

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. CB(2)704/18-19  
(These minutes have been seen  
by the Administration)

Ref : CB2/PL/SE

**Panel on Security**

**Minutes of meeting**  
**held on Tuesday, 4 December 2018, at 2:30 pm**  
**in Conference Room 3 of the Legislative Council Complex**

**Members present** : Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP (Chairman)  
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP  
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Kin-por, GBS, JP  
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP  
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP  
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP  
Hon Claudia MO  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP  
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS  
Hon MA Fung-kwok, SBS, JP  
Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP  
Hon CHAN Chi-chuen  
Hon CHAN Han-pan, BBS, JP  
Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP  
Hon Kenneth LEUNG  
Hon Alice MAK Mei-kuen, BBS, JP  
Hon KWOK Wai-keung, JP  
Hon Dennis KWOK Wing-hang  
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP  
Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung  
Dr Hon Elizabeth QUAT, BBS, JP  
Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH  
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan  
Hon Alvin YEUNG  
Hon CHU Hoi-dick  
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting

Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding  
Hon YUNG Hoi-yan  
Hon CHAN Chun-ying, JP  
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP  
Hon HUI Chi-fung  
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai  
Hon AU Nok-hin  
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS

**Member attending** : Hon SHIU Ka-fai

**Members absent** : Hon James TO Kun-sun (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, JP  
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP  
Hon SHIU Ka-chun

**Public Officers attending** : Item IV

The Administration

Mr John LEE Ka-chiu, SBS, PDSM, PMSM, JP  
Secretary for Security

Ms Mimi LEE Mei-mei, JP  
Deputy Secretary for Security 1

Mr Andrew TSANG Yue-tung  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Security E

Mr CHIU Man-hin  
Assistant Secretary for Security E2

Independent Commission Against Corruption

Mr Steven LAM Kin-ming  
Assistant Director / Operations 3

Ms Winky HSU Man-wai  
Senior Principal Investigator / R Group

Item V

The Administration

Mr Sonny AU Chi-kwong, PDSM, PMSM, JP  
Under Secretary for Security

Miss Winnie CHUI Hiu-lo  
Principal Assistant Secretary for Security C

Mr LAW Chun-nam, IDSM  
Acting Director of Immigration

Mr Gavin HO Ka-wing  
Assistant Director (Management & Support)  
Immigration Department

Mr Ken TSE Shing-ngai  
Assistant Principal Immigration Officer (Planning)  
Immigration Department

Mr Frank WONG Tak-choi, JP  
Project Director 1  
Architectural Services Department

Mr LAM Kwai-sang  
Chief Project Manager 103  
Architectural Services Department

Item VI

The Administration

Ms Manda CHAN Wing-man, JP  
Commissioner for Narcotics

Mr Kevin LAI Ming-fai  
Principal Assistant Secretary (Narcotics) 1  
Security Bureau

Mr Nelson NG Kwok-cheung  
Senior Superintendent (Narcotics Bureau)  
Hong Kong Police Force

Mr WONG Yim-pui  
Group Head (Controlled Chemicals)  
Customs and Excise Department

Mr Lot CHAN Sze-tao  
Chief Pharmacist  
Department of Health

Dr CHENG Wing-chi  
Senior Chemist  
Government Laboratory

**Clerk in attendance** : Miss Betty MA  
Chief Council Secretary (2) 1

**Staff in attendance** : Mr Timothy TSO  
Senior Assistant Legal Adviser 1

Mr Raymond LAM  
Senior Council Secretary (2) 7

Ms Kiwi NG  
Legislative Assistant (2) 1

---

Action

**I. Confirmation of minutes of previous meeting**  
(LC Paper No. CB(2)332/18-19)

The minutes of the policy briefing-cum-meeting held on 2 November 2018 were confirmed.

**II. Information papers issued since the last meeting**  
(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)303/18-19(01) and CB(2)337/18-19(01))

2. Members noted that the following papers had been issued since the last meeting:

- (a) joint letter dated 20 November 2018 from Ms Claudia MO, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr CHU Hoi-dick and Mr AU Nok-hin; and

Action

- (b) Administration's information paper on its proposals to revise fees for services provided by the Immigration Department ("ImmD").

3. Regarding paragraph 2(a) above, Ms Claudia MO and Mr AU Nok-hin expressed concern that the Administration's response to the issues raised in their joint letter was still awaited. The Chairman said that he would follow up the matter with the Administration. He drew Members' attention that the Administration could lodge an appeal within 28 days in relation to the judgment mentioned in the joint letter.

4. Regarding paragraph 2(b) above, the Chairman said that no member proposed discussing the paper at a meeting of the Panel.

**III. Date of next meeting and items for discussion**  
(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)334/18-19(01) and (02))

Regular meeting in January 2019

5. Members agreed that the following items would be discussed at the next regular meeting on 8 January 2019 at 2:30 pm:

- (a) An update on the comprehensive review on the strategy of handling non-refoulement claims - proposals to amend the Immigration Ordinance;
- (b) Installation of electric locks security system in Pik Uk Correctional Institution; and
- (c) Flight Simulator Training Centre of the Government Flying Service.

**IV. Results of study of matters raised in the Annual Report 2017 to the Chief Executive by the Commissioner on Interception of Communications and Surveillance**  
(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)334/18-19(03) to (04) and Annual Report 2017 to the Chief Executive by the Commissioner on Interception of Communications and Surveillance)

Action

6. Members noted a Summary of the Annual Report 2017 ("the Annual Report") to the Chief Executive by the Commissioner on Interception of Communications and Surveillance ("the Commissioner") prepared by the Secretariat of the Commissioner, which was tabled at the meeting.

*(Post-meeting note: The Summary tabled at the meeting was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(2)389/18-19(01) on 4 December 2018.)*

7. The Chairman informed Members that the Commissioner, who had been invited to attend the meeting, had replied that it was not appropriate for him to attend. The Commissioner had, in line with his past practice and the practice of former Commissioners, held a briefing on the Annual Report in the morning of 4 December 2018, which was open to Legislative Council ("LegCo") Members, the media and members of the public.

8. Secretary for Security ("S for S") briefed Members on the results of the Administration's study of matters raised in the Annual Report, which were set out in the paper to the Panel.

9. Members noted an updated background brief entitled "Results of Study of Matters Raised in the Annual Report to the Chief Executive by the Commissioner on Interception of Communications and Surveillance" prepared by the LegCo Secretariat.

Cases involving journalistic material

10. Referring to paragraphs 4.45 and 4.46 of the Annual Report, Ms Claudia MO asked about the nature of the additional conditions imposed by the panel judge in the case concerned which involved journalistic material ("JM"). S for S responded that appropriate conditions could be imposed by a panel judge on a prescribed authorization under section 58A of the Interception of Communications and Surveillance Ordinance (Cap. 589) ("ICSO"), having regard to the circumstances of a case and the object under investigation. However, it was not appropriate for him to disclose more information than what the Commissioner had included in the Annual Report in accordance with ICSO. He said that law enforcement agencies ("LEAs") had implemented the Commissioner's recommendation that if JM had been inadvertently obtained in covert operations, the dedicated unit of the LEA

Action

concerned should screen out JM and withhold the material from the investigators.

11. Ms Claudia MO expressed concern that although the Commissioner had made recommendations for LEAs to better carry out the objects of ICSO, the recommendations of the Commissioner had no legal effect and no one could know whether the LEAs concerned had implemented the recommendations. S for S responded that LEAs were required to comply with the requirements in ICSO and the Code of Practice ("CoP") issued under section 63 of ICSO. The Commissioner indicated in the Annual Report that in the report period, LEAs continued to be positive to the Commissioner's recommendations in regard to new arrangements for better operation of the ICSO regime.

Training for relevant officers of law enforcement agencies

12. Mr CHAN Chun-ying noted the Commissioner's remark in the Annual Report regarding some LEA officers being not conversant with the operating procedures of the systems concerned or the requirements on handling of ICSO cases. He also noted the Commissioner's suggestion for LEAs to provide their officers with sufficient training. He asked whether training on the requirements under ICSO was incorporated into the general training programmes of respective LEAs or only provided to relevant officers of LEAs.

13. Dr Elizabeth QUAT said that LEA officers were under heavy pressure in complying with the reporting requirements under ICSO and CoP after discovering that information involving legal professional privilege ("LPP") had been obtained through operations conducted under ICSO. She asked whether the Administration would strengthen training on compliance with such reporting requirements.

14. S for S responded that various training was provided by LEAs to officers in performing duties under ICSO. Induction training was provided for officers newly appointed to perform such duties. Practice sessions were organized to familiarize relevant LEA officers with the operation of relevant systems and the definitions of LPP as well as JM. Refresher training, seminars, case-sharing sessions and workshops were organized for relevant LEA officers. Training was also provided on the requirement to notify the panel judge of any subsequent material change in circumstances which involved LPP and compliance with the additional conditions imposed by the panel judge. Where necessary, relevant LEA

Action

officers were also briefed on the Commissioner's comments which required particular attention. The LEAs also invited the Commissioner to a forum in January 2019 to speak to frontline officers on the requirements under ICSO.

Cases involving legal professional privilege

15. Noting that there was an increase in the number of cases involving LPP information in 2017, Mr CHAN Chun-ying asked whether the LPP information concerned had been obtained from interception of communications involving the offices of lawyers. S for S responded that the Commissioner had pointed out at his briefing held in the morning of 4 December 2018 that none of the seven cases of obtaining LPP information in 2017 involved direct communication between the object of interception and their lawyers.

16. Mr AU Nok-hin expressed concern that there was a substantial increase in the number of LPP cases in 2017. He considered that LEA officers did not attach much importance to LPP information and the Administration should take steps to address the problem. S for S responded that the obtaining of LPP information was not prohibited under the ICSO regime, but there were stringent measures to protect any LPP information obtained and before it arose. An LEA applicant was required to state his assessment of LPP likelihood in his affidavit or statement in support of his application. Whenever there were any subsequent changes which might affect the assessment, such as heightened likelihood of obtaining LPP information, the LEA applicant had to notify the panel judge as soon as practicable. The panel judge could impose additional conditions if the prescribed authorization was allowed to continue. CoP provided that if LPP information had been obtained inadvertently, such information would be handled by a dedicated team independent of the investigation team.

17. Dr CHENG Chung-tai expressed concern that the number of LPP cases in which LEAs submitted reports to panel judges on subsequent changes in circumstances relating to LPP involvement or likelihood had increased from 17 in 2015 to 80 in 2017. He asked whether the Administration had examined whether any particular LEA was mainly involved in such cases.



Action

18. S for S responded that among 86 new LPP cases in 2017, the great majority were only cases of heightened likelihood of obtaining LPP information and there were only seven cases in which LPP information had been obtained inadvertently. Such LPP cases had been reported by LEAs on their own initiative to panel judges when the likelihood of obtaining LPP information was heightened.

19. Mr Holden CHOW asked whether the Administration would strengthen training for LEA officers to avoid obtaining LPP information inadvertently. S for S responded that the inadvertent obtaining of LPP information was not in breach of ICSO. However, all such cases had to be reported to the panel judges in accordance with ICSO and CoP. The Commissioner pointed out at his briefing in the morning of 4 December 2018 that the inadvertent obtaining of LPP information was unavoidable notwithstanding the safeguards in place. The Commissioner also expressed in the Annual Report his appreciation for an LEA having erred on the side of caution in handling information which might be subject to LPP.

20. Referring to item 1 of the Annex to the Administration's paper, Mr Dennis KWOK queried why LEAs had not sealed LPP information or possible LPP information in a separate envelope. He said that such steps had already been adopted by the legal sector for a long time and expressed doubt whether LEAs really attached importance to LPP information. S for S responded that transcripts, summaries and notes containing LPP information or possible LPP information had all along been kept in confidence by LEAs. The sealing of such information in a separate envelope was a further preventive measure adopted in response to the request of the Commissioner.

21. Mr Dennis KWOK asked how interception operations would be stopped when the subject of investigation suddenly received a telephone call from a lawyer. S for S responded that conditions were imposed by panel judges on the handling of cases involving heightened LPP likelihood. However, it was inappropriate for him to disclose operational details. He stressed that the Commissioner had pointed out at his briefing held in the morning of 4 December 2018 that none of the seven cases of obtaining LPP information in 2017 involved direct communication between the object of interception and their lawyers.

Action

Pressure experienced by frontline law enforcement officers in performing duties under the Interception of Communications and Surveillance Ordinance

22. Mr LAM Cheuk-ting said that when he was working for the Independent Commission Against Corruption ("ICAC"), frontline officers were under heavy pressure when carrying out covert surveillance operations under ICSO, as any error in procedures or records could result in disciplinary actions. This had resulted in a substantial drop in the number of applications for Type 1 and Type 2 surveillance from 134 and 126 in 2007 to eight and three in 2017 respectively, representing a drop of about 94% and 97% respectively. He asked whether frontline officers of ICAC were reluctant to submit surveillance applications in order to avoid making mistakes and whether this would undermine the law enforcement capability of ICAC. He said that interception of communications and surveillance were effective tools for the detection of serious crime and protection of public safety. LEA officers should not avoid submitting surveillance applications in order to avoid making mistakes.

23. Assistant Director/Operations 3, Independent Commission Against Corruption responded that applications for conducting Type 1 and Type 2 surveillance under ICSO were made on a need basis having regard to the nature of individual cases, and the grant of a prescribed authorization would expressly be based on the necessity and proportionality principles under ICSO. Statistics on Type 1 and Type 2 surveillance under ICSO thus varied from year to year. There was no question of ICAC officers avoiding the submission of surveillance applications under ICSO in order to avoid regulation under ICSO.

24. S for S said that applications for Type 1 and Type 2 surveillance were based on the circumstances of individual cases and subject to the necessity and proportionality tests. The number of applications varied from year to year. In this connection, he pointed out that there were only six applications for Type 1 surveillance in 2012.

Other issues

25. Referring to paragraph 4.54 of the Annual Report, Dr Elizabeth QUAT expressed concern that no record on the contents of the calls in question had been documented by the two LEA officers concerned who had left the service. S for S responded that although the two officers concerned had left the service, they were still required to

Action

respond to questions raised by the Commissioner. He said that there was no record of the contents of the calls in question because the two cases were related to interception conducted already some time ago (i.e. in 2011 and 2013).

26. Mr AU Nok-hin said that the definition of "communication" in ICSO should be amended having regard to the proliferation of use of social media and instant message applications by members of the public. The Commissioner's view should also be sought on whether ICSO could effectively protect the privacy of communications of members of the public. S for S referred to relevant definitions in section 2 of ICSO and said that the definitions were clear and adequate.

27. Ms Claudia MO asked whether there were separate statistics on cases of non-compliance and irregularities of the respective LEAs. S for S responded that requirements on the information to be included in the Annual Report had been set out in ICSO and relevant statistics could be found in Chapter 8 of the Annual Report. The Commissioner had stated in the Annual Report that he had continued the practice of providing the utmost transparency of his work as the Commissioner, while taking care not to divulge any information the disclosure of which might prejudice the prevention or detection of crime or the protection of public security.

**V. Construction of Immigration Headquarters in Tseung Kwan O**  
(LC Paper No. CB(2)334/18-19(05))

28. The Chairman drew Members' attention to Rule 83A of the Rules of Procedure concerning the requirement of disclosing personal pecuniary interest.

29. Under Secretary for Security ("US for S") briefed Members on the Administration's proposal regarding the construction of the Immigration Headquarters ("HQ") in Tseung Kwan O.

Issues relating to the construction and design of the proposed headquarters

30. Mr SHIU Ka-fai expressed support for the Administration's proposal. He said that with ImmD's increasing manpower establishment following the opening of more control points and the need to process a large number of non-refoulement claims, there was a need for increased

Action

office space for ImmD. He said that relevant arrangements should be maintained in the proposed HQ to ensure proper crowd management and the order of residential areas nearby. He asked whether the Administration had encountered any problems in taking forward the proposed project.

31. US for S responded that the proposed project was being taken forward as scheduled. Subject to the support of LegCo, the Administration would proceed with the relevant tendering procedures. Acting Director of Immigration ("D of Imm (Atg)") and Project Director 1, Architectural Services Department ("PD1/ArchSD") added that various major project activities including the tendering process had been carried out timely according to the project programme .

32. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen sought information on the number of storeys in the proposed HQ and the increase in net operating floor area ("NOFA") arising from the relocation to the proposed HQ. He also asked about the services to be provided at self-service stations. US for S responded that the proposed HQ would provide NOFA of about 57 400 m<sup>2</sup> for ImmD and the net increase in NOFA arising from the relocation would be about 8 300 m<sup>2</sup>. D of Imm (Atg) added that the area of the existing HQ was about 33 000 m<sup>2</sup> and the area of other offices and facilities in various districts and leased premises which would be relocated to the proposed HQ was about 15 800 m<sup>2</sup>. He said that the increase in NOFA would alleviate the situation of space shortage. The integration of ImmD's offices into the proposed HQ would enhance operational efficiency.

33. Mr Holden CHOW sought information on the height of the proposed HQ.

34. PD1/ArchSD said that the proposed HQ would comprise 18 storeys and a basement subject to the final design. Although the Town Planning Board had approved a maximum height of 97 metres above the Hong Kong Principal Datum ("mPD") for the proposed HQ, the maximum height of the proposed HQ would be kept to about 90 mPD as far as possible, having taken into account the views of the Sai Kung District Council and local residents.

35. Mr Tony TSE expressed support in principle for the Administration's proposal. He asked why a "Design-and-Build" mode would be adopted for the proposed project and why the proposed project had an estimated cost of \$6,806 million.

Action

Admin

36. PD1/ArchSD responded that in determining the most suitable procurement mode for a project, consideration would be given to the nature, scale and requirements of the project as well as resource implications. The "Design-and-Build" mode was adopted and the contract commencement would be shortened by half a year so that detailed design development could take place in parallel with the site preparation/foundation works. The proposed HQ would tentatively comprise two 18-storey buildings, one of which would be sub-divided into north and south wings with appropriate connections, to facilitate provision of public services with better ventilation and minimal visual impact to the neighbourhood. Mr Tony TSE requested the Administration to provide the Panel with information on the design brief for the proposed project.

37. Mr Tony TSE enquired about the role of the Project Cost Management Office ("PCMO") in controlling the project cost. PD1/ArchSD responded that PCMO scrutinized the cost estimates of the project at different stages and the design requirements of the project were formulated in accordance with ImmD's operational requirement.

Accessibility of the proposed headquarters

38. Dr Elizabeth QUAT said that the Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong supported the Administration's proposal. She asked about the anticipated number of staff and members of the public travelling to and from the proposed HQ and expressed concern about the adequacy of public transport services for the area including cross-harbour tunnel bus service. She also asked whether there would be sheltered walkway between the proposed HQ and MTR stations in the vicinity.

39. US for S responded that about 3 000 staff would work at the proposed HQ. Currently, on average, about 6 500 members of the public visited the existing HQ per day to seek various immigration-related services. ImmD would closely monitor if the number of visitors to the proposed HQ would decrease following the introduction of enhanced electronic services in the coming years. As the commute pattern of ImmD staff to the proposed HQ would be different from that of the local residents, the project should not create added pressure on public transport services during peak hours. The MTR Tseung Kwan O Line would have adequate passenger carrying capacity

Action

to cater for the demand. According to the study conducted by a traffic consultant, the proposed HQ would not have any adverse impact on public transport services in the area. PD1/ArchSD added that it would take about five minutes to walk from Tseung Kwan O MTR Station to the proposed HQ, which would be easily accessible at grade or through planned pedestrian walkway leading to the adjacent Government, Institution or Community ("GIC") site in future. The proposed HQ would also be accessible from Tiu Keng Leng MTR Station through a series of existing and planned walkways and footbridges.

40. Mr AU Nok-hin asked whether the footbridge connecting Tseung Wan O MTR Station and The Wings III would be made available for use by the public on a 24-hour basis. PD1/ArchSD responded that the existing walkways and footbridges connecting Tiu Keng Leng MTR Station, Hong Kong Design Institute, Tiu Keng Leng Sports Centre would be open to the public round the clock, with footbridge connecting to the proposed HQ. Provision had also been allowed at The Wings III façade for possible connection by a planned footbridge to the future GIC site adjacent to the proposed HQ.

41. Mr POON Siu-ping expressed support in principle for the Administration's proposal. He expressed concern that with about 3 000 staff anticipated to be working at the proposed HQ, together with a large number of members of the public visiting the proposed HQ as well as a number of persons using the future government buildings in the vicinity, there would be a substantial increase in demand for public transport services in the area. The Administration should strengthen train services and other public transport services for the area.

42. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung expressed support for the Administration's proposal. He said that it would take a long time to travel from Yuen Long to the proposed HQ. The Administration should strengthen public transport services for the area to facilitate members of the public from different districts to access the proposed HQ.

43. US for S responded that the proposed HQ would be close to two MTR stations. The Tseung Kwan O-Lam Tin Tunnel and the Cross Bay Link, which were under construction, would help cater for the traffic demands in the area. As ImmD would enhance its electronic services, more immigration-related services would be easily accessible by electronic means, which would reduce the need for an applicant to go to the proposed HQ in person.

Action

Adequacy of car parking spaces at the proposed headquarters

44. Dr Elizabeth QUAT expressed concern that there was an acute shortage of public car parking spaces in the area near the proposed HQ. She said that public car parks should be provided in the area to meet the needs of members of the public who sought immigration-related services at the proposed HQ as well as residents in the area.

45. PD1/ArchSD responded that over 100 parking spaces for coaches and goods vehicles had been planned for the area at the adjacent Joint-user Government Office Building. The Government Property Agency and the Transport Department would consider providing additional public car parking spaces for private cars at the said Joint-user Government Office Building.

Admin

46. Dr Elizabeth QUAT and Mr Holden CHOW requested the Administration to provide detailed information on the number of public car parking spaces to be provided at the adjacent Joint-user Government Office Building. The Chairman requested the Administration to provide supplementary information in its paper when taking the project forward to the Public Works Subcommittee ("PWSC").

47. Mr CHAN Han-pan expressed support in principle for the Administration's proposal. He said that more parking spaces for members of the public should be provided in the area. Mr LEUNG Che-cheung expressed concern that there was an acute shortage of public parking spaces in Tseung Kwan O. He said that more car parking spaces should be provided at the proposed HQ.

48. Mr AU Nok-hin asked whether the public car parking spaces to be provided at the adjacent Joint-user Government Office Building would be restricted for any particular users. PD1/ArchSD replied in the negative.

49. Mr POON Siu-ping asked about the number of parking spaces for departmental use in the proposed HQ. US for S responded that there were 70 parking spaces for departmental use at the existing HQ and relevant offices in other districts. The same number of parking spaces for departmental use would be provided at the proposed HQ. Mr CHAN Han-pan said that more parking spaces for departmental use should be provided at the proposed HQ.

Action

50. US for S said that the Administration would consider members' views regarding the provision of more parking spaces at the proposed HQ.

Immigration-related services in the proposed HQ and on Hong Kong Island after reprovisioning of the existing headquarters

51. Referring to paragraph 9 of the Administration's paper, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen asked about the services to be provided through self-service stations of ImmD. Mr POON Siu-ping and Mr CHAN Han-pan asked whether ImmD would maintain an office on Hong Kong Island to continue providing immigration-related services to members of the public on Hong Kong Island to dovetail the relocation of HQ.

52. D of Imm (Atg) responded that ImmD was identifying sites for an office on Hong Kong Island to dovetail the construction of the proposed HQ. With the launching of the Next Generation Application and Investigation Easy Systems in 2021, more members of the public could use the new and enhanced electronic services which would reduce the need to go to the public-oriented office in person.

Issues relating to the Wan Chai Government Office Compound relocation exercise

53. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen said that supporting the construction of the proposed HQ would be equivalent to supporting the Wan Chai Government Office Compound ("WCGOC") relocation exercise.

54. US for S responded that the construction of the proposed HQ and the WCGOC relocation exercise were separate exercises. PD1/ArchSD added that the Administration had decided to relocate WCGOC, and the existing site would be used for the development of convention and exhibition venues, hotel facilities and offices. Further information on the relocation exercise would be announced by the relevant bureaux/departments in due course.

55. Mr AU Nok-hin and Dr Fernando CHEUNG expressed reservation about the demolition of WCGOC to make way for the development of convention and exhibition facilities. They considered that it might not be environmentally friendly to demolish WCGOC. They requested the Administration to provide more information in its paper when taking the



Action

project forward to PWSC on its plan to relocate the three office buildings at WCGOC under nine projects to make way for the development of convention and exhibition facilities, including the timetable, the estimated cost and whether the site at Wan Chai would be used by other government departments.

56. US for S agreed to liaise with the relevant bureaux/departments on whether such information could be provided. He said that integrating ImmD's offices and facilities currently located in various districts and leased premises due to shortage of space into the proposed HQ would help increase command and operational efficiency. It would facilitate collaboration as well as communication and enhance ImmD's effectiveness in law enforcement. It would achieve annual savings of about \$40 million in rental expenditure.

57. The Chairman concluded that members had no objection in principle to the Administration's submission of its proposal to PWSC.

*[To allow sufficient time for discussion, members agreed that the meeting would be extended by 15 minutes.]*

**VI. Proposed amendments to the First Schedule to the Dangerous Drugs Ordinance**  
(LC Paper Nos. CB(2)334/18-19(06) and (07))

58. Commissioner for Narcotics ("C for N") briefed Members on the Administration's proposal to bring five dangerous drugs, namely acryloylfentanyl, furanylfentanyl, 5F-MDMB-PINACA, ocfentanil and tetrahydrofuranylfentanyl, under control in the First Schedule to the Dangerous Drugs Ordinance (Cap. 134) ("DDO").

59. Members noted an updated background brief entitled "Amendments to the schedules to the Dangerous Drugs Ordinance" prepared by the LegCo Secretariat.

60. Mr CHAN Chun-ying asked whether there was any noticeable trend of abuse of the five dangerous drugs in Hong Kong. He asked whether the five substances were subject to any form of regulation before the proposed subsidiary legislation came into operation.

Action

61. C for N responded that the Administration had been closely monitoring the drug trend in Hong Kong. The statistics from the Central Registry of Drug Abuse, and the experiences of LEAs as well as non-governmental organizations providing drug treatment and rehabilitation services did not suggest a prevalent domestic abuse of the five substances. While the five substances had not yet been regulated under DDO, the import and export of the substances were subject to regulation under the Import and Export Ordinance (Cap. 60).

62. Mr CHAN Chun-ying noted that it would take about a year between the time of the relevant decision of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs ("UNCND") of placing a substance under international control and the time the five substances were brought under control in the First Schedule to DDO. He asked whether such a timeframe was in line with the timeframe of other Member States of UNCND. C for N responded that under the established procedures for bringing a substance under statutory control, the Administration would consult the relevant sectors, the Action Committee Against Narcotics and the Panel before the relevant subsidiary legislation would be considered by the Chief Executive in Council and tabled at LegCo for negative vetting. Compared with previous exercises, the current exercise would be shortened by about three months. There was a large number of Member States in the context of UNCND, and their progress of bringing the substances concerned under local control varied from one to another.

63. There being no other business, the meeting ended at 4:32 pm.