

**立法會**  
**Legislative Council**

LC Paper No. FC89/20-21  
(These minutes have been  
seen by the Administration)

Ref : FC/1/1(32)

**Finance Committee of the Legislative Council**

**Minutes of the 31<sup>st</sup> meeting**  
**held at Conference Room 1 of the Legislative Council Complex**  
**on Friday, 12 June 2020 from 9:03 am to 10:45 am;**  
**and from 3:09 pm to 7:12 pm**

**Members present:**

Hon CHAN Kin-por, GBS, JP (Chairman)  
Hon CHAN Chun-ying, JP (Deputy Chairman)  
Hon James TO Kun-sun  
Hon LEUNG Yiu-chung  
Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP  
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP  
Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP  
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP  
Hon WONG Ting-kwong, GBS, JP  
Hon Starry LEE Wai-king, SBS, JP  
Hon CHAN Hak-kan, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP  
Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP  
Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee, GBS, JP  
Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP  
Hon Claudia MO  
Hon Michael TIEN Puk-sun, BBS, JP  
Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS  
Hon Frankie YICK Chi-ming, SBS, JP  
Hon WU Chi-wai, MH  
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  
Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki  
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 Helena WONG Pik-wan  
Hon IP Kin-yuen  
Hon Elizabeth QUAT, BBS, JP  
Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, GBS, JP  
Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH  
Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, SBS, JP  
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP  
Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan  
Hon Alvin YEUNG  
Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin  
Hon CHU Hoi-dick  
Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, BBS, JP  
Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP  
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting  
Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding  
Hon SHIU Ka-fai, JP  
Hon SHIU Ka-chun  
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH  
Hon YUNG Hoi-yan, JP  
Dr Hon Pierre CHAN  
Hon Tanya CHAN  
Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP  
Hon HUI Chi-fung  
Hon LUK Chung-hung, JP  
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH  
Hon Kenneth LAU Ip-keung, BBS, MH, JP  
Dr Hon CHENG Chung-tai  
Hon KWONG Chun-yu  
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho  
Hon Vincent CHENG Wing-shun, MH, JP  
Hon Tony TSE Wai-chuen, BBS  
Hon CHAN Hoi-yan

**Public officers attending:**

Ms Alice LAU Yim, JP	Permanent Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)
Mr Raistlin LAU Chun, JP	Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury) 1
Mr Mike CHENG Wai-man	Principal Executive Officer (General), Financial Services and the Treasury Bureau (The Treasury Branch)
Mr Frank CHAN Fan, JP	Secretary for Transport and Housing
Mrs Sharon YIP LEE Hang-ye, JP	Deputy Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport) 1
Mr Peter MAK Chi-kwong	Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport) 7
Mr Jimmy CHAN Pai-ming, JP	Director of Highways
Mr Robert CHAN Cheuk-ming, JP	Principal Government Engineer (Railway Development), Highways Department
Mr LEUNG Sai-ho	Chief Engineer (Railway Development 1-2), Highways Department
Dr David CHUNG Wai-keung, JP	Under Secretary for Innovation and Technology
Ms Sandy CHEUNG Pui-shan	Principal Assistant Secretary for Innovation and Technology (1)
Ms Rebecca PUN Ting-ting, JP	Commissioner for Innovation and Technology, Innovation and Technology Commission
Mr Ivan LEE Kwok-bun, JP	Deputy Commissioner for Innovation and Technology, Innovation and Technology Commission

**Other person attending:**

Dr Jacob KAM	Chief Executive Officer, MTR Corporation Limited
Mr Roger BAYLISS	Projects Director, MTR Corporation Limited
Mr James CHOW	Divisional General Manager (Projects Construction), MTR Corporation Limited

Mr Scott MACKENZIE	General Manager (Procurement and Contracts), MTR Corporation Limited
Mr Lam CHAN	Deputy General Manager (Projects and Property Communications), MTR Corporation Limited
Mr Daniel YU Wang-tak	Chief Executive Officer, Nano and Advanced Materials Institute
Dr Lawrence Cheung Chi-chong	Chief Executive Officer, Automotive Platforms and Application Systems R&D Centre, Hong Kong Productivity Council
Mr Edwin KEH	Chief Executive Officer, Hong Kong Research Institute of Textiles and Apparel
Ms Yan CHAN Wai-yan	Director (Business Development), Hong Kong Research Institute of Textiles and Apparel
Mr Simon WONG Kwong-yeung	Chief Executive Officer, Logistics and Supply Chain MultiTech R&D Centre

**Clerk in attendance:**

Ms Anita SIT	Assistant Secretary General 1
--------------	-------------------------------

**Staff in attendance:**

Ms Angel SHEK	Chief Council Secretary(1)1
Miss Bowie LAM	Council Secretary (1)1
Miss Queenie LAM	Senior Legislative Assistant (1)2
Mr Frankie WOO	Senior Legislative Assistant (1)3
Miss Mandy POON	Legislative Assistant (1)1
Miss Yannes HO	Legislative Assistant (1)7

---

Action

The Chairman reminded members of the requirements under Rule 83A and Rule 84 of the Rules of Procedure.

**Item 1 — FCR(2020-21)11  
RECOMMENDATION OF THE PUBLIC WORKS  
SUBCOMMITTEE MADE ON 11 MAY 2020**

**PWSC(2019-20)27**

**HEAD 706 — HIGHWAYS**

**Transport—Railways**

**61TR — Shatin to Central Link – construction of railway works – remaining works**

**62TR — Shatin to Central Link – construction of non-railway works – remaining works**

2. The Chairman advised that the item sought the approval of the Finance Committee ("FC") for the recommendation made by the Public Works Subcommittee ("PWSC") at its meeting held on 11 May 2020 in respect of PWSC(2019-20)27 to:

- (a) increase the approved project estimate ("APE") of 61TR by \$8,696.8 million from \$65,433.3 million to \$74,130.1 million in money-of-the-day (MOD) prices; and
- (b) increase the APE of 62TR by \$1,367 million from \$5,983.1 million to \$7,350.1 million in MOD prices.

The Chairman said that PWSC spent 6 hours 50 minutes on the deliberation of the funding proposal, while FC spent 4 hours on deliberation at the last meeting.

3. The Chairman declared that he was an Executive Director and the Chief Executive Officer of Well Link Insurance Group Holdings Limited.

Motions proposed by members under paragraph 19 of the Finance Committee Procedure

4. The Chairman advised that he received nine motions proposed by members under paragraph 19 of the Finance Committee Procedure ("FCP 19 motions"). He ruled that seven motions were in order. The seven FCP 19 motions were proposed by Mr Andrew WAN, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr James TO, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Dr Helena WONG and Mr KWONG Chun-yu respectively. The Chairman directed that a joint debate would be held for these motions. He would first invite movers of the motions to speak, to be followed by other members, each for not more than three minutes. He would then invite the Administration to respond to the motions. Thereafter, the movers of the motions could respectively speak in reply, each for not more than one minute. Upon conclusion of the joint debate, he would put the seven FCP 19 motions to vote one by one.

5. Mr Andrew WAN introduced his motion (**Appendix I**). He said that as regards the arrangement for relocating vessels affected by the proposed Shatin to Central Link ("SCL") at Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter, the MTR Corporation Limited ("MTRCL") failed to provide sufficient information in response to members' concerns or enquiries. Therefore, he moved a motion to summon Mr Kelvin WU, Senior Liaison Engineer of MTRCL, to testify or give evidence before the FC.

6. Mr LAM Cheuk-ting introduced his motion (**Appendix II**). Mr LAM said that the SCL project was embroiled in a number of scandals, including the cutting-short of steel bars, forging documents, destruction of construction records and concealment of construction conditions. Mr LAM was of the view that Mr Philco WONG, former Projects Director of MTRCL, was the top person in charge of the project during the relevant period, and should therefore be held accountable; Mr LAM considered that, with root causes of the problem and loopholes in the monitoring system yet to be identified, it was necessary to summon Mr Philco WONG to testify or give evidence before the committee.

7. Mr WU Chi-wai introduced his motion (**Appendix III**). Mr WU said that one of the main reasons for cost overruns of the SCL project was the Administration or MTRCL's failure to anticipate the conditions of underground facilities within the site during design stage, and additional works were therefore needed to remedy or modify the original design. However, the Administration or MTRCL were both unable to provide sufficient information to assist members' understanding of whether these additional works were a result of necessity or negligence. Therefore, Mr WU considered it necessary to summon Anthony Zervaas, Project Director of Leighton Contractors (Asia) Limited ("Leighton Asia"), to testify or give evidence before the FC.

8. Mr James TO introduced his motion (**Appendix IV**). Mr TO advised that Leighton Asia was said to be the culprit of the SCL works incidents. He believed that Malcolm Plummer, the former Project Director of Leighton Asia, was the key person in the incidents who would be able to help members understand who was responsible for the cost overruns of the SCL project.

9. Mr HUI Chi-fung introduced his motion (**Appendix V**). Mr HUI said that according to paragraph 22(c) of Enclosure 1 to FCR(2020-21)11, in view of comments from the District Council ("DC"), MTRCL carried out additional works in the site in Wan Chai North to reduce the impact on nearby residents and existing facilities. From Mr HUI's understanding,

MTRCL once said that as the ex-Wan Chai Swimming Pool and ex-Harbour Road Sports Centre had to remain open for public use during the investigation stage, the extent of ground investigation works prior to construction was limited; the contractor could only conduct detailed investigation after the demolition of the two aforementioned facilities, and could then ascertain that the actual rock head level and soil conditions were different from that anticipated. This had prompted necessary additional works and resulted in additional cost. Mr HUI was of the view that this remark was only made by the MTRCL side alone. He considered it necessary to summon Miss Clarisse YEUNG, Chairman of Wan Chai DC, to testify or give evidence before the FC in order to facilitate members' understanding of the DC's views at that time and the reason for the subsequent additional works.

10. Dr Helena WONG introduced her motion (**Appendix VI**). Dr WONG said that settlement occurred during the construction of To Kwa Wan ("TKW") Station, causing substantial or structural damage to some buildings in the vicinity. Although MTRCL claimed that it had already implemented the TKW Station Community Care Programme to assist affected residents in carrying out remedial works for their properties, MTRCL did not heed the request of members to provide the numbers of complaint cases received and handled, as well as information such as structural safety status of relevant buildings. Therefore, Dr WONG considered it necessary to summon Ms Jade FUNG, Public Relations Manager (Projects and Property) of MTRCL, to testify or give evidence before the FC.

11. Mr KWONG Chun-yu introduced his motion (**Appendix VII**). Mr KWONG said that while the SCL project had substantial cost overruns, the Administration made an excuse that the reasons for this included the additional works conducted in response to views of the Wong Tai Sin DC. Therefore, Mr KWONG considered it necessary to summon Mr HUI Kam-shing, Chairman of Wong Tai Sin DC, to testify or give evidence before the FC.

12. Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Jeremy TAM and Ms Tanya CHAN expressed support for the seven FCP 19 motions mentioned above.

13. Mr Alvin YEUNG said that the total cost of the SCL project reached \$90 billion and the financial proposal under consideration involved additional funding of as much as \$10 billion, accounting for one ninth of the total project cost. However, the Administration and MTRCL failed to clearly respond to members' concerns or enquiries about the details of the extra cost. Furthermore, Mr YEUNG pointed out that since the SCL

project involved several districts, it was necessary for relevant DC Chairmen to relay local residents' concerns about the project before the committee, so as to ensure proper use of public funds.

14. Mr LUK Chung-hung did not support the aforementioned seven motions. Mr LUK was of the view that most of the works of the SCL project had been completed, and the additional funding application to the FC was only meant to conclude the remaining works. Summoning related parties (including former management of MTRCL or representatives of contractor) to testify or give evidence before FC was not only time-consuming, causing further delay to the completion and commissioning of the SCL and great inconvenience to members of the public, but also pointless in terms of monitoring the Government's execution of the SCL project. He believed that MTRCL representatives present at the meeting would try their best to provide members with further information. Furthermore, views and resolutions of relevant DCs were already uploaded onto their websites; FC members (especially members who were also DC members) could convey the views of local residents at the meeting as well. Therefore, Mr LUK considered it not necessary to summon DC Chairmen. While FC already had a huge backlog of agenda items, summoning witnesses would render it more difficult to vet and approve financial proposals efficiently. If certain financial proposals failed to be approved before the end of the current Legislative Council ("LegCo") term, the Administration had to go through all consultation and funding application procedures over again in the next LegCo term.

15. Mr Jeremy TAM was of the view that former and current Project Directors of Leighton Asia were key figures at the forefront of the SCL project incident who could provide the committee with first-hand information to assist the deliberation of the funding proposal. Therefore, he did not agree with Mr LUK Chung-hung's opinion that it did not have meaning to summon related individuals. Furthermore, witnesses summoned under paragraph 19 of the Finance Committee Procedure ("FCP") would be protected under the Legislative Council (Powers and Privileges) Ordinance (Cap. 382) when testifying or giving evidence.

16. Ms Tanya CHAN considered that summoning relevant individuals of MTRCL and Leighton Asia could assist the committee in further understanding how the Administration and MTRCL would handle issues related to project management cost; and whether the monitoring and verification consultant ("M&V consultant") engaged by the Administration in the SCL project had dereliction of duty.



17. At the invitation of the Chairman, the Secretary for Transport and Housing ("STH") gave the following response:

- (a) the Government already expounded in the discussion paper the rationales for seeking additional funding from the committee for the remaining projects and additional works of the SCL project, as well as the cost of various works;
- (b) officials and MTRCL representatives present at the committee meeting were able to respond to the enquiries of members;
- (c) apart from providing supplementary information in response to Members' enquiries raised on previous meetings of the Subcommittee on Matters Relating to Railways, PWSC and FC, the Government was also prepared to provide afterwards supplementary information on questions that could not be responded at the meeting; and
- (d) the various concerns raised by members on construction management were generally covered in the Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Construction Works at and Near the Hung Hom Station Extension ("Construction works at the Hung Hom Station Extension") under the SCL Project. The Independent Audit Panel appointed by the Government to follow up the recommendations in the Report had thoroughly reviewed the relevant recommendations, which were being followed up and implemented by the Government.

18. In the light of the above, STH said that the Government considered it not necessary to summon persons specified in the seven FCP 19 motions. He also called on members to oppose the motions and supported the funding proposal to enable the early completion and commissioning of the SCL project.

19. Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Mr WU Chi-wai and Dr Helena WONG called on members to support the motions. Mr Andrew WAN, Mr James TO, Mr HUI Chi-fung and Mr KWONG Chun-yu respectively said that they would not speak in reply.

Voting on motions proposed under paragraph 19 of the Finance Committee Procedure

20. At 9:39 am, the Chairman put to vote, one by one, the seven motions. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division in

respect of each question put. The voting results were as follows (the votes of individual members were set out in **Appendix VIII**).

Members proposing the motion	Wording of the motion	Voting results
Mr Andrew WAN Siu-kin	Appendix I	Negated
Mr LAM Cheuk-ting	Appendix II	Negated
Mr WU Chi-wai	Appendix III	Negated
Mr James TO Kun-sun	Appendix IV	Negated
Mr HUI Chi-fung	Appendix V	Negated
Dr Helena WONG Pik-wan	Appendix VI	Negated
Mr KWONG Chun-yu	Appendix VII	Negated

21. After the Chairman announced that the FCP 19 motion proposed by Mr LAM Cheuk-ting was negated by the committee, Mr CHU Hoi-dick moved without notice under paragraph 47 of the FCP ("FCP 47") that in the event of further divisions being claimed in respect of any motions or questions under the same agenda item, FC should proceed to each of such divisions immediately after the division bell had been rung for one minute. In response to Mr CHU's enquiry, the Chairman explained that upon consulting the Legislative Council Secretariat and the Legal Adviser, it was confirmed that members could propose only one motion for the same agenda item under FCP 47. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division, and the motion was negated.

#### Continuation of the discussion on item FCR(2020-21)11

22. FC continued with the discussion on FCR(2020-21)11.

#### Overall construction cost of SCL

23. Dr Fernando CHEUNG noted that MTRCL notified the Government in 2017 that the estimated entrustment cost of the main construction works of the SCL had to be raised by around \$16.5 billion, but the Government only sought additional funding of around \$10 billion at present to continue carrying out the remaining works of the SCL project. In this regard, Dr CHEUNG requested the Administration to illustrate the cost reduction from \$16.5 billion to \$10 billion with a breakdown.

24. In response, the Director of Highways ("DHy") explained that:

- (a) after the Government received the notification that the entrustment cost would be increased by \$16.5 billion from MTRCL in 2017, the Highways Department ("HyD"), assisted

by its M&V consultant, critically examined the estimate and justifications provided by MTRCL. In 2017, certain projects were not yet settled, or the scale not confirmed. In 2020, those projects were all finalized. After taking into account the views of HyD on the expenditure item, MTRCL reduced the entrustment cost estimate in 2020; and

- (b) since the Government considered the justifications submitted by MTRCL for the proposed additional project management cost (about \$1.3 billion) insufficient, it disagreed to the proposal by MTRCL for additional project management cost. After deducting the said project management cost, this application for additional funding was amount to about \$10 billion.

25. Mr WU Chi-wai said that given that 90% of the overall SCL project had been completed, the remaining works should encounter fewer uncertainties. However, this funding application still reserved around 10% of the amount required for the remaining works as contingencies. In this regard, Mr WU enquired whether there was some expected expenditure not set out in the additional funding application in question.

26. STH responded that this funding application for increasing the APE (including contingencies) did not have any hidden expenditure items.

27. Mr KWONG Chun-yu, Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Dr CHIANG Lai-wan were all of the view that the Administration should cap the expenditure for the SCL project and undertake that it would not apply for any additional funding for the SCL project from the LegCo in future.

28. In response, STH said:

- (a) the discussion paper already expounded the justifications for this additional funding application in detail. The expenditures involved were costs which had been unpredictable in the course of taking forward the project, and were practically needed. According to current estimates, the funding this time would be sufficient for the remaining works of the SCL project;
- (b) as the social incidents last year and the outbreak of the epidemic this year were unpredictable in advance, the Government could not undertake to cap the expenditure at the moment; and

- (c) the Government undertook that upon the funding approval, it would stringently perform its gatekeeping role to ensure proper use of public money to the interest of the public.

Additional works for topside developments above railway stations

29. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen noted that additional works for topside developments above Exhibition Centre Station and Diamond Hill Station involved around \$580 million, and enquired about the following:

- (a) the respective share between Exhibition Centre Station and Diamond Hill Station of the additional expenditures to be incurred; and
- (b) the respective share of the additional expenditures to be incurred on works listed in items (a) to (c) in paragraph 24 in Enclosure 1 to the paper.

30. In response, DHy said that:

- (a) of the expenditure of around \$580 million, the Exhibition Centre Station accounted for around \$500 million and the Diamond Hill Station only accounted for around \$ 10 million; and
- (b) works stated in item (a) in paragraph 24 in Enclosure 1 to the paper accounted for around \$500 million, while works set out in items (b) and (c) accounted for around \$10 million in total.

31. Mr Alvin YEUNG enquired about the types of properties to be developed atop the Exhibition Centre Station and Diamond Hill Station, and whether MTRCL would benefit from owning, leasing or managing the properties. Mr YEUNG was of the view that if topside developments above railway stations involved future commercial interests to MTRCL, the additional works should not be borne by public funds. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen was concerned whether MTRCL would have an advantage in the public tender exercises for topside developments in future.

32. In response, STH and DHy said that:

- (a) the Government had the development rights and the initiative in topside developments above the two stations, which were unrelated to MTRCL;

- (b) the site of Exhibition Centre Station was zoned as "Comprehensive Development Area". Future development of properties atop railway stations would be conducted by open tenders through a fair process. Whether to participate in the tender exercises in future would be MTRCL's commercial decision; and
- (c) the site of the Diamond Hill Station was zoned as "Government Facilities" of a non-commercial nature. Any public works projects to be developed on the site in future would still require LegCo's funding approval.

33. Mr Alvin YEUNG enquired about the number of existing properties atop railway stations managed by MTRCL.

34. The Chief Executive Officer ("CEO") of MTRCL responded that among the existing 90 or so railway stations, around half of the above-station properties were managed by MTRCL, while around half were not. For example, properties atop West Kowloon Terminus of the Hong Kong Section of Guangzhou-Shenzhen-Hong Kong Express Rail Link ("XRL") were not managed by MTRCL.

35. In reply, STH explained that:

- (a) generally speaking, sites for above-station property development were sold through open tenders or auctions, e.g. the properties above the West Kowloon Terminus of XRL were developed through tenders; and
- (b) if an above-station project was implemented under the rail-plus-property development model, the Government would specify the part of the land within the station area to be allocated and the relevant development scale during the detailed planning and design process, and would give a detailed account on financial assessments.

36. Mr Jeremy TAM was of the view that as properties were developed atop railway stations in the past, the Government should have included the foundation works in the main works of the SCL when it first submitted funding application. Ms Tanya CHAN recalled that the Government once consulted the Hong Kong Trade Development Council on the need for additional convention and exhibition facilities, and said that design and public consultation would be conducted on future convention and

exhibition facilities. However, the Government did not provide any further information in this regard, nor did it conduct any consultation. Given that the Exhibition Centre Station accounted for the majority of the expenditure for the additional works for topside developments above railway stations, Ms CHAN questioned whether this arrangement implied that certain preliminary works would be done for the large-scale convention and exhibition facilities to be developed, so as to save some money for potential bidders in future. In this regard, Ms CHAN requested the Government to submit written information to illustrate the proposed development in detail, including but not limited to:

- (a) the engineering design and consultation work conducted by the Administration for the proposed development, and the consultation outcome;
- (b) gross floor area to be provided by the proposed development after the additional works; and
- (c) how would the proponent of the relevant development bear the costs incurred on the aforementioned additional works and the amount/proportion of the costs to be borne.

37. In response, STH said that:

- (a) the additional works for topside developments above railway stations were advance work to be done in response to the planning of the Commerce and Economic Development Bureau ("CEDB") for future developments atop the Exhibition Centre Station; and
- (b) the arrangement was similar to the Government's usual practice of completing site formation works for land plots as a kind of advance work. The scale of future development atop the Exhibition Centre Station was yet to be finalized. THB would relay members' concerns to CEDB for follow-up.

38. DHy added that:

- (a) the original foundation design of the Exhibition Centre Station only aimed for supporting the station itself. Since the Exhibition Centre Station was located underground, there would be practical difficulties to construct foundations for above-station properties after the completion and commissioning of the station; and

- (b) the additional works were added to this additional funding application because topside developments were confirmed only after the initial funding application for the main works of the SCL.

[*Post-meeting note*: the supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. FC299/19-20(01) on 6 October 2020.]

39. Ms Tanya CHAN was of the view that, as it was CEDB's request to construct the "enhanced" foundation of the Exhibition Centre Station, it should leave it to CEDB to apply for the funding for the related works. Ms CHAN pointed out that the basement and foundation of the West Kowloon Cultural District were built by the Government, with properties atop developed by private developers subsequently. If this arrangement was to be repeated at the Exhibition Centre Station, the Government would in effect subsidize private interests as topside developments would involve commercial benefits.

40. Mr Alvin YEUNG was concerned whether funding for new railway projects would cover construction cost of foundations of corresponding topside developments in future, regardless of the use of the above-station developments. Mr WU Chi-wai enquired whether the Administration would recover the costs of additional foundation works of the Exhibition Centre Station from developers of convention and exhibition facilities in future.

41. In response, STH said that:

- (a) works would be commissioned by way of entrustment agreement among bureaux and departments. The project presents an opportunity as the railway works involved topside developments which would be economically beneficial;
- (b) at the time of the inception of SCL, the need for topside developments above the Exhibition Centre Station was not yet confirmed, and was therefore not included in the estimate when the project was implemented in the beginning; and
- (c) the foundation cost borne by the Government would be properly reflected in the land premium during land auctions or tenders, and as the Exhibition Centre Station was located in a Comprehensive Development Area, its development

approaches and uses were yet to be finalized.

Modifications in response to feedback and requirements of stakeholders and the railway operator

42. Mr Jeremy TAM recalled that he requested the Administration at the last meeting to provide detailed written information with a breakdown of the \$2.2 billion additional cost involved in modifications done in response to feedback and requirements of stakeholders and the railway operator, but he noted that LC Paper No. FC217/19-20(01) submitted by the Administration did not give a clear account on the information requested by him. In this regard, Mr Jeremy TAM requested the Administration to provide written information as soon as possible, regarding:

- (a) the numbers of additional baby caring rooms and lifts to the ground level at various new stations of SCL, the stations where they were located, the construction cost per unit; and the size of each baby caring room, the capacity and the height of travel of each lift, respectively in tabular form; and
- (b) reasons for enhancing the ticket selling systems and customer service facilities of a number of new stations.

43. In response, Deputy General Manager (Projects and Property Communications) of MTRCL said that:

- (a) to tie in with station construction works, large-scale traffic diversion measures had to be implemented in the vicinity of Ma Tau Wai Road under which the original three southbound lanes and three northbound lanes arrangement at Ma Tau Wai Road was replaced by two southbound lanes and one northbound lane. To ensure the smooth operation of temporary traffic management measures, MTRCL deployed 22 care ambassadors and traffic supervisors on site to assist residents in adapting to the traffic diversion around Ma Tau Wai Road; and
- (b) traffic diversion measures were implemented around Farm Road and Tin Kwong Road from 2012 to 2013. Given the large number of schools in the proximity, temporary pedestrian refuges and lay-bys were added to reduce the impact on students in the area.



[*Post-meeting note*: the supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. FC299/19-20(01) on 6 October 2020.]

44. Mr CHAN Chi-chuen noted that the works under 62TR included reprovisioning of Ma Chai Hang Recreation Ground. In this regard, Mr CHAN requested the Administration to explain the cost and progress of the reprovisioning works. Mr Jeremy TAM was also concerned about the plan of reprovisioning of Ma Chai Hang Recreation Ground as an 11-a-side soccer pitch. He said that some residents expressed their wish of having a lawn for parent-child activities after reprovisioning. In this regard, Mr TAM requested the Administration to consider modifying the reprovisioning plan to provide a futsal pitch, which was smaller in size, and a lawn to better meet the people's actual needs.

45. In response, DHy said that:

- (a) ventilation facilities for the SCL project were built at the original site of the Ma Chai Hang Playground. A soccer pitch and an indoor game hall would be reprovisioned upon completion of the works. The relevant cost were already included in this additional funding application for 62TR; and
- (b) due to the delay in the Tuen Ma Line project, it was necessary to keep the works site at Ma Chai Hang Playground. Several consultations were conducted on reprovisioning arrangements. In the light of the views of the DC and locals on the scale and uses of reprovisioned facilities, the reprovisioning plan was still under design, in the hope that it could meet the views and needs of the public as far as possible. However, the works could only be finalized after the approval of the additional funding application.

46. Divisional General Manager (Projects Construction) of MTRCL added that MTRCL was conducting design work and local consultation on the reprovisioning plan, and would take forward the design work in detail after funding approval. It was estimated that the design stage would take one year while the construction would span three years.

47. Mr WU Chi-wai said that locals requested the establishment of a district library at the reprovisioned Ma Chai Hang Recreation Ground. In this respect, Mr WU enquired whether THB could relay the request to relevant departments.

48. STH responded that, in the course of implementing railway projects, on top of the reprovisioning of original facilities affected in the first place, if there were views that other facilities should also be added, such ideas had to be put to discussion with the bureau concerned, as each district had its own planning standards for various facilities (e.g. recreational and leisure facilities or welfare facilities). THB could relay the views of members to relevant bureaux.

Reprovisioning of Police Officers' Club ("POC") and improvement works of Police Sports and Recreation Club ("PSRC")

49. Mr CHU Hoi-dick noted that regarding the works under 62TR, "other government facilities" incurred an additional cost of over \$500 million as the returned tender prices were higher than original estimate. Mr CHU enquired what other works were included in "other government facilities" apart from the reprovisioning of POC and improvement works of PSRC.

50. DHy replied that:

- (a) apart from the reprovisioning of POC and improvement to PSRC, works categorized as "other government facilities" in the paper also included reprovisioning of New Territories South Animal Management Centre and reprovisioning of a public toilet in Wan Chai; and
- (b) the works under 62TR included other non-railway works. Other than the aforementioned "other government facilities", there were other projects with returned tender prices higher than the estimates in 2012.

51. Mr CHU Hoi-dick said that to his understanding, FC already approved the funding for the main works of the SCL in May 2012, but the Administration did not award the contract for the reprovisioning of POC and improvement to PSRC until August 2014. Mr CHU was concerned whether the cost inflation was attributable to the time lapse of two years between funding approval and award of contract. Ms Tanya CHAN also enquired why the contract was only awarded two years after the funding was approved.

52. Divisional General Manager (Projects Construction) of MTRCL responded that tender exercises for works contracts were carried out according to overall project priority, such as taking into account the timetable for surrender of land and the overall project.

53. Mr CHU Hoi-dick noted that the cost of various contracts for works under 61TR and 62TR increased by \$1.1 billion in total, yet the reprovisioning of POC and improvement to PSRC already accounted for \$300 million of the increase, and the returned tender prices also inflated significantly by 60% compared with the original estimate. In this regard, he enquired whether there was similar example of substantial increase in returned tender prices over the original estimate. Furthermore, Mr CHU requested the Administration to provide information on estimated and returned tender prices of individual works contracts awarded in mid-2013 or later in relation to the works under 61TR and 62TR.

*[Post-meeting note: the supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. FC299/19-20(01) on 6 October 2020.]*

54. In response, DHy said that:

- (a) LC Paper No. FC217/19-20(02) submitted just now set out the amount saved from works contracts awarded before mid-2013 due to total actual contract prices being lower than estimates made in 2012. The paper also set out the increased amounts of contracts awarded in mid-2013 or later due to total actual contract prices being higher than estimates made in 2012. The information in the paper reflected the aggregate amount of numerous contracts. The reprovisioning of POC was included in Works Contract No. 1128. The major component of the contract was related to railway works; and
- (b) regarding the example of a substantial increase in returned tender price over original estimate, in the case of the Wan Chai Ferry Concourse Public Toilet, the original estimated price was \$3.5 million, while the returned tender price was \$18 million.

55. Ms Tanya CHAN was of the view that as the Administration already noted that returned tender prices in mid-2013 or later were generally higher than estimates made in 2012, it should identify the reasons for that. Furthermore, Ms CHAN enquired which department was responsible for determining the standard of facilities to be provided in the reprovisioned POC.

56. In response, DHy said that:

- (a) discrepancies between returned tender prices and original estimates could be ascribed to many factors, which mainly depended on bidders' assessments based on business considerations, including such factors as wages and material prices. When applying for funding in 2012, the Government already adopted the most appropriate information at the time to formulate the estimate;
- (b) while returned tender prices increased since mid-2013, some returned tender prices received between 2012 and mid-2013 were lower than estimates. The returned tender prices of the main works contracts of the SCL were generally lower than estimates; and
- (c) as for the standard of facilities in the reprovisioned POC, the Government drew reference from the original club facilities before making a decision on facilities in the reprovisioned POC through internal procedures.

57. Dr KWOK Ka-ki said that, at the last meeting, he requested the Government to compare the project costs of clubs/recreational facilities for civil servants completed in recent years with the project costs of reprovisioning of POC and improvement to PSRC, but so far the Administration had not submitted any information.

58. In response, the Deputy Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury (Treasury)<sup>1</sup> said that the Government was collecting and collating relevant information, and would provide Members with a reply upon verifying the information.

*[Post-meeting note: the supplementary information provided by the Administration was circulated to members vide LC Paper No. FC299/19-20(01) on 6 October 2020.]*

#### Claims from contractors

59. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan was concerned about the latest progress of claims submitted by contractors in accordance with contract terms. She also enquired, regarding the unsolved claim cases, whether the money involved was included in the current application for additional funding.

60. In response, DHy said that:
- (a) the entrustment agreement had specified procedures for handling claims. MTRCL set up a task force dedicated to scrutinize submitted claims, and HyD and the M&V consultant would also scrutinize whether the claims were sufficiently justified. MTRCL had to take into account the Government's views before making decisions;
  - (b) the amount involved in the resolved claim cases had been confirmed, and was included in this funding application;
  - (c) as for the unresolved claims, MTRCL had scrutinized the justifications for these claims and the estimated amount of claims were incorporated into this funding application. It was expected that the estimated amount should be sufficient for the unresolved claims; and
  - (d) this funding application also set aside around \$1.7 billion as contingencies to deal with claims that might arise in the future.

Assistance and compensation for residents affected by the works

61. Dr Priscilla LEUNG said that buildings in which many residents resided and business of shop operators in the To Kwa Wan District were affected by the SCL project. To her knowledge, some households had to spend as much as \$90,000 to repair cracks in the flats caused by the works, but MTRCL only offer \$10,000 in compensation to each household. She considered that MTRCL should provide full compensation. Dr Helena WONG was concerned whether MTRCL knew the number of households whose buildings were damaged under the impact of the SCL project, as well as MTRCL's follow-up work on these damaged flats.

62. CEO of MTRCL and Deputy General Manager (Projects and Property Communications) of MTRCL said that MTRCL proactively introduced a community care programme in early 2019 as a goodwill move and handled around 210 cases in 2019 in total, of which 206 cases were subsidized by MTRCL in various aspects. Furthermore, members of the public affected by the works could also claim compensation for Government works from the Government in accordance with relevant Ordinances.

63. Dr Priscilla LEUNG enquired whether MTRCL would provide fare concessions as compensation, and whether the project management cost of

\$700 million would be used as compensation to affected households and shop operators.

64. In response, CEO OF MTRCL said that:

- (a) 20% fare concession would be offered to all passengers from 1 July 2020 onwards;
- (b) MTRCL also granted various concessions subject to the needs of passengers from time to time, and other concessions would be available depending on local circumstances upon commissioning of new railway lines; and
- (c) there were laws at present to protect all members of the public affected by railway works. They could claim compensation in accordance with relevant procedures.

Responsibility for the construction works at the Hung Hom Station Extension and the related incidents

65. Mr LAM Cheuk-ting recalled the short-piling incidents concerning the Home Ownership Scheme and the step down of the then Chairman of the Hong Kong Housing Authority after being held accountable in the past. In this regard, Mr LAM enquired whether STH would accept responsibility and step down for the series of incidents in relation to delays, cost overruns and quality of works of the Hung Hom Station Extension under the SCL project.

66. In response, STH said that:

- (a) the Commission of Inquiry appointed by Chief Executive-in-Council clearly set out in its Final Report a chronology of the construction works at the Hung Hom Station Extension which commenced in 2013 and were completed at the end of 2016. The current-term Government was aware of the incidents only in 2018;
- (b) the report of the Commission of Inquiry did not name and criticize the Board of MTRCL or senior officials of the Government. The persons in charge back then had already left office. Therefore, he was not in a position to comment; and

- (c) he was duty bound as a politically accountable official of the current-term Government to ponder how to deal with the problems. He finally decided to stay and lead the Government team to earnestly follow up the various recommendations made by the Commission of Inquiry and put forward improvements in site supervision, management, construction etc., in hope of completing the remaining works of SCL within the current term of the Government, so that the SCL could be commissioned as soon as possible, providing members of the public with convenient railway service.

67. The Chairman reminded members not to repeatedly enquire about the accountability of STH for the construction works at the Hung Hom Station Extension as STH had unequivocally expounded his position. He asked members to focus on discussing the financial proposal.

Follow-up actions for the construction works at the Hung Hom Station Extension

68. Dr CHIANG Lai-wan was concerned about the Administration's follow-up actions for the construction works at the Hung Hom Station Extension. Dr Priscilla LEUNG was concerned how MTRCL would make improvements after replacing the management.

69. In response, STH said that:

- (a) after the incidents relating to the construction works at the Hung Hom Station Extension of SCL, regardless of whether it was an entrustment agreement for a new railway project or a contract for a public works project, the Government would seriously and thoroughly scrutinize the terms to ensure avoidance of similar problems regarding the construction and monitoring of the works of the Hung Hom Station Extension;
- (b) since the Government considered MTRCL's justifications for increasing its project management cost (around \$1.3 billion) insufficient, it did not agree to grant MTRCL additional project management cost, and the said project management cost was not included in this funding application; and
- (c) the Government had already appointed an Independent Audit Panel to carry out an independent follow-up audit on the implementation progress of the measures recommended in the Commission's Interim Report.

70. In response, CEO of MTRCL and MTRCL Projects Director said that:

- (a) to follow up the incidents relating to the construction works at the Hung Hom Station Extension, MTRCL had already made a provision of \$2 billion for the relevant costs of follow-up actions;
- (b) with reference to the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry and detailed reviews made by the board of MTRCL, MTRCL would launch a series of measures, including the enhancement of inspection process and monitoring by means of digital technology, immediate completion of Request for Inspection, Survey and Check ("RISC") forms and maintenance of site records. It would also carry out regular verification and adopt Building Information Modelling and the New Engineering Contract to more effectively control costs and progress etc.; and
- (c) the SCL project used the best prevailing monitoring method at the time when construction started, and MTRCL would adopt the latest best practices on new projects in future.

71. Mr Michael TIEN said that, according to the Commission of Inquiry report, the Government should claim compensation from MTRCL if MTRCL's actions were found to have caused losses to the Government. Mr TIEN questioned why the Government still had to pay MTRCL a project management cost of \$8 billion when a series of incidents relating to the quality of construction works at the Hung Hom Station Extension took place, and why MTRCL would want to accept the project management cost. Ms Tanya CHAN said that the entrustment agreement should include relevant terms that required MTRCL to provide a reasonable level of service. Ms CHAN enquired whether MTRCL considered that its performance in the incidents relating to the construction works at the Hung Hom Station Extension had already reached a level acceptable to both the Government and the people.

72. STH responded that MTRCL had an unshirkable responsibility for the construction works at the Hung Hom Station Extension. The Government would seriously follow it up in accordance with the entrustment agreement and judge on the basis of facts whether MTRCL had inflicted losses to the Government owing to negligence or other actions. The Government had the right to lodge claims against MTRCL.



73. In response, CEO of MTRCL said that:

- (a) MTRCL received the project management cost for having completed a proper station structure according to project requirements;
- (b) in the past few years, apart from the SCL project, MTRCL also completed the construction of other railway lines, in which a vast majority of staff and the contractors engaged did make their best endeavors to perform their professional duties; and
- (c) MTRCL did have inadequacies in the construction works at the Hung Hom Station Extension, yet it already made a provision of \$2 billion for the relevant costs of follow-up work.

74. Ms Tanya CHAN said that the former STH, after leaving office, once said that implementation of projects through entrustment agreements might not be the most ideal arrangement. In this regard, Ms CHAN enquired whether STH considered entrustment agreement had problems in itself, or whether some provisions did not clearly spell out the division of work and responsibilities, or whether there were problems in supervision.

75. In response, STH said that:

- (a) SCL and XRL projects were both implemented under the concession approach, which involved entrustment agreements. Certain terms in the agreements served to protect the Government's interests, the Government would bear the project cost, while MTRCL received project management cost for carrying out the works; and
- (b) he noticed that society had opinions on the concession approach, especially the performance of MTRCL which was responsible for the implementation of works. However, there were reasons for adopting the concession approach back then, e.g. the East Rail Line extended under the SCL project was owned by the Kowloon-Canton Railway Corporation, while XRL involved many Government agencies, e.g. the co-location arrangement. Therefore, the Government's participation and ownership in the relevant projects could facilitate implementation.

76. Dr Fernando CHEUNG was of the view that the Administration had the duty to examine the governance structure and the *modus operandi* of MTRCL, and review the prevailing transport policy of "railway hegemony", as follow-up actions for the incident relating to the works at the Hung Hom Station Extension.

77. In response, STH said that:

- (a) after the incident relating to the works at the Hung Hom Station Extension, MTRCL had already conducted a review, and the Government had also explicitly reminded MTRCL that as a railway company in Hong Kong, its core business should be in Hong Kong and it should take care of the interests of Hong Kong people first;
- (b) as for future railway projects, the Tuen Mun South Extension and the Tung Chung Line Extension would be taken forward using the ownership approach, and it was believed that certain problems in the past would not recur; and
- (c) the discussion paper already explained clearly the reasons for this application for additional funding of \$10 billion, which had nothing to do with the incident relating to the works at the Hung Hom Station Extension.

78. Dr Helena WONG pointed out that the Final Report of the Commission of Inquiry mentioned the Government's monitoring system on railway projects, in which the Government performed multiple roles: including overseer, funder of projects, statutory approving authority, the ultimate approver and acceptor of the projects. Dr WONG enquired, if the Government was to continue with this monitoring model, whether it could effectively supervise the remaining works of SCL and ensure that SCL project would be able to complete on time with no more delays and cost overruns.

79. STH replied that the Final Report of the Commission of Inquiry put forward relevant recommendations for improvement, and some of which were in progress, including the study for establishing an independent department for comprehensive supervision of railway projects.

80. Dr Helena WONG was concerned how HyD monitored the work of M&V consultant and whether it was the consultant's inadequacies that resulted in cost overruns and project delays. On the other hand, the current monitoring system mainly relied on Railway Development Office

("RDO") within HyD for administrative co-ordination. Dr WONG enquired how RDO carried out monitoring and verification, as well as why it was not able to ensure no delays and cost overruns in SCL.

81. DHy and Principal Government Engineer (Railway Development), HyD responded that the Administration usually outsourced work depending on the needs of individual projects. An M&V consultant was engaged to assist with the SCL project. The Government would monitor the work of the M&V consultant and assess whether it was up to requirements, e.g. number of site inspections carried out by the M&V consultant or findings in reports submitted by the consultant. The Commission of Inquiry had already recommended how to improve the monitoring and verification work in its Interim Report, and the relevant recommendations had also been enforced.

82. At 10:45 am, the Chairman declared that the meeting be adjourned and FC would continue to deliberate on this item at 3 pm on the same day.

83. At 3:09 pm, FC continued the deliberation on FCR(2020-21)11.

84. At 4:31 pm, the Chairman said that the item had already been discussed by PWSC and FC for around 14 hours, and some members' questions and arguments on various aspects were repeated 20 times or more. Therefore, he considered the item was thoroughly discussed, and reminded members who still wished to ask questions to press the "Request-to-speak" button as soon as possible to indicate their intention to speak. The Chairman said that he would conclude the discussion and deal with motions proposed by members pursuant to paragraph 37A of FCP after all members on the wait-to-speak list had spoken.

#### Motion to adjourn discussion on item FCR(2020-21)11

85. At 4:47 pm, Dr Fernando CHEUNG, when speaking on the item, moved without notice under paragraph 39 of the FCP that discussion on item FCR(2020-21)11 be adjourned. The Chairman proposed the question and directed that each member might speak once on the motion for not more than three minutes.

86. Dr Fernando CHEUNG said that it was not the first time for the Administration to apply to FC for supplementary provision for the SCL project. However, as to members' requests that the Administration promise to cap the cost of the SCL project and hold relevant public officers accountable, the Administration did not respond positively, merely saying that it was following up the recommendations in the report of the

Commission of Inquiry into the construction works at the Hung Hom Station Extension. Regarding members' opinion that the Administration should review the "railway hegemony" of MTRCL as soon as possible, the Administration turned a deaf ear and intended to allow MTRCL's continued participation in planning and implementation of projects such as the Tuen Mun South Extension and the Tung Chung Line Extension. Therefore, Dr CHEUNG considered FC should adjourn discussion on this item in the hope that the Administration could cap the cost of the SCL project and enhance accountability.

87. The meeting was suspended at 4:52pm and resumed at 5:02 pm.

88. Mr CHU Hoi-dick, Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Jeremy TAM, Mr Andrew WAN, Dr Helena WONG, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Ms Tanya CHAN, Mr WU Chi-wai, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Ms Claudia MO, Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Mr KWONG Chun-yu supported the motion to adjourn discussion on FCR(2020-21)11.

89. Mr CHU Hoi-dick was of the view that regarding the cost for reprovisioning of POC near Causeway Bay Typhoon Shelter and improvement to PSRC at Boundary Street, although the Administration pointed out that the returned tender prices of the projects concerned were higher than estimate, it failed to give an account of why the returned tender prices were significantly higher, nor could it expound the details of the works. Therefore, he supported the motion proposed by Dr Fernando CHEUNG. Mr Andrew WAN expressed similar concerns. Mr WU Chi-wai and Dr KWOK Ka-ki were of the view that the aforementioned projects of reprovisioning and improvement to welfare facilities for the Police Force seemed too extravagant.

90. Mr Alvin YEUNG, Mr Andrew WAN, Mr HUI Chi-fung, Mr SHIU Ka-chun, Ms Claudia MO and Mr KWONG Chun-yu said that they were strongly dissatisfied with the severe cost overruns of the SCL project and the Administration's refusal to cap project cost. Mr SHIU Ka-chun requested the Administration to respond whether it would expedite the installation of platform screen doors for the East Rail Line. Ms Claudia MO questioned the justifications for the increase in fees for the M&V consultant.

91. Mr Andrew WAN, Dr Helena WONG, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr LAM Cheuk-ting, Dr KWOK Ka-ki and Mr KWONG Chun-yu said that they were dissatisfied with the Administration's repeated claims that no officials or public officers had to be held accountable and step down for the various scandals over the SCL project. When these members were

speaking, the Chairman reminded members that they should not address government officials or public officers with insulting language.

92. Mr Andrew WAN, Dr Helena WONG, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen, Mr SHIU Ka-chun and Ms Claudia MO criticized the Chairman's arrangement to "draw a line" on the discussion session. The Chairman said that he did not agree with members' criticism as PWSC and FC had discussed this item for a total of 14 hours and it was appropriate to "draw a line" at the moment.

93. Ms Tanya CHAN criticized that MTRCL's performance in the SCL project completely failed to meet the requirements of the entrustment agreement, and considered that the Commission of Inquiry into the construction works at the Hung Hom Station Extension was too lenient with MTRCL's performance as shown in its conclusion in the Report. Ms CHAN also criticized the Administration for not learning from the cost overruns of XRL, leading to the recurrence of the same problem in the SCL project.

94. Mr WU Chi-wai was of the view that most of the works of the SCL project had been completed, yet the Administration still reserved \$1.7 billion as contingencies for the remaining works without a specific scope of application. He was worried whether the Administration had fully disclosed the financial exposure related to the project.

95. Regarding additional works for topside developments above relevant railway stations, Mr CHAN Chi-chuen said that he was dissatisfied that the Administration could go so far as to claim unawareness of the topside development projects in the early period.

96. The Administration did not make a consolidated reply on the motion. Dr Fernando CHEUNG spoke in reply on his motion, mainly to reiterate the arguments for proposing the motion.

97. Mr Jimmy NG declared that he was an Independent Non-executive Director of MTRCL.

98. The Chairman put to vote the motion that discussion on the agenda item be adjourned. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. The motion was negatived. FC continued with the discussion on FCR(2020-21)11.

Motions proposed by members under paragraph 37A of the Finance Committee Procedure

99. At 6:03 pm, FC started to vote on whether the motions proposed by members under paragraph 37A of the FCP ("FCP 37A motions") should be proceeded with forthwith. The Chairman put to vote the questions that these FCP 37A motions should be proceeded with forthwith. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division in respect of each question put. The voting results were as follows:

Members proposing the motions	Serial numbers of motions	Whether to proceed with the motions forthwith
Mr Alvin YEUNG	<a href="#">0001</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
Dr Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung	<a href="#">0002</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
Dr KWOK Ka-ki	<a href="#">0003</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
Mr Jeremy TAM Man-ho	<a href="#">0004</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
Mr CHAN Chi-chuen	<a href="#">0005</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
Ms Tanya CHAN	<a href="#">0006</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
Mr WU Chi-wai	<a href="#">0007</a>	<a href="#">No</a>
Dr Helena WONG Pik-wan	<a href="#">0008</a>	<a href="#">No</a>

Voting on FCR(2020-21)11

100. At 6:45 pm, the Chairman put item FCR(2020-21)11 to vote. At the request of members, the Chairman ordered a division. The Chairman declared that 30 members voted for and 21 members voted against the item. No members abstained from voting. The votes of individual members were as follows:

*For:*

Mr Abraham SHEK Lai-him	Mr WONG Ting-kwong
Mr CHAN Hak-kan	Dr Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun
Mr WONG Kwok-kin	Mr Michael TIEN Puk-sun
Mr Steven HO Chun-yin	Mr Frankie YICK Chi-ming
Mr YIU Si-wing	Mr MA Fung-kwok
Mr LEUNG Che-cheung	Ms Alice MAK Mei-kuen
Mr KWOK Wai-keung	Mr Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung
Ms Elizabeth QUAT	Mr POON Siu-ping
Mr Dr LO Wai-kwok	Mr Jimmy NG Wing-ka
Mr Holden CHOW Ho-ding	Mr SHIU Ka-fai
Mr Wilson OR Chong-shing	Ms YUNG Hoi-yan

Mr CHAN Chun-ying	Mr CHEUNG Kwok-kwan
Mr LUK Chung-hung	Mr LAU Kwok-fan
Mr Kenneth LAU Ip-keung	Mr Vincent CHENG Wing-shun
Mr Tony TSE Wai-chuen	Ms CHAN Hoi-yan

(30 members)

*Against:*

Prof Joseph LEE Kok-long	Ms Claudia MO
Mr WU Chi-wai	Mr Charles Peter MOK
Mr CHAN Chi-chuen	Dr KWOK Ka-ki
Mr Dennis KWOK Wing-hang	Dr Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung
Dr Helena WONG Pik-wan	Mr IP Kin-yuen
Mr Alvin YEUNG	Mr Andrew WAN Siu-kin
Mr CHU Hoi-dick	Mr LAM Cheuk-ting
Mr SHIU Ka-chun	Dr Pierre CHAN
Ms Tanya CHAN	Mr HUI Chi-fung
Dr CHENG Chung-tai	Mr KWONG Chun-yu
Mr Jeremy TAM Man-ho	

(21 members)

101. The Chairman declared that the item was approved.
102. At 6:45 pm, the Chairman announced that the meeting be extended for 15 minutes.

**Item 2 — FCR(2020-21)1**

**INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY FUND**

**Head 111 — INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY**

**Subhead 104 The Nano and Advanced Materials Institute**

**Subhead 105 The Hong Kong Research Institute of Textiles and Apparel**

**Subhead 106 The Automotive Parts and Accessory Systems Research and Development Centre**

**Subhead 107 The Research and Development Centre for Logistics and Supply Chain Management Enabling Technologies**

103. At around 6:50 pm, the Chairman left the meeting room. The Deputy Chairman chaired the remainder of the meeting. The Deputy Chairman declared that he was an advisor of the Bank of China (Hong Kong).

104. The Deputy Chairman advised that the item invited FC to approve an increase in commitment of the following Subheads under Head 111 - Innovation and Technology:

- (a) from \$690 million by \$439.5 million to \$1,129.5 million for Subhead 104 – The Nano and Advanced Materials Institute ("NAMI ");
- (b) from \$344.5 million by \$214.3 million to \$558.8 million for Subhead 105 – The Hong Kong Research Institute of Textiles and Apparel ("HKRITA");
- (c) from \$299.7 million by \$84.5 million to \$384.2 million for Subhead 106 – The Automotive Parts and Accessory Systems Research and Development Centre; and
- (d) from \$362.4 million by \$276.8 million to \$639.2 million for Subhead 107 – The Research and Development Centre for Logistics and Supply Chain Management Enabling Technologies.

105. The Deputy Chairman advised that the Innovation and Technology Bureau consulted the Panel on Commerce and Industry ("C&I Panel") on the proposal on 19 November 2019. The Panel spent about 41 minutes on the discussion of the proposal.

106. At the invitation of the Deputy Chairman, Mr Jimmy NG, the Chairman of the C&I Panel reported that the Panel supported in principle the funding proposal to extend the operation of the four Research and Development ("R&D") Centres (i.e. NAMI, HKRITA, the Automotive Parts and Accessory Systems Research and Development Centre (now known as the "Automotive Platforms and Application Systems Research and Development Centre") and the Research and Development Centre for Logistics and Supply Chain Management Enabling Technologies (now known as the "Logistics and Supply Chain MultiTech Research and Development Centre")) for four years to 31 March 2025. Members were concerned about the commercialization of the R&D projects undertaken by the four R&D Centres since their commissioning and the performance of their R&D outcomes in the international community. Members also expressed concern about the reasons for the Government to significantly increase its funding commitment for the coming four years of operation of the four R&D Centres. Some members considered that it was high time to review and consolidate the development plans of various R&D Centres, with a view to (a) expanding the scope of R&D and undertaking more



innovation-oriented and value-added projects; (b) opening up a career path in R&D for Hong Kong's youth; (c) exploring further scope of cooperation with I&T professionals from the Mainland on R&D projects in order to develop the vast Mainland market; and (d) enhancing the performance of the R&D Centres by raising the level of commercialization income against the amount of R&D investment.

107. At 6:53 pm, the Deputy Chairman instructed that the meeting be extended for 15 minutes.

### R&D projects

#### *CuMask<sup>+TM</sup>*

108. Mr KWONG Chun-yu said that the R&D of CuMask<sup>+TM</sup> undertaken by HKRITA involved an allocation of nearly \$800 million from the Government under the Anti-epidemic Fund. However, he reckoned that the public was not quite interested in collecting or using the mask. He asked whether the Government had assessed the utilization of the mask and the reasons for its low utilization so as to ensure the proper use of public funds. Ms Claudia MO enquired about the total expenditure spent by HKRITA on the CuMask<sup>+TM</sup> R&D project.

109. Commissioner for Innovation and Technology ("CIT") said that the online registration period for eligible Hong Kong residents to collect CuMask<sup>+TM</sup> free of charge had just ended. A total of more than 1.44 million online registrations had been received, involving over 3.93 million people. Hongkong Post had delivered more than 3.38 million face masks to the people concerned. In addition, more than 1.4 million face masks had been delivered to primary schools and kindergartens for use by students. Apart from making online registrations, members of the public might collect face masks at post offices or estate management offices under the Hong Kong Housing Authority and the Hong Kong Housing Society from 15 June to 15 July 2020. As for the total expenditure, calculations were still undergoing at present as the distribution of face masks had not yet finished. Relevant information was expected to be released around August 2020. It was believed that the total expenditure would be less than \$800 million.

110. CIT further advised that the unit cost of CuMask<sup>+TM</sup> was about \$40, including the costs of raw materials, production, packaging, transport logistics, wages and delivery. The expenditure incurred was paid to HKRITA on a reimbursement basis. HKRITA conducted R&D on the prototype of the mask as early as March 2017. Later in 2018, HKRITA

filed a patent application and won a gold medal in the International Exhibition of Inventions of Geneva. The total cost of the R&D project on the prototype was \$1.5 million, around \$1.28 million of which was funded by the Innovation and Technology Fund while the remainder was sponsored by the trade. In early 2020, when Coronavirus Disease 2019 ("COVID-19") started to spread quickly, the supply of face masks and their raw materials became seriously tight. In view of this, the Government commissioned HKRITA to launch CuMask<sup>+TM</sup> based on the aforesaid prototype project with improvements made to it. HKRITA applied for a United States patent in respect of the technology of CuMask<sup>+TM</sup> in 2020.

111. Ms Claudia MO was concerned about the alleged transfer of benefits in the CuMask<sup>+TM</sup> project. CIT explained that to address the acute shortage of face masks at the time, the Government commissioned HKRITA to coordinate the production of reusable face masks. Procurement of materials of the face masks was carried out by HKRITA. The materials of CuMask<sup>+TM</sup> came from four suppliers. During that time, only these four suppliers in the market could provide the relevant materials for producing the face masks. Some of the required materials of the face masks were provided by a company which the Chairman of HKRITA was serving. In this regard, the Chairman of HKRITA had declared interests to the Board of Directors of HKRITA and obtained approval from CIT. CIT emphasized that the relevant materials were provided by the suppliers at cost.

#### *Nanomaterials*

112. Dr Pierre CHAN enquired how many of the R&D projects undertaken by NAMI had reached the technology level associated with nanotechnology. Chief Executive Officer, NAMI advised that the R&D projects of NAMI covered nanomaterials and other advanced materials. At the request of Dr CHAN, the Administration agreed to provide after the meeting supplementary information on the research outcomes or products, among the technologies or materials developed by NAMI, which had reached nanometer standards.

[*Post-meeting note:* The supplementary information provided by the Administration was issued to members vide LC Paper No. FC 225/19-20(01) on 19 June 2020.]

113. The meeting ended at 7:12 pm.

財務委員會

尹兆堅議員

根據《立法會議事規則》第 80(a)條及  
《財務委員會會議程序》第 19 段  
動議的議案

議案措辭

就本委員會審議議程文件編號 FCR(2020-21)11 內的財務建議，本委員會依據《立法會(權力及特權)條例》(第 382 章)第 9(1)條授予本委員會的權力，命令香港鐵路有限公司高級統籌工程師胡嘉麟先生到本委員會席前，就上述議程文件內的財務建議的上述事宜作證和提供證據，以及出示所有相關文據、簿冊、紀錄或文件：

港鐵聽取市民意見後，改善銅鑼灣避風塘的搬遷船隻安排事宜。

財務委員會

林卓廷議員

根據《立法會議事規則》第 80(a)條及  
《財務委員會會議程序》第 19 段  
動議的議案

議案措辭

就本委員會審議議程文件編號 FCR(2020-21)11 內的財務建議，本委員會依據《立法會(權力及特權)條例》(第 382 章)第 9(1)條授予本委員會的權力，命令香港鐵路有限公司前工程總監黃唯銘先生到本委員會席前，就上述議程文件內的財務建議的下述事宜作證和提供證據，以及出示所有相關文據、簿冊、紀錄或文件：

在施工期間，承建商須進行額外工程，以應對設計時未能準確預視的地下設施狀況事宜。

## 財務委員會

胡志偉議員

根據《立法會議事規則》第 80(a)條及  
《財務委員會會議程序》第 19 段  
動議的議案

### 議案措辭

就本委員會審議議程文件編號 FCR(2020-21)11 內的財務建議，本委員會依據《立法會(權力及特權)條例》(第 382 章)第 9(1)條授予本委員會的權力，命令禮頓建築(亞洲)有限公司項目總監 Anthony Zervaas 到本委員會席前，就上述議程文件內的財務建議的下述事宜作證和提供證據，以及出示所有相關文據、簿冊、紀錄或文件：

在施工期間，承建商須進行額外工程，以應對設計時未能準確預視的地下設施狀況事宜。

財務委員會

涂謹申議員

根據《立法會議事規則》第 80(a)條及  
《財務委員會會議程序》第 19 段  
動議的議案

議案措辭

就本委員會審議議程文件編號 FCR(2020-21)11 內的財務建議，本委員會依據《立法會(權力及特權)條例》(第 382 章)第 9(1)條授予本委員會的權力，命令禮頓建築(亞洲)有限公司前項目總監 Malcolm Plummer 到本委員會席前，就上述議程文件內的財務建議的下述事宜作證和提供證據，以及出示所有相關文據、簿冊、紀錄或文件：

在施工期間，承建商須進行額外工程，以應對設計時未能準確預視的地下設施狀況事宜。

## 財務委員會

許智峯議員

根據《立法會議事規則》第 80(a)條及  
《財務委員會會議程序》第 19 段  
動議的議案

### 議案措辭

就本委員會審議議程文件編號 FCR(2020-21)11 內的財務建議，本委員會依據《立法會(權力及特權)條例》(第 382 章)第 9(1)條授予本委員會的權力，命令灣仔區議會主席楊雪盈小姐到本委員會席前，就上述議程文件內的財務建議的下述事宜作證和提供證據，以及出示所有相關文據、簿冊、紀錄或文件：

港鐵公司在聽取區議會意見後，於灣仔北工地進行額外工程以減少對附近住戶及現有設施的影響事宜。

## 財務委員會

黃碧雲議員

根據《立法會議事規則》第 80(a)條及  
《財務委員會會議程序》第 19 段  
動議的議案

### 議案措辭

就本委員會審議議程文件編號 FCR(2020-21)11 內的財務建議，本委員會依據《立法會(權力及特權)條例》(第 382 章)第 9(1)條授予本委員會的權力，命令香港鐵路有限公司公共關係經理(項目及物業)馮翠碧女士到本委員會席前，就上述議程文件內的財務建議的下述事宜作證和提供證據，以及出示所有相關文據、簿冊、紀錄或文件：

沙中線土瓜灣站地盤工程影響附近樓宇的外牆及室內結構，港鐵對受影響居民作出的補救工作及賠償事宜。



財務委員會

鄭俊宇議員

根據《立法會議事規則》第 80(a)條及  
《財務委員會會議程序》第 19 段  
動議的議案

議案措辭

就本委員會審議議程文件編號 FCR(2020-21)11 內的財務建議，本委員會依據《立法會(權力及特權)條例》(第 382 章)第 9(1)條授予本委員會的權力，命令黃大仙區議會主席許錦成先生到本委員會席前，就上述議程文件內的財務建議的下述事宜作證和提供證據，以及出示所有相關文據、簿冊、紀錄或文件：

港鐵公司在聽取區議會意見後，於馬仔坑工地進行額外工程，包括更改馬仔坑 工地的出入口、建造及拆卸臨時行人天橋等，為附近居民提供更方便的行人通道設施事宜。

# 附錄 VIII Appendix VIII

點名表決 DIVISION: 1  
日期 DATE: 12/06/2020  
時間 TIME: 09:44:25 上午 AM

動議 MOTION: 尹兆堅議員根據《立法會議事規則》第 80(a) 條及《財務委員會會議程序》第 19 段動議的議案  
Motion moved by Hon Andrew WAN Siu-kin under Rule 80(a) of the Rules of Procedure of the Legislative Council and paragraph 19 of the Finance Committee Procedure

動議人 MOVED BY:

出席 Present : 44  
投票 Vote : 43  
    贊成 Yes : 20  
    反對 No : 23  
    棄權 Abstain : 0  
結果 Result : 否決 Negatived

個別表決如下 THE INDIVIDUAL VOTES WERE AS FOLLOWS:

議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE	議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE
陳健波	CHAN Kin-por	出席	PRESENT	葉建源	IP Kin-yuen	贊成	YES
涂謹申	James TO	贊成	YES	葛珮帆	Elizabeth QUAT		
梁耀忠	LEUNG Yiu-chung	贊成	YES	廖長江	Martin LIAO		
石禮謙	Abraham SHEK	反對	NO	潘兆平	POON Siu-ping	反對	NO
張宇人	Tommy CHEUNG	反對	NO	蔣麗芸	Dr CHIANG Lai-wan		
李國麟	Prof Joseph LEE			盧偉國	Ir Dr LO Wai-kiok		
林健鋒	Jeffrey LAM	反對	NO	鍾國斌	CHUNG Kwok-pan		
黃定光	WONG Ting-kiwong	反對	NO	楊岳橋	Alvin YEUNG	贊成	YES
李慧琼	Starry LEE			尹兆堅	Andrew WAN	贊成	YES
陳克勤	CHAN Hak-kan			朱凱迪	CHU Hoi-dick	贊成	YES
梁美芬	Dr Priscilla LEUNG			吳永嘉	Jimmy NG		
黃國健	WONG Kwok-kin	反對	NO	何君堯	Dr Junius HO		
葉劉淑儀	Mrs Regina IP	反對	NO	林卓廷	LAM Cheuk-ting	贊成	YES
謝偉俊	Paul TSE			周浩鼎	Holden CHOW	反對	NO
毛孟靜	Claudia MO	贊成	YES	邵家輝	SHIU Ka-fai		
田北辰	Michael TIEN			邵家臻	SHIU Ka-chun		
何俊賢	Steven HO	反對	NO	柯創盛	Wilson OR	反對	NO
易志明	Frankie YICK	反對	NO	容海恩	YUNG Hoi-yan		
胡志偉	WU Chi-wai	贊成	YES	陳沛然	Dr Pierre CHAN		
姚思榮	YIU Si-wing			陳振英	CHAN Chun-ying	反對	NO
馬逢國	MA Fung-kiok	反對	NO	陳淑莊	Tanya CHAN	贊成	YES
莫乃光	Charles Peter MOK	贊成	YES	張國鈞	CHEUNG Kwok-kwan	反對	NO
陳志全	CHAN Chi-chuen	贊成	YES	許智峯	HUI Chi-fung	贊成	YES
陳恒鎮	CHAN Han-pan	反對	NO	陸頌雄	LUK Chung-hung	反對	NO
梁志祥	LEUNG Che-cheung			劉國勳	LAU Kwok-fan	反對	NO
梁繼昌	Kenneth LEUNG	贊成	YES	劉業強	Kenneth LAU		
麥美娟	Alice MAK	反對	NO	鄭松泰	Dr CHENG Chung-tai	贊成	YES
郭家麒	Dr KWOK Ka-ki	贊成	YES	鄭俊宇	KWONG Chun-yu	贊成	YES
郭偉強	KWOK Wai-keung	反對	NO	譚文豪	Jeremy TAM	贊成	YES
郭榮鏗	Dennis KWOK			鄭泳舜	Vincent CHENG	反對	NO
張華峰	Christopher CHEUNG	反對	NO	謝偉銓	Tony TSE	反對	NO
張超雄	Dr Fernando CHEUNG	贊成	YES	陳凱欣	CHAN Hoi-yan	反對	NO
黃碧雲	Dr Helena WONG	贊成	YES				

秘書 CLERK



點名表決 DIVISION: 2  
日期 DATE: 12/06/2020  
時間 TIME: 09:49:55 上午 AM

動議 MOTION: 林卓廷議員根據《立法會議事規則》第 80(a) 條及《財務委員會會議程序》第 19 段動議的議案  
Motion moved by Hon LAM Cheuk-ting under Rule 80(a) of the Rules of Procedure of the Legislative Council and paragraph 19 of the Finance Committee Procedure

動議人 MOVED BY:

出席 Present : 44  
投票 Vote : 43  
贊成 Yes : 20  
反對 No : 23  
棄權 Abstain : 0  
結果 Result : 否決 Negatived

個別表決如下 THE INDIVIDUAL VOTES WERE AS FOLLOWS:

議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE	議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE
陳健波	CHAN Kin-por	出席	PRESENT	葉建源	IP Kin-yuen	贊成	YES
涂謹申	James TO	贊成	YES	葛珮帆	Elizabeth QUAT		
梁耀忠	LEUNG Yiu-chung	贊成	YES	廖長江	Martin LIAO		
石禮謙	Abraham SHEK	反對	NO	潘兆平	POON Siu-ping	反對	NO
張宇人	Tommy CHEUNG	反對	NO	蔣麗芸	Dr CHIANG Lai-wan		
李國麟	Prof Joseph LEE			盧偉國	Ir Dr LO Wai-kiwok		
林健鋒	Jeffrey LAM	反對	NO	鍾國斌	CHUNG Kwok-pan		
黃定光	WONG Ting-kiwong	反對	NO	楊岳橋	Alvin YEUNG	贊成	YES
李慧琼	Starry LEE			尹兆堅	Andrew WAN	贊成	YES
陳克勤	CHAN Hak-kan			朱凱迪	CHU Hoi-dick	贊成	YES
梁美芬	Dr Priscilla LEUNG			吳永嘉	Jimmy NG		
黃國健	WONG Kwok-kin	反對	NO	何君堯	Dr Junius HO		
葉劉淑儀	Mrs Regina IP	反對	NO	林卓廷	LAM Cheuk-ting	贊成	YES
謝偉俊	Paul TSE			Holden CHOW	Holden CHOW	反對	NO
毛孟靜	Claudia MO	贊成	YES	邵家輝	SHIU Ka-fai		
田北辰	Michael TIEN			邵家臻	SHIU Ka-chun		
何俊賢	Steven HO	反對	NO	柯創盛	Wilson OR	反對	NO
易志明	Frankie YICK	反對	NO	容海恩	YUNG Hoi-yan		
胡志偉	WU Chi-wai	贊成	YES	陳沛然	Dr Pierre CHAN		
姚思榮	YIU Si-wing			陳振英	CHAN Chun-ying	反對	NO
馬逢國	MA Fung-kiwok	反對	NO	陳淑莊	Tanya CHAN	贊成	YES
莫乃光	Charles Peter MOK	贊成	YES	張國鈞	CHEUNG Kwok-kwan	反對	NO
陳志全	CHAN Chi-chuen	贊成	YES	許智峯	HUI Chi-fung	贊成	YES
陳恒鎮	CHAN Han-pan	反對	NO	陸頌雄	LUK Chung-hung	反對	NO
梁志祥	LEUNG Che-cheung			劉國勳	LAU Kwok-fan	反對	NO
梁繼昌	Kenneth LEUNG	贊成	YES	劉業強	Kenneth LAU		
麥美娟	Alice MAK	反對	NO	鄭松泰	Dr CHENG Chung-tai	贊成	YES
郭家麒	Dr KWOK Ka-ki	贊成	YES	鄭俊宇	KWONG Chun-yu	贊成	YES
郭偉強	KWOK Wai-keung	反對	NO	譚文豪	Jeremy TAM	贊成	YES
郭榮鏗	Dennis KWOK			鄭泳舜	Vincent CHENG	反對	NO
張華峰	Christopher CHEUNG	反對	NO	謝偉銓	Tony TSE	反對	NO
張超雄	Dr Fernando CHEUNG	贊成	YES	陳凱欣	CHAN Hoi-yan	反對	NO
黃碧雲	Dr Helena WONG	贊成	YES				

秘書 CLERK



點名表決 DIVISION: 4  
日期 DATE: 12/06/2020  
時間 TIME: 10:01:36 上午 AM

動議 MOTION: 胡志偉議員根據《立法會議事規則》第 80(a) 條及《財務委員會會議程序》第 19 段動議的議案  
Motion moved by Hon WU Chi-wai under Rule 80(a) of the Rules of Procedure of the Legislative Council and paragraph 19 of the Finance Committee Procedure

動議人 MOVED BY:

出席 Present : 44  
投票 Vote : 43  
贊成 Yes : 20  
反對 No : 23  
棄權 Abstain : 0  
結果 Result : 否決 Negatived

個別表決如下 THE INDIVIDUAL VOTES WERE AS FOLLOWS:

議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE	議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE
陳健波	CHAN Kin-por	出席	PRESENT	葉建源	IP Kin-yuen	贊成	YES
涂謹申	James TO	贊成	YES	葛珮帆	Elizabeth QUAT		
梁耀忠	LEUNG Yiu-chung	贊成	YES	廖長江	Martin LIAO		
石禮謙	Abraham SHEK	反對	NO	潘兆平	POON Siu-ping	反對	NO
張宇人	Tommy CHEUNG	反對	NO	蔣麗芸	Dr CHIANG Lai-wan		
李國麟	Prof Joseph LEE			盧偉國	Ir Dr LO Wai-kiok		
林健鋒	Jeffrey LAM	反對	NO	鍾國斌	CHUNG Kwok-pan		
黃定光	WONG Ting-kiwong	反對	NO	楊岳橋	Alvin YEUNG	贊成	YES
李慧琼	Starry LEE			尹兆堅	Andrew WAN	贊成	YES
陳克勤	CHAN Hak-kan			朱凱迪	CHU Hoi-dick	贊成	YES
梁美芬	Dr Priscilla LEUNG	反對	NO	吳永嘉	Jimmy NG		
黃國健	WONG Kwok-kin	反對	NO	何君堯	Dr Junius HO		
葉劉淑儀	Mrs Regina IP	反對	NO	林卓廷	LAM Cheuk-ting	贊成	YES
謝偉俊	Paul TSE			周浩鼎	Holden CHOW	反對	NO
毛孟靜	Claudia MO	贊成	YES	邵家輝	SHIU Ka-fai		
田北辰	Michael TIEN			邵家臻	SHIU Ka-chun		
何俊賢	Steven HO	反對	NO	柯創盛	Wilson OR	反對	NO
易志明	Frankie YICK	反對	NO	容海恩	YUNG Hoi-yan		
胡志偉	WU Chi-wai	贊成	YES	陳沛然	Dr Pierre CHAN		
姚思榮	YIU Si-wing			陳振英	CHAN Chun-ying	反對	NO
馬逢國	MA Fung-kiok	反對	NO	陳淑莊	Tanya CHAN	贊成	YES
莫乃光	Charles Peter MOK	贊成	YES	張國鈞	CHEUNG Kwok-kwan	反對	NO
陳志全	CHAN Chi-chuen	贊成	YES	許智峯	HUI Chi-fung	贊成	YES
陳恒鎮	CHAN Han-pan			陸頌雄	LUK Chung-hung	反對	NO
梁志祥	LEUNG Che-cheung			劉國勳	LAU Kwok-fan	反對	NO
梁繼昌	Kenneth LEUNG	贊成	YES	劉業強	Kenneth LAU		
麥美娟	Alice MAK	反對	NO	鄭松泰	Dr CHENG Chung-tai	贊成	YES
郭家麒	Dr KWOK Ka-ki	贊成	YES	鄭俊宇	KWONG Chun-yu	贊成	YES
郭偉強	KWOK Wai-keung	反對	NO	譚文豪	Jeremy TAM	贊成	YES
郭榮鏗	Dennis KWOK			鄭泳舜	Vincent CHENG	反對	NO
張華峰	Christopher CHEUNG	反對	NO	謝偉銓	Tony TSE	反對	NO
張超雄	Dr Fernando CHEUNG	贊成	YES	陳凱欣	CHAN Hoi-yan	反對	NO
黃碧雲	Dr Helena WONG	贊成	YES				

秘書 CLERK

點名表決 DIVISION: 5

日期 DATE: 12/06/2020

時間 TIME: 10:06:56 上午 AM

動議 MOTION: 涂謹申議員根據《立法會議事規則》第 80(a) 條及《財務委員會會議程序》第 19 段動議的議案  
Motion moved by Hon James TO Kun-sun under Rule 80(a) of the Rules of Procedure of the Legislative Council and paragraph 19 of the Finance Committee Procedure

動議人 MOVED BY:

出席 Present : 44  
投票 Vote : 43  
贊成 Yes : 20  
反對 No : 23  
棄權 Abstain : 0  
結果 Result : 否決 Negatived

個別表決如下 THE INDIVIDUAL VOTES WERE AS FOLLOWS:

議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE	議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE
陳健波	CHAN Kin-por	出席	PRESENT	葉建源	IP Kin-yuen	贊成	YES
涂謹申	James TO	贊成	YES	葛珮帆	Elizabeth QUAT	反對	NO
梁耀忠	LEUNG Yiu-chung	贊成	YES	廖長江	Martin LIAO		
石禮謙	Abraham SHEK			潘兆平	POON Siu-ping	反對	NO
張宇人	Tommy CHEUNG	反對	NO	蔣麗芸	Dr CHIANG Lai-wan		
李國麟	Prof Joseph LEE			盧偉國	Ir Dr LO Wai-kiok		
林健鋒	Jeffrey LAM	反對	NO	鍾國斌	CHUNG Kwok-pan		
黃定光	WONG Ting-kiwong	反對	NO	楊岳橋	Alvin YEUNG	贊成	YES
李慧琼	Starry LEE			尹兆堅	Andrew WAN	贊成	YES
陳克勤	CHAN Hak-kan			朱凱迪	CHU Hoi-dick	贊成	YES
梁美芬	Dr Priscilla LEUNG	反對	NO	吳永嘉	Jimmy NG		
黃國健	WONG Kwok-kin	反對	NO	何君堯	Dr Junius HO		
葉劉淑儀	Mrs Regina IP	反對	NO	林卓廷	LAM Cheuk-ting	贊成	YES
謝偉俊	Paul TSE			周浩鼎	Holden CHOW	反對	NO
毛孟靜	Claudia MO	贊成	YES	邵家輝	SHIU Ka-fai		
田北辰	Michael TIEN			邵家臻	SHIU Ka-chun		
何俊賢	Steven HO	反對	NO	柯創盛	Wilson OR	反對	NO
易志明	Frankie YICK	反對	NO	容海恩	YUNG Hoi-yan		
胡志偉	WU Chi-wai	贊成	YES	陳沛然	Dr Pierre CHAN		
姚思榮	YIU Si-wing			陳振英	CHAN Chun-ying	反對	NO
馬逢國	MA Fung-kiok	反對	NO	陳淑莊	Tanya CHAN	贊成	YES
莫乃光	Charles Peter MOK	贊成	YES	張國鈞	CHEUNG Kwok-kwan	反對	NO
陳志全	CHAN Chi-chuen	贊成	YES	許智峯	HUI Chi-fung	贊成	YES
陳恒鎮	CHAN Han-pan			陸頌雄	LUK Chung-hung	反對	NO
梁志祥	LEUNG Che-cheung			劉國勳	LAU Kwok-fan	反對	NO
梁繼昌	Kenneth LEUNG	贊成	YES	劉業強	Kenneth LAU		
麥美娟	Alice MAK	反對	NO	鄭松泰	Dr CHENG Chung-tai	贊成	YES
郭家麒	Dr KWOK Ka-ki	贊成	YES	鄭俊宇	KWONG Chun-yu	贊成	YES
郭偉強	KWOK Wai-keung	反對	NO	譚文豪	Jeremy TAM	贊成	YES
郭榮鏗	Dennis KWOK			鄭泳舜	Vincent CHENG	反對	NO
張華峰	Christopher CHEUNG	反對	NO	謝偉銓	Tony TSE	反對	NO
張超雄	Dr Fernando CHEUNG	贊成	YES	陳凱欣	CHAN Hoi-yan	反對	NO
黃碧雲	Dr Helena WONG	贊成	YES				

秘書 CLERK

點名表決 DIVISION: 6  
日期 DATE: 12/06/2020  
時間 TIME: 10:12:14 上午 AM

動議 MOTION: 許智峯議員根據《立法會議事規則》第 80(a) 條及《財務委員會會議程序》第 19 段動議的議案  
Motion moved by Hon HUI Chi-fung under Rule 80(a) of the Rules of Procedure of the Legislative Council and paragraph 19 of the Finance Committee Procedure

動議人 MOVED BY:

出席 Present : 47  
投票 Vote : 46  
贊成 Yes : 20  
反對 No : 26  
棄權 Abstain : 0  
結果 Result : 否決 Negatived

個別表決如下 THE INDIVIDUAL VOTES WERE AS FOLLOWS:

議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE	議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE
陳健波	CHAN Kin-por	出席	PRESENT	葉建源	IP Kin-yuen	贊成	YES
涂謹申	James TO	贊成	YES	葛珮帆	Elizabeth QUAT	反對	NO
梁耀忠	LEUNG Yiu-chung	贊成	YES	廖長江	Martin LIAO	反對	NO
石禮謙	Abraham SHEK	反對	NO	潘兆平	POON Siu-ping	反對	NO
張宇人	Tommy CHEUNG	反對	NO	蔣麗芸	Dr CHIANG Lai-wan		
李國麟	Prof Joseph LEE			盧偉國	Ir Dr LO Wai-kiok		
林健鋒	Jeffrey LAM	反對	NO	鍾國斌	CHUNG Kwok-pan		
黃定光	WONG Ting-kiwong	反對	NO	楊岳橋	Alvin YEUNG	贊成	YES
李慧琼	Starry LEE			尹兆堅	Andrew WAN	贊成	YES
陳克勤	CHAN Hak-kan			朱凱迪	CHU Hoi-dick	贊成	YES
梁美芬	Dr Priscilla LEUNG	反對	NO	吳永嘉	Jimmy NG	反對	NO
黃國健	WONG Kwok-kin	反對	NO	何君堯	Dr Junius HO		
葉劉淑儀	Mrs Regina IP	反對	NO	林卓廷	LAM Cheuk-ting	贊成	YES
謝偉俊	Paul TSE			周浩鼎	Holden CHOW	反對	NO
毛孟靜	Claudia MO	贊成	YES	邵家輝	SHIU Ka-fai		
田北辰	Michael TIEN			邵家臻	SHIU Ka-chun		
何俊賢	Steven HO	反對	NO	柯創盛	Wilson OR	反對	NO
易志明	Frankie YICK	反對	NO	容海恩	YUNG Hoi-yan		
胡志偉	WU Chi-wai	贊成	YES	陳沛然	Dr Pierre CHAN		
姚思榮	YIU Si-wing			陳振英	CHAN Chun-ying	反對	NO
馬逢國	MA Fung-kiok	反對	NO	陳淑莊	Tanya CHAN	贊成	YES
莫乃光	Charles Peter MOK	贊成	YES	張國鈞	CHEUNG Kwok-kwan	反對	NO
陳志全	CHAN Chi-chuen	贊成	YES	許智峯	HUI Chi-fung	贊成	YES
陳恒鎮	CHAN Han-pan			陸頌雄	LUK Chung-hung	反對	NO
梁志祥	LEUNG Che-cheung			劉國勳	LAU Kwok-fan	反對	NO
梁繼昌	Kenneth LEUNG	贊成	YES	劉業強	Kenneth LAU		
麥美娟	Alice MAK	反對	NO	鄭松泰	Dr CHENG Chung-tai	贊成	YES
郭家麒	Dr KWOK Ka-ki	贊成	YES	鄭俊宇	KWONG Chun-yu	贊成	YES
郭偉強	KWOK Wai-keung	反對	NO	譚文豪	Jeremy TAM	贊成	YES
郭榮鏗	Dennis KWOK			鄭泳舜	Vincent CHENG	反對	NO
張華峰	Christopher CHEUNG	反對	NO	謝偉銓	Tony TSE	反對	NO
張超雄	Dr Fernando CHEUNG	贊成	YES	陳凱欣	CHAN Hoi-yan	反對	NO
黃碧雲	Dr Helena WONG	贊成	YES				

秘書 CLERK



點名表決 DIVISION: 7  
日期 DATE: 12/06/2020  
時間 TIME: 10:17:32 上午 AM

動議 MOTION: 黃碧雲議員根據《立法會議事規則》第 80(a) 條及《財務委員會會議程序》第 19 段動議的議案  
Motion moved by Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan under Rule 80(a) of the Rules of Procedure of the  
Legislative Council and paragraph 19 of the Finance Committee Procedure

動議人 MOVED BY:

出席 Present : 50  
投票 Vote : 49  
贊成 Yes : 21  
反對 No : 28  
棄權 Abstain : 0  
結果 Result : 否決 Negatived

個別表決如下 THE INDIVIDUAL VOTES WERE AS FOLLOWS:

議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE	議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE
陳健波	CHAN Kin-por	出席	PRESENT	葉建源	IP Kin-yuen	贊成	YES
涂謹申	James TO	贊成	YES	葛珮帆	Elizabeth QUAT	反對	NO
梁耀忠	LEUNG Yiu-chung	贊成	YES	廖長江	Martin LIAO	反對	NO
石禮謙	Abraham SHEK	反對	NO	潘兆平	POON Siu-ping	反對	NO
張宇人	Tommy CHEUNG	反對	NO	蔣麗芸	Dr CHIANG Lai-wan		
李國麟	Prof Joseph LEE			盧偉國	Ir Dr LO Wai-kiok		
林健鋒	Jeffrey LAM	反對	NO	鍾國斌	CHUNG Kwok-pan		
黃定光	WONG Ting-kiwong	反對	NO	楊岳橋	Alvin YEUNG	贊成	YES
李慧琼	Starry LEE			尹兆堅	Andrew WAN	贊成	YES
陳克勤	CHAN Hak-kan	反對	NO	朱凱迪	CHU Hoi-dick	贊成	YES
梁美芬	Dr Priscilla LEUNG	反對	NO	吳永嘉	Jimmy NG	反對	NO
黃國健	WONG Kwok-kin	反對	NO	何君堯	Dr Junius HO		
葉劉淑儀	Mrs Regina IP	反對	NO	林卓廷	LAM Cheuk-ting	贊成	YES
謝偉俊	Paul TSE			周浩鼎	Holden CHOW	反對	NO
毛孟靜	Claudia MO	贊成	YES	邵家輝	SHIU Ka-fai		
田北辰	Michael TIEN			邵家臻	SHIU Ka-chun		
何俊賢	Steven HO	反對	NO	柯創盛	Wilson OR	反對	NO
易志明	Frankie YICK	反對	NO	容海恩	YUNG Hoi-yan		
胡志偉	WU Chi-wai	贊成	YES	陳沛然	Dr Pierre CHAN	贊成	YES
姚思榮	YIU Si-wing	反對	NO	陳振英	CHAN Chun-ying	反對	NO
馬逢國	MA Fung-kiok	反對	NO	陳淑莊	Tanya CHAN	贊成	YES
莫乃光	Charles Peter MOK	贊成	YES	張國鈞	CHEUNG Kwok-kwan	反對	NO
陳志全	CHAN Chi-chuen	贊成	YES	許智峯	HUI Chi-fung	贊成	YES
陳恒鎮	CHAN Han-pan			陸頌雄	LUK Chung-hung	反對	NO
梁志祥	LEUNG Che-cheung			劉國勳	LAU Kwok-fan	反對	NO
梁繼昌	Kenneth LEUNG	贊成	YES	劉業強	Kenneth LAU		
麥美娟	Alice MAK	反對	NO	鄭松泰	Dr CHENG Chung-tai	贊成	YES
郭家麒	Dr KWOK Ka-ki	贊成	YES	鄭俊宇	KWONG Chun-yu	贊成	YES
郭偉強	KWOK Wai-keung	反對	NO	譚文豪	Jeremy TAM	贊成	YES
郭榮鏗	Dennis KWOK			鄭泳舜	Vincent CHENG	反對	NO
張華峰	Christopher CHEUNG	反對	NO	謝偉銓	Tony TSE	反對	NO
張超雄	Dr Fernando CHEUNG	贊成	YES	陳凱欣	CHAN Hoi-yan	反對	NO
黃碧雲	Dr Helena WONG	贊成	YES				

秘書 CLERK



點名表決 DIVISION: 8

日期 DATE: 12/06/2020

時間 TIME: 10:22:56 上午 AM

動議 MOTION: 鄭俊宇議員根據《立法會議事規則》第 80(a) 條及《財務委員會會議程序》第 19 段動議的議案  
Motion moved by Hon KWONG Chun-yu under Rule 80(a) of the Rules of Procedure of the Legislative Council and paragraph 19 of the Finance Committee Procedure

動議人 MOVED BY:

出席 Present : 51

投票 Vote : 50

贊成 Yes : 21

反對 No : 29

棄權 Abstain : 0

結果 Result : 否決 Negatived

個別表決如下 THE INDIVIDUAL VOTES WERE AS FOLLOWS:

議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE	議員	MEMBER	投票	VOTE
陳健波	CHAN Kin-por	出席	PRESENT	葉建源	IP Kin-yuen	贊成	YES
涂謹申	James TO	贊成	YES	葛珮帆	Elizabeth QUAT	反對	NO
梁耀忠	LEUNG Yiu-chung	贊成	YES	廖長江	Martin LIAO	反對	NO
石禮謙	Abraham SHEK	反對	NO	潘兆平	POON Siu-ping	反對	NO
張宇人	Tommy CHEUNG	反對	NO	蔣麗芸	Dr CHIANG Lai-wan		
李國麟	Prof Joseph LEE			盧偉國	Ir Dr LO Wai-kiok		
林健鋒	Jeffrey LAM	反對	NO	鍾國斌	CHUNG Kwok-pan		
黃定光	WONG Ting-kiwong	反對	NO	楊岳橋	Alvin YEUNG	贊成	YES
李慧琼	Starry LEE			尹兆堅	Andrew WAN	贊成	YES
陳克勤	CHAN Hak-kan	反對	NO	朱凱迪	CHU Hoi-dick	贊成	YES
梁美芬	Dr Priscilla LEUNG	反對	NO	吳永嘉	Jimmy NG	反對	NO
黃國健	WONG Kwok-kin	反對	NO	何君堯	Dr Junius HO		
葉劉淑儀	Mrs Regina IP	反對	NO	林卓廷	LAM Cheuk-ting	贊成	YES
謝偉俊	Paul TSE			周浩鼎	Holden CHOW	反對	NO
毛孟靜	Claudia MO	贊成	YES	邵家輝	SHIU Ka-fai		
田北辰	Michael TIEN			邵家臻	SHIU Ka-chun		
何俊賢	Steven HO	反對	NO	柯創盛	Wilson OR	反對	NO
易志明	Frankie YICK	反對	NO	容海恩	YUNG Hoi-yan		
胡志偉	WU Chi-wai	贊成	YES	陳沛然	Dr Pierre CHAN	贊成	YES
姚思榮	YIU Si-wing	反對	NO	陳振英	CHAN Chun-ying	反對	NO
馬逢國	MA Fung-kiok	反對	NO	陳淑莊	Tanya CHAN	贊成	YES
莫乃光	Charles Peter MOK	贊成	YES	張國鈞	CHEUNG Kwok-kwan	反對	NO
陳志全	CHAN Chi-chuen	贊成	YES	許智峯	HUI Chi-fung	贊成	YES
陳恒鎮	CHAN Han-pan			陸頌雄	LUK Chung-hung	反對	NO
梁志祥	LEUNG Che-cheung			劉國勳	LAU Kwok-fan	反對	NO
梁繼昌	Kenneth LEUNG	贊成	YES	劉業強	Kenneth LAU	反對	NO
麥美娟	Alice MAK	反對	NO	鄭松泰	Dr CHENG Chung-tai	贊成	YES
郭家麒	Dr KWOK Ka-ki	贊成	YES	鄭俊宇	KWONG Chun-yu	贊成	YES
郭偉強	KWOK Wai-keung	反對	NO	譚文豪	Jeremy TAM	贊成	YES
郭榮鏗	Dennis KWOK			鄭泳舜	Vincent CHENG	反對	NO
張華峰	Christopher CHEUNG	反對	NO	謝偉銓	Tony TSE	反對	NO
張超雄	Dr Fernando CHEUNG	贊成	YES	陳凱欣	CHAN Hoi-yan	反對	NO
黃碧雲	Dr Helena WONG	贊成	YES				

秘書 CLERK

