in exhibitions of public museums, AD(HM) explained that as it would take time for history experts and academics to collate relevant data and conduct related studies. The threshold was usually 50 years after the relevant incidents.

25. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen and Dr Elizabeth QUAT considered that the Administration should step up efforts in the collection and display of artefacts relating to the Imperial Japanese occupation of Hong Kong, e.g. comfort women, the anti-Japanese campaigns waged by the Dongjiang Column and the Massacre in Nanshitou, Guangzhou. SHA and AD(HM)



Action

responded that the permanent exhibitions at the Hong Kong Museum of History and the Hong Kong Museum of Coastal Defence already featured contents relating to the Imperial Japanese occupation of Hong Kong, and LCSD would enhance the relevant contents as appropriate. Interested parties were welcome to donate relevant artefacts/materials to LCSD for consideration.

26. Expressing support for the proposal of providing \$300 million for the safeguarding, promotion and transmission of intangible cultural heritage ("ICH"), the Chairman, Mr YIU Si-wing and Mr Kenneth LAU urged the Administration to enhance its work in engaging the community and bearer organizations in safeguarding and promoting ICH. The Chairman considered that the transmission of the ICH items was most important and asked whether measures were in place to encourage people to join the trades so as to preserve the relevant craftsmanship. Mr YIU urged the Administration to provide more platforms to showcase ICH items of Hong Kong. Mr LAU urged the Administration to proactively liaise with the bearers or respective organizations in organizing the funded projects, particularly those related to rituals and festive events.

27. SHA and AD(HM) said that the Intangible Cultural Heritage Office ("ICHO") was established to take forward the relevant work, including organizing exhibitions, talks, field visits and demonstrations for promotion of local ICH to the public. The proposed funding scheme would support two different types of projects, namely the Community-driven Project and the Partnership Project. For the Community-driven Project, applicants were required to submit proposals for assessment. As regards the Partnership Project, ICHO would initiate projects of specific themes, scopes and requirements, and would invite partnership proposals for this type of funding support. The Intangible Cultural Heritage Advisory Committee ("ICHAC") would be consulted in formulating the themes and scopes of these projects. ICHO would provide technical advice and assistance, and would closely liaise with the bearers or respective organizations to jointly carry out the funded projects.

28. In response to Mr Jimmy NG's enquiry about the implementation details of the proposed funding scheme, AD(HM) explained that the projects to be funded should be of a certain scale. There was no funding cap for each project, and submission of multiple applications on a single ICH item was allowed. An assessment panel comprising five members would be set up under ICHAC for assessing the applications, and subsequent monitoring

Action

and evaluating the implementation of the funded projects/activities. The assessment panel would assess applications received by ICHO and make recommendations to LCSD for consideration and funding approval in accordance with the established procedures.

29. Mr KWONG Chun-yu and Mr Andrew WAN enquired about the procedures and criteria for selecting items to be included in the Representative List of ICH of Hong Kong. They considered that some of the ICH items which had an urgent need for preservation should be added to the list, e.g. "Fishermen's Ballads" and "Soy Sauce Making Technique". Ms Claudia MO suggested that Cantonese should also be included in the Representative List. Ms Tanya CHAN said that she had long held the view that the Administration should legislate for the preservation and protection of ICH of Hong Kong.

30. SHA said that ICHAC, with local academics, experts and community personalities as members, would regularly examine the need to add more ICH items to the Representative List as appropriate. Having regard to the differences among various ICH items in terms of their importance, nature and urgency for immediate protection actions, a host of safeguarding measures which covered identification, documentation, in-depth research, preservation, promotion and transmission of the heritage would be devised and implemented. SHA considered that the aforementioned efforts made in the preservation and protection of ICH of Hong Kong were effective and he did not see an urgent need at present to legislate for safeguarding ICH.

31. Summing up, the Chairman said that members raised no objection to the submission of the two funding proposals to FC for consideration.

**V. Any other business**

32. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 10:36 am.